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ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Background

The guidelines for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (California Administrative Code, Title 14, Division 6), known as CEQA, stipulates that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on a local general plan, element or amendment thereof may be combined with that document and no separate Environmental Impact Report will be required as specified in Section 15148. For purposes of clarity, this section is reproduced fully below:

15148. EIR as Part of General Plan.

(a) The requirements for an EIR on a local general plan, element or amendment thereof will be satisfied by the general plan or element document, and no separate EIR will be required, if:

(1) The general plan addresses all the points required to be in an EIR by Article 9 of these guidelines and;

(2) The document contains a special section or a cover sheet identifying where the general plan document addresses each of the points required.

(b) The Lead Agency for the general plan, element, or amendment shall forward the appropriate documents to the State Clearinghouse for state review.

As utilized by the South Sacramento Community Area Plan, this procedure allows for the inclusion of the EIR within the project itself. The information required by law for an EIR is found throughout the plan document.

In addition, public participation has been included throughout the plans development and recognition of potentially adverse effects has resulted in modifications to the land use designations. Resident participation through Sacramento County's Community Council System whereby local residents work with planning staff in goal identification and plan development has further augmented the EIR requirement of citizen review prior to official public hearings.

Summary of Environmental Impacts

The South Sacramento Community Area Plan is a consolidation and updating of various City of Sacramento and County of Sacramento planning documents. The purpose of the plan is to guide the future physical growth and to make provision for public services for the community area. Further, the plan, through certain proposals, may be instrumental in making small but significant changes to the social fabric of neighborhoods and the community. As described in Chapter 1, the introduction, South Sacramento
is a 29 square mile planning area in the southern Sacramento Metropolitan area. Present (1975) population is about 62,000 persons; by 1995 the population is expected to be 104,000 persons and if the development follows the plan a maximum population of about 158,000 persons may be reached at an undetermined future time. The study area is partially located in the City of Sacramento and Sacramento County unincorporated area.

The project finds that following the potentially significant impacts can be expected as population increases with attendant changes to commercial and industrial areas occur. The analysis of potentially significant impacts described by the project can be summarized as:

1. Air quality along high volume traffic corridors, major commercial area parking lots and the larger air basin of which the Sacramento metropolitan area is a part of, would be adversely affected if the project is implemented. The increase is a result of more vehicle miles traveled within the project area. A companion impact associated with transportation is increased noise levels throughout the community along certain streets.

2. Traffic would significantly increase with project implementation. Some major thoroughfares are projected to be close to their rated capacity by the year 1985. The resulting traffic congestion will add to the degradation of air quality in the project area.

3. Use of limited groundwater will continue to lower the water table throughout the South Sacramento Metropolitan area. Provisions to mitigate the shortfall of water supply may yet be a number of years away because of a lack of determined coordination between water purveyors of the area to pursue the use of additional surface water as is done by the City of Sacramento.

4. Significant potential for conflict exists between proposed land uses as shown on the project's land use plan. Areas include industrial-residential interfaces, and heavy commercial/residential interfaces; additionally the more common situation of major streets and freeway conflicts with residential uses exists in various sections of the project.

5. Development consistent with the project presumes the construction of four elementary schools and one junior high school by 1985. A further less than significant by-product of project will be a continued overcrowding of schools that presently serve the high growth area. This impact will be only relieved and not totally resolved by new school construction.

Mitigation Measures

The project describes the existing condition of the South Sacramento areas as committed to urban type development. As a result of this
condition, the available mitigation measures are limited because of the
developed situation. Nevertheless, the project includes a series of
mitigation measures that are specific to identified problems described
within each section of the project. Recommended policies and programs
include: Chapter 1, Implementation, pp. 1-5 through 1-23; Chapter 3, Land
Use, pp. 3-1 through 3-15, esp. Map 3-C, South Sacramento Community Area
Land Use Plan; Chapter 4, Economic Element, pp. 4-1 through 4-45, esp. pp.
4-20, 21 and 22, and 4-41, 42, 43, 44 and 45; Chapter 6, Transportation
Element, pp. 6-1 through 6-17, esp. pp. 6-13, 14, 15, 16 and 17; Chapter 7,
Environmental Considerations, pp. 7-1 through 7-37, esp. pp. 7-18 through
24, 7-27 through 30, 32 and 34; Chapter 8, Housing Element, pp. 8-1
through 8-38 esp. pp. 8-34 through 38; Chapter 9, Schools Element, pp. 9-1
through 9-7, esp. pp. 9-2, 6 and 7; Chapter 10, Parks and Recreation,
Community Aesthetics and Open Space, pp. 10-1 through 10-21, esp.
pp.10-5, 6, 7, 11 and pp. 10-13, 15 and pp. 10-18, 20 and 21; and
Chapter 11, Public Services, pp. 11-1 through 11-32, esp. pp. 11-5, 8, 17,
22, 23, 31.

Energy Conservation

The plan has a set of policies relating to yard area, building orientation,
tree planting and land use allocations to minimize energy consumption.
The plan includes the following policies (among others):

1. Encourage increased use of public transportation and non-auto
   transport by design and transit routing.

2. Reduce heat gain/loss by retaining trees and by promoting a community
   tree planting program.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

1. No Development

Obviously, the no development concept is the least likely alternative
to be considered and recent history of the area indicates that a no
growth policy would be contrary to all that's gone before. The
effect would be to avoid the impacts described in other sections of
this report that are related to population increases and significant
changes in non-residential related land uses. Existing open space
would remain, road traffic would not increase to any substantial
degree, and the need to expand most public services would not be
likely. This situation would be changed if previously approved
projects were to be constructed. Presently, there are a number of
subdivisions and other residential projects that are approved but
unconstructed. However, the population related increases that might
occur under the situation of allowing development of already approved
projects would have the least significant of impacts than any other
alternative. There would be, associated with the no development
concept, significant impact in the hardship faced by those owners of
vacant or underdeveloped land who would perceive further develop-
ment to be in their economic interest. Such impact could, by
some, be viewed to include all area residents and local governments
in a negative fashion.
2. Continuation of Existing Plans and Zoning

Because the South Sacramento study area is governed by a number of jurisdictions, there presently exists a variety of plans for the future. These plans include the Sacramento City and County General Plans; community plans such as the City of Sacramento, Valley Hi and Fruitridge Community Plans; and Park District and School District Plans, etc. Further, there exists the control over land use of zoning in both the City of Sacramento and the unincorporated area. Continuation of the existing plans and zoning would result in impacts that might be considered greater than the proposed project (South Sacramento Community Area Plan), for a number of reasons. The reasons are both organizational and physical. In terms of population, there would be a small percentage population difference between full development under the General Plan compared to the project because a number of acres of land proposed for commercial use on the General Plans is proposed to be developed for multiple family use under the project. This revision seems justified based on a full analysis of commercial needs found in Chapter 6. This situation will continue.

A trend in most communities recently has been an increase in the ratio of multiple family housing compared to single family units. This occurrence—and it is proposed by the project—can be beneficial from an energy conservation viewpoint. Normally, fewer resources are utilized per multi-unit; better insulation is incorporated into the structure and; in the South Sacramento case, these housing units are located along major transportation routes with good access to transit. There no doubt will be a theoretical population increase and, hence, an increase in the need for services required by the project. However, these factors have been included in the plan considerations and, as such, their impacts should be lessened. The cumulative impacts of air quality reduction, noise level increases and groundwater depletion are spoken to in the project and General Plans both, and while in neither case are the issues resolved, they may be better described with more localized programs proposed in the project. The project makes reference to industrial area relocation and definition, buffer area proposals where industrial and residential uses have a common boundary, and other procedures to reduce conflict between uses. A final difference is that the project has investigated current conditions within all jurisdictions serving the community and includes recommendations addressing identified problems; whereas, the existing plans do not have the same current overview and, as such, are to some extent narrow and outdated.

3. Reduced Density

As an alternative, this proposal would be closest to the project itself. A reduced density alternative would be a proposal that would about halve the allowable density of a number of undeveloped
properties in the study area. As a recommendation, it would be straightforward in its application. Certain property shown for commercial on the project land use map would be shown for Residential Density 20 (RD-20) resulting in a population increase; some property shown as Residential Density 20 would be proposed for Residential Density 10 (RD-10), and so on through the residential categories. These changes result in an overall population decrease. The result of this could be a decrease in the holding capacity figure for dwelling units by about 6,075. This would translate into a reduction in the holding capacity from about 158,000 to about 140,000 persons. This calculation is rough and it assumed a population per household of 2.9, the same as the 1975 census for the area. While only an estimated figure, the reduction would be about 11% of the holding capacity of the project. Almost half of this figure would be based on the significant change from land recommended for agricultural urban reserve to land placed in the Agricultural-Residential V (5 acre minimum size) category. While this population reduction could be of some importance in reducing impacts accrued under higher population, the need for metropolitan area expansion must enter into any consideration of this land use decision. Additionally, there may be individual economic impacts which would vary, and there may be an effect on some population dependent services relative to transit.

4. Increased Density

An additional alternative to be considered would be increasing the residential density in special areas. Several changes to the project could increase the holding capacity of South Sacramento to a significant degree (10% or more). Present vacant or underdeveloped lands in both the City of Sacramento and the unincorporated county area could conceivably accept higher densities than are proposed by the project. This would entail changes to RD-40 and RD-30 for lands presently shown for RD-30, 20 and 10.

Advantages and benefits to the increase of density would include (but not be limited to), transit opportunity for more persons, increased density near commercial areas with a potential for less automobile usage, potential for increased housing opportunities and locations for a broader economic range of persons, concentration of suburban areas rather than continual expansion of the suburbs, possible decrease of need for some additional infrastructure and possibly allow a greater efficiency in public services (transit, streets, parks, schools, etc.). Obvious disadvantages may include, development of housing that is not marketable in this portion of the metropolitan area, increased need for changes in capacity of present infrastructure (schools, parks, sewers, etc.), potential for increased social conflict associated with higher densities, less opportunity for detached single family home ownership, potential for concentration of lower economic persons compared to other similar areas of the county without similar densities.

It would be expected that the holding capacity of this community area could be increased to between 175,000 and 180,000 persons if a concentrated effort was made at proposing and developing the area at increased densities.
CHAPTER ONE

IMPLEMENTATION

Orientation

The Community Plan for the South Sacramento area has been jointly developed by the South Sacramento Area Planning Advisory Council and planning staff as a guide for the area's future development. The South Sacramento Area Community Plan is unique in that about 60% of the area is in the unincorporated county and 40% is located within the incorporated City of Sacramento. Thus, the plan has been a joint effort of these jurisdictions. A community plan is a more detailed planning tool than the general plan of either a city or county and makes specific recommendations at a block and parcel level. For a community plan to remain a viable planning document, it is important that a regular review and update process be utilized by both the community residents and planning officials.

The plan for this community will be self-implementing to a large degree. This will come about through the adoption of the plan by the Board of Supervisors under a combined zoning and land use program described in this chapter. This process is designed to simplify development procedures under appropriate conditions. A further refinement of the planning process is the inclusion in the report of an environmental assessment of possible development scenarios. Any individual future development proposal will still require or not require an Environmental Impact Report depending upon its specific nature. Consistency of a project with the adopted plan will, however, indicate that the proposal fits the scenario which has been subject to a degree of environmental scrutiny and, as such, could be expected to proceed through the decision making process with greater facility than one which is inconsistent.

Location and Description

The South Sacramento area is a portion of and south of the City of Sacramento. The plan area is about 29 square miles and its boundaries for the purpose of this report are: Fruitridge Road on the north, the Western Pacific Railroad Company tracks on the west, Elk Grove - Florin Road on the east, and Calvine Road, Sheldon Road and the City limits on the south. Additionally, an area called "The Fruitridge Pocket" is included in the study area. "The Pocket" is an unincorporated area north of Fruitridge Road that extends to 14th Avenue. Within the community area is a great diversity of special districts such as fire, water, schools, etc., which may or may not have a direct relationship to the plan area's boundary. The South Sacramento area is not a completely separate, identifiable community. Rather, it is a loose confederation of small neighborhoods which focus around the major thoroughfares, shopping centers and places of employment within the area.
South Sacramento or portions of it are best described as a suburban city. While some of these areas are not incorporated, they have the appearance of a city. (The best example, of course, is the major shopping area along Florin Road from Franklin Boulevard east to Stockton Boulevard, with its back-up residential areas.)

The South Sacramento community has some 62,700 persons in 1975, and has many features of what might be called a balanced city. For example, major shopping areas including community, regional and super regional centers are located within the area. There are industrial areas with both large and small industries such as Campbell Soup, Sacramento Army Depot and Keyes Fibreboard Plant. There are two major and one minor railroad lines, a freeway, and a largely completed major street network in the developed northerly two thirds of the study area providing access to nearly all areas of the community and the metropolitan Sacramento Area.

History

The suburban growth of South Sacramento began with the major roads of Stockton which traverse the area. Stockton Boulevard and Franklin Boulevard (Lower Stockton Road) extend southerly from the old town area of the City of Sacramento and were used from the earliest days of the "gold mining" period for land transportation to Stockton and for rural, farm oriented travel. The next transportation growth was the Southern Pacific Railroad (Central Pacific) and then some years later, the Western Pacific Railroad. The old town of Florin, located at Florin Road and the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks had its beginnings in the 1880's. Further growth in any concentrated form beyond farm residences did not occur until the 1930's and then in the Fruitridge Pocket area. During the 1940's, steady growth of residential areas took place in the City Farms, Fruitridge, and Fruitridge Manor areas. The 1950's saw even more residential growth occur in Fruitridge Manor and Fruitridge areas with the "Pocket" area steadily filling in. During this period, additional shopping was developed along Stockton Boulevard and Florin Road and new residential areas developed in the Parkway, Lindale, Elder Creek and Florin areas. The 1960's found residential growth extending ever southward. During this period a decline in growth occurred in Fruitridge, the Pocket and Fruitridge Manor areas. Meanwhile, rapid growth occurred during the early 60's in the Bowling Green, Florin Mall, Lindale, Meadowview and Valley Hi areas. The growth trend tapered off between 1968 and 1973. Currently, however, the southern areas once again are witnessing a resurgence in both single and multiple family dwellings. Additional housing was provided in mobile home parks throughout the period 1960 to 1975. During this same decade and a half, commercial and industrial areas developed providing services and employment for the area's residents.

Community Council Role

The County of Sacramento has established, in communities throughout the unincorporated area, a group of Planning Advisory Councils and Committees that provide a local forum and input to planning matters
affecting their communities. The South Sacramento Area Planning Advisory Council was appointed by the Board of Supervisors during July of 1975, from members of an already established and functioning ad hoc group. Planning staff was assigned to plan development and began on a part-time basis about the same time.

The role the Planning Advisory Council plays is clearly laid out by the Board of Supervisors in Resolution No. 75-743. The principle concept behind the council system is to encourage citizen participation. Further, it is hoped that the community council will be a "watchdog", so to speak, of the plan and make every attempt, from a local viewpoint, to guide the growth of its area. Councils are designed to be a continuous, long term operation and thus, be better able to have contact and idea exchange with the community at large. The councils give advice to the Zoning Administrator, Subdivision Review Committee, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors on planning and other related community concerns.

Future Land Use Plan Discussion and Population

The population and its growth are described based on the land use zones, projections and other factors. The "Holding Capacity" of a community is a calculated maximum number of persons who could live in an area based on specific assumptions of density. The South Sacramento Study area holding capacity is about 158,000 persons, and it is estimated that this population may not occur until some time after the year 2020.

The population changes and projections can be seen on Table 3-B and in other sections of this report, and can be summarized as follows: Population change 70-75, 58,900 to 62,700 for a 2% per year increase; projections for the period 75-85 are for a 2.3% annual growth rate, and a 1985 population of 78,900 persons; for the period 85-95 a 2.8% rate is forecast, with a 1995 population estimated at about 104,000. The increase in number of dwelling units by type and projected area is shown on Table 3-C.

The Land Use Plan for the South Sacramento area is basically a growth accommodating plan. This plan recognizes that virtually all of the area is appropriate for urban development, and most constraints to development for residential areas can be mitigated during construction or corrected by investment for public services. Areas with constraints that are not in these categories may require non-residential service type uses. For example, land impacted by aircraft from Mather Air Force Base should not have residential uses, and the probable use may include agricultural or industrial. The growth accommodating plan envisions an infilling of vacant land and an outward growth within areas designated for urban development. It is not a growth managing plan or one that attempts to limit the number of new dwellings. The constraints to growth will be services such as water, energy, schools and parks, and if these services are not readily available, then new development must wait until they are.
City of Sacramento - Incorporated Area

As described elsewhere in this report, a large portion of the study area is within the jurisdiction of the City of Sacramento. The method of implementation will be to first hold public hearings on the plan before the City Planning Commission and then the City Council. Subsequent to plan adoption by the Sacramento City Council, an additional planning effort will be required to meet the city's needs. The goals and policy directions will remain virtually the same. Implementation measures specific to the city, however, will need to be developed. The City Planning staff will develop a zoning consistency proposal. This zoning proposal will be brought to public hearing and the City Council will adopt revised zoning based on the adopted plan for specific locations.

Community Development Program

During the preparation of the South Sacramento Area Plan, Sacramento County began to distribute to local areas monies from the Federal Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG). For South Sacramento, this has meant staff persons to help with the development of its plan, monies for housing rehabilitation and insulation, improvements to streets, and street lighting and other important public improvements to identified target areas; thus some aspects of the plan have already been implemented. For the year 1976-77, the Board of Supervisors allocated about $900,000 from this program to the South Sacramento area. Construction of these facilities will be started upon completion of engineering studies and will probably begin during the Spring of 1979. The City of Sacramento receives federal money for these types of projects and has had a similar on-going program for several years.

Major Policy Statements

For the South Sacramento Area Land Use Zone Plan

It is the policy of the Board of Supervisors of Sacramento County that:

1. **A MAJOR CONCEPT OF THIS PLAN IS TO PLACE A GREAT EMPHASIS ON INFILLING (DEVELOPMENT OF VACANT URBAN AREAS WITHIN AREAS PARTIALLY URBANIZED).**

2. **SPECIAL EFFORT MUST BE MADE TO ENCOURAGE THE CONTIGUOUS GROWTH FROM EXISTING URBAN DEVELOPMENT OUTWARD. THE PRINCIPAL REASON FOR THIS IS TO ELIMINATE "LEAP FROG" DEVELOPMENT WHICH INCREASES COSTS OF DEVELOPMENT BECAUSE OF THE NEED TO EXTEND PUBLIC UTILITIES AND OTHER SERVICES BEYOND VACANT LANDS. THE QUESTION OF, "IS A PROPOSAL CONTIGUOUS OR NOT," MUST BE ANSWERED AT THE TIME A PROPOSAL FOR DEVELOPMENT IS BEING CONSIDERED.**

3. **AREAS IN THE URBAN RESERVE CATEGORY ARE PLANNED FOR AGRICULTURAL USE FOR THE LIFE OF THE PLAN (5 TO 10 YEARS) AND ARE PROPOSED FOR FUTURE URBAN USE WHEN A REAL NEED HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED. CONVERSION TO URBAN USE SHOULD NOT OCCUR UNTIL A FULL PLAN RENSTUDY HAS BEEN COMPLETED. UNDER SOME CIRCUMSTANCES, SUCH AS ONLY 20 OR 30 ACRES PURPOSED FOR URBAN USE, AN INTERMEDIATE PLAN UPDATE MAY BE SUFFICIENT.**
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GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The following pages cover the goals and objectives of the South Sacramento community. An effort has been made to relate those aspirations to specific problems, some known at the outset of this study and others identified as the study proceeded. The list includes only those issues more traditionally discussed by a community plan. The list is not exhaustive, but does highlight the major problems identified. A broader range of social and economic issues are included only as they relate to more commonly discussed areas of community planning such as housing and community facilities planning.

GOAL ONE:

TO ACHIEVE A SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA COMMUNITY PLAN TO ENSURE THAT LAND USES ARE MUTUALLY COMPATIBLE, FUNCTIONAL, HEALTHFUL, AND AESTHETICALLY PLEASING.

The age of structures and low quality new construction in combination with leap frog and strip commercial areas without adequate provision for landscaping and other aesthetic needs has resulted in a community with a noticeably poor image. The image is further "enhanced" by the inadequate buffering of residential and commercial/industrial uses and the lack of protection and development of identifiable neighborhoods.

1.0 PROBLEM. The leap frog development of the community has resulted in residential and commercial/industrial areas being developed too close to one another.

1.1 OBJECTIVE. To promote the development of land use policies that will maintain existing business areas and encourage their improvement.

1.12 PROGRAM. Develop a set of special development standards applicable for future policy decisions regarding development in the following specific areas: one, Florin Old Town; two, Stockton Boulevard between Mack Road and Gerber Road; and three, Wyndham Drive, east of Valley Hi Drive; and in the following general areas; one, Industrial/Residential areas; two, Heavy Commercial/Residential areas; and three, Flood areas. (The policies and programs are listed at the end of this chapter).

2.0 PROBLEM. Much of the development currently occurring in the community is of lower quality and not aesthetically attractive.

2.1 OBJECTIVE. To beautify major thoroughfares, etc.

2.12 PROGRAM. Establish a design review body which would have authority to approve or disapprove the architectural design of development in the community including landscaping, architecture and quality of construction, and control of the size and location of off-street signs, billboards and outdoor lighting.
GOAL TWO:

TO PROMOTE OPEN SPACE AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES WITHIN THE PLAN AREA.

The past provision of park facilities and a system of linkage between parks has been inadequate. The inadequacy has been, in part, due to lack of planning and in part due to inadequate park dedication standards for new development. In addition to a lack of physical recreational facilities a noticeable lack of concern for cultural activities and centers has prevailed.

3.0 PROBLEM. A lack of parks and planned open space.

3.1 OBJECTIVE. To promote a well balanced system of parks and open space.

3.11 PROGRAM. To evaluate standards for providing open space within the community where such standards are not now in effect, including parks, unimproved areas, buffer zones and other recreational facilities.

3.12 PROGRAM. To recommend recreational requirements for all new development and all urban renewal development.

4.0 PROBLEM. The existing opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian recreational facilities and accesses from one park to another have not been taken.

4.1 OBJECTIVE. To promote safe access, to the extent possible, separated from automobiles, for neighborhoods within the community, to all recreational facilities for pedestrian, bicyclists and equestrians.

4.2 OBJECTIVE. To encourage the city and county to provide public use easements beneath existing and proposed electrical power transmission lines, and improved or unimproved waterways for equestrian trails and bikeways.

4.21 PROGRAM. Implement the local park district master plans.

5.0 PROBLEM. The community has a wide diversity of ethnic groups but does not have adequate cultural activity opportunities or centers.

5.1 OBJECTIVE. To encourage and promote culturally-oriented activities within the community.

5.11 PROGRAM. Obtain funds for, construct and maintain the Fruitridge Neighborhood Center as proposed during Community Development Block Grant hearings.
GOAL THREE:

TO PROVIDE PLANNING POLICIES FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE OVERALL COMMUNITY PLAN.

The development of industrial lands in the community has, for the most part, proceeded on a "happenstance" basis resulting in conflicts with other types of land uses, while discouraging higher quality, more intensive use of well situated industrial land. Likewise, industry has not received key inducements to locate in the community.

6.0 PROBLEM. The community has a concern for the orderly development of industry.

6.1 OBJECTIVE. To require that the size, quality, location and types of industrial land uses are consistent with the orderly development of the community.

6.11 PROGRAM. Adoption of the proposed land use plan and the policies listed at the conclusion of this chapter.

7.0 PROBLEM. The industrial sector has insufficient inducement to locate in South Sacramento.

GOAL FOUR:

TO PROVIDE PLANNING POLICIES FOR SAFE, CONVENIENT AND ATTRACTIVE COMMERCIAL FACILITIES MEETING THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY.

Presently much of the strip commercial development along Franklin Blvd., portions of Stockton Blvd. and Fruitridge Road have vacant and marginal development. The trend towards cluster shopping areas is evident and improving the appearance of the community.

8.0 PROBLEM. Excessive amounts of vacant, commercially zoned land and older strip commercial development. As a result there is a noticeable lack of attractive well designed commercial areas and buildings.

8.1 OBJECTIVE. Require well-designed commercial development be located in appropriate areas.

8.2 OBJECTIVE. Encourage the enhancement and/or rehabilitation of existing commercial development within the community.

8.3 OBJECTIVE. To assure the quality, location and type of commercial land use is closely related to the needs and demands of the community.

8.31 PROGRAM. The policies and regulations contained in the policy areas and the special planning areas contained herein and adopted with the plan are to be implemented by application on a project-by-project review basis.
8.32 PROGRAM. Prevent leap frog or strip commercial development by eliminating the commercial zoning in cases where the strips are narrow and/or not near the developed urban area.

GOAL FIVE:

TO ENCOURAGE QUALITY RESIDENTIAL PLANNING POLICIES FOR A HEALTHFUL LIVING ENVIRONMENT THROUGH A VARIETY OF ATTRACTIVE DESIGN, STYLES, TYPES AND PRICE RANGES.

Throughout the plan's development the many housing problems which face an older community within a larger urban area have been confronted by staff and community representatives. The residential areas of the community suffer from four major housing problems: one, over concentration of housing types by cost and type of unit; two, a lack of maintenance of some of the existing housing stock; three, a lack of neighborhood amenities in some areas, including curbs, gutters, sidewalks and street lights; and four, an over concentration of mobile homes, when considered on a regional basis.

9.0 PROBLEM. Construction of low and low-moderate income housing has been concentrated in specific locales throughout the county, but most specifically in South Sacramento.

9.1 OBJECTIVE. Require a reasonable "mix" of low to low-medium and medium population densities in appropriate locations at ultimate development.

9.11 PROGRAMS. Presently, a large variety of housing programs are being utilized by federal, state and local jurisdictions. These programs and other housing related programs should continue on an as needed basis.

9.12 PROGRAM. The county will consider and hold public hearings on a proposal for an ordinance to assure that major development proposals provide a modest percentage of units in a price range affordable to moderate income families (1975 annual income of 10,100 per year minimum). A proposal is contained in the appendix to the plan.

GOAL SIX:

TO PROVIDE INPUT FOR PLANNING POLICIES OF APPROPRIATE PUBLIC SERVICES DESIGNED TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY.

As the plan developed the governmental structure of the area was recognized as being, to a degree, a hinderance to logical planning of public services. The existence of four fire protection agencies in the plan area is just one example of how complicated the jurisdictional aspects of the community are. While the level of service is generally high throughout the community comprehensive planning is not as straightforward as it might be with lesser jurisdictional considerations.
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10.0 **PROBLEM.** The community has a concern for the unacceptable level of coordination between the City of Sacramento, the County of Sacramento and special districts that provide public services to South Sacramento.

10.1 **OBJECTIVE.** Provide planning policies and suggested programs which deal with human problems, needs, aspirations, ambitions, and the welfare of the community. This includes concern for the socio-economic impact on the community of any program altering the physical environment.

10.2 **OBJECTIVE.** Develop planning policies providing for an adequate domestic, recreational, public service and industrial water supply system within the community area.

10.3 **OBJECTIVE.** To encourage utilities be placed underground, or consolidated to reduce visual pollution.

10.11 **PROGRAM.** The Planning Advisory Council has been and will continue to work with and direct local special districts towards the common goal of providing improved lower cost, more responsive public services.

**GOAL SEVEN:**

TO PROVIDE PLANNING POLICIES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS RECOGNIZING MODES OF MOVEMENT WHICH PROVIDE SAFE, CONVENIENT TRANSPORTATION WITH THE LEAST POSSIBLE POLLUTION TO THE ENVIRONMENT.

Many of the transportation problems which face the South Sacramento community are similar to those of the urban/urbanizing region in which it lies. It can be assumed that the future of the community will generally show:

1) Increasing traffic flows in amounts and locations directly related to the future development pattern of the community.

2) Despite emphasis and encouragement toward the use of alternative transport modes such as public transit and bicycling, the predominant means of transportation will continue to be the private automobile.

3) Despite the increase of traffic flows, congestion will not generally become intolerable over the life of the plan (1995) if a street improvement program is carried out as reflected on the major street and highways plan (See Map 6-C, Major Streets and Highways) as it may be modified by the currently (August, 1978) ongoing Transportation Study.

Despite the many possible problems that do or will exist, it must be noted that it is not too late to seek and find favorable solutions.
This report has identified several specific problems to be faced by the South Sacramento community. Below is a listing of the major concerns accompanied by policies which would alleviate or prevent them.

11.0 **PROBLEM.** Future development in the southern portion of the community may well cause severe circulation problems if the existing major street pattern is not, at the same time, bolstered to accommodate the traffic it brings.

11.1 **POLICY.** It is envisioned that the ongoing Transportation Study will provide several partial solutions. The problem is a complex one; the exact magnitude of which will depend on the pattern of future development. Specific policies should include:

1) The widening and continued development of Franklin Blvd.

2) Widening and improvement of Meadowview Road and its connection with Mack Road. The re-evaluation of the Power Inn Road - Elsie Ave. connection and an improved and/or alternate Mack Road - Elsie Ave. - power Inn Freeway connection.

3) Most importantly, the development of the ex-route 148, transportation corridor as a major street from the U.S. 99 Freeway new interchange to a connection with I-5 to the west.

12.0 **PROBLEM.** Public transit serves the needs of the home-to-work commuter to the central city, however, intra-community, point-to-point travel without a transfer is a tenuous proposition at best. Especially unsatisfactory is movement in an east-west direction across the freeway.

12.1 **OBJECTIVE.** Develop an efficient public transit system.

12.2 **OBJECTIVE.** To develop a network of on-street and off-street bicycle and pedestrian paths with emphasis on connecting parks, libraries, schools and transit access points.

12.21 **POLICY.** Public transit routes and schedules should be re-evaluated to determine intra-community travel needs. One or more predominantly east-west routes should be established, and include Fruitridge Road and 47th Ave.

13.0 **PROBLEM.** Further industrial development in the northeastern portion of the community poses the specter of increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic passing through residential and commercial areas, as noted in the industrial discussion, Chapter 4. Specifically, the traffic can be projected to flow along Fruitridge Road and 47th Ave. - Elder Creek Road to and from the freeway.
13.1 **POLICY.** A street improvement program will be carried out such that heavy industrial traffic flows proceed north to Highway 50, north of the community, and south to Freeway 99, rather than east-west through residential-commercial areas. Specifically this will require the widening and improvement of Power Inn Road.

An alternative to the presently unsatisfactory Mack Road freeway access would be to extend Power Inn southward to the intersection of the former Route 148 major street with the freeway.

14.0 **PROBLEM.** The major streets in the community are presently providing an acceptable level of service. As future development occurs with concomitant increases in travel demand the level of service on some of these streets will, however, decline. Indeed, at a few specific locations severe congestion can be expected.

14.1 **POLICY.** Concurrently with community development, a program of widening, traffic control installation and general improvement should be undertaken as is reflected on the major street and highways plan.

Although not strictly a concern of this Transportation Element, any program of street improvement should also include the consideration of street tree planting as outlined in Chapter 10 of the Community Plan.

14.11 **PROGRAM.** Appoint a joint task force of city/county members to quantify costs of street improvements and to suggest amendment of current jurisdictional policies to provide for improvements to the local street system.

15.0 **PROBLEM.** "At grade" rail crossings in the community at present cause concern for their accident potential as well as inconvenience.

15.1 **POLICY.** Where possible, all future major rail crossings shall be separated. The Florin Road crossing of the Western Pacific Railroad will be evaluated to determine the feasibility of a grade separation in the near future.

16.0 **PROBLEM.** In some areas the City of Sacramento and the unincorporated county area boundary is the centerline of a public street or the line cuts a street at right angles. This condition of jurisdiction may result in the street being developed utilizing different development standards and having an unusual and/or undesirable appearance.
16.1 POLICY. As development occurs along jurisdictional boundary streets, the City of Sacramento and County of Sacramento will cooperate and coordinate development standards with the object being a consistency of size, type of improvements and development.

16.11 OBJECTIVE. To quantify the costs of street improvements and to amend current city and county policies as needed to provide for improvements to local street system.

GOAL EIGHT:

TO SUPPORT THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY COUNCILS THROUGH OBTAINMENT OF SUCH POWERS AS MAY BE REQUIRED TO ACCOMPLISH THE DEVELOPMENT AND ADOPTION OF THE COMMUNITY PLANS, AND ACHIEVEMENT OF STATED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.

17.0 PROBLEM. The South Sacramento community has perceived a past lack of interest for the community as a whole by the County Board of Supervisors. This lack of interest was reflected in the lack of physical improvements to the community. As well, the lack of concern has left a leadership void in an area of need for coordination between business, local governmental agencies and the local citizenry.

17.1 OBJECTIVE. To initiate policies designed to promote and support capital improvement programs for public improvements recommended in community plans.

17.2 OBJECTIVE. To establish coordinating policies between the business and industrial interests, special districts and other governmental agencies and the South Sacramento Area Community Planning Advisory Council.

17.21 PROGRAM. Upon adoption of this document the Board of Supervisors will appoint a new Council with the express direction to: one, pursue the implementation of the community plan's goals, objectives and policies, and; two, assist the Board in coordinating the efforts of business and government in South Sacramento, and; three, assist the Board in identifying the need for capital improvements in the community.

GOAL NINE:

TO PROVIDE INPUT INTO PLANNING POLICIES FOR EFFICIENT ENERGY USAGE, CONSERVATION AND POLLUTION CONTROL.

The several programs cited throughout the plan have at base an objective to conserve energy and reduce pollution. The transportation section, the land use map, the aesthetics proposals, in fact nearly all of the items addressed in this report are designated with the end to obtain this goal.
SPECIAL TREATMENT AREAS

Within the study area there exist conditions or the potential for conditions that require special attention. The method of treatment varies from situation to situation, thus the measures to be used are described on an individual area basis within this section of the report. Of specific concern are, Policy Areas, Designated Buffer Areas and Floodways and Floodplains.

Policy Areas

The use of specific Policy Areas in the South Sacramento study area is done chiefly to identify special concern and to encourage specific uses that may not be immediately obvious to all persons. Additionally, it is recognized that the strict interpretation of the zoning code may not always promote the best interests of these individual areas. Each of these areas then is discussed individually; included is the reason it is designated a policy area and specific and general development standards or guidelines which would hopefully help to improve, maintain or reduce an identified condition.

1. Fruitridge Pocket Area

This neighborhood is an unincorporated county area north of Fruitridge Road extending to 14th Avenue. As identified elsewhere in this report, portions of this neighborhood suffer from problems of unemployment, low income, housing, neglect, underinvestment of public money, redlining practices relating to housing loans, etc. The picture is not totally negative for there are some residential areas that are attractive, and much of the housing is reasonably well maintained. Additionally, with the Fiscal Year 1978-1979 large investments for public improvements have been made utilizing both property owner money and Community Development Block Grant Funds. The improvements include housing rehabilitation, streets, sidewalks, curb and gutter, street lights and parks. The following special consideration should be given to appropriate sections of the pocket area as well as other locations within the plan area with similar circumstances.

a. Encourage better utilization of underdeveloped single family residential deep lots (160 foot deep or more) through application of various sections of the zoning code which will allow density increases based on lot area and special circumstances. Each of these situations must be evaluated separately.

City of Sacramento recommendation - continue existing practice of deep lot development with appropriate special permit. The specific incorporated area of the study area is between Fruitridge Road on the north, Elder Creek Road on the south, 65th Street Expressway on the west and Power Inn Road on the east.
b. Continue through the Community Development funding cycle, as appropriate until completion, the housing rehabilitation and other physical improvement programs that have been started with funding from Fiscal Year 1976-1977.

2. Florin Old Town

The Florin Old Town area is principally that portion of Florin Road extending several blocks both east and west from the Southern Pacific Company Rail Road tracks. Within this area are several old semi-historic buildings that may be utilized as a central theme for the development of an old time specialty shop area. This would require that considerable reinvestment occur and that some obnoxious uses be relocated or their appearance modified. Therefore, it is the policy of Sacramento County to:

a. Encourage commercial utilization of the several block long area of Florin Road at the Southern Pacific Rail Road for historic interest specialty shopping. Special consideration should be given to innovative and perhaps non-conforming uses that may enhance this older commercial area.

3. Stockton Boulevard Between Mack Road and Gerber Road

Located in this vicinity is a group of commercial recreational uses. Included are: a golf course, driving range, roller skating rink, drive in/walk in theatre, gymnasium, and restaurant. This location seems well suited to these regional wide recreational uses and it would seem appropriate to encourage more facilities of the type in this vicinity.

It is therefore the policy of Sacramento County to:

a. Encourage commercial recreational uses to locate along Stockton Boulevard between Gerber Road and Mack Road by giving special consideration to innovative proposals. Uses should be community or regional in scope and should enhance rather than detract from the surrounding area and community.

4. Laguna Creek

The most southerly sector of the South Sacramento study area is contiguous with the Laguna community area, and includes Laguna Creek and portions of its floodplain.

5. Gardner Avenue - Gerber Road

This area lies west of Elk Grove-Florin Road, south of Florin and north and south of Gerber Road. The area has partially developed with agricultural-residential lots about 5 acres in size. The
reason for special treatment of the area lies in its potential urban use. The short term use of the area is seen as agricultural-residential uses on 5 acre or larger lots with private wells and septic systems. The long-term or future use, probably more than 15 years in the future, may be standard urban, predominantly residential density 5. The area then would utilize both public sewer and water supply facilities. The reason for not showing the area in the Urban Reserve (U.R.) category is that the typical parcel size is too small to meet the established policy for such designation.

Future development of the area in the low density (RD-5) fashion could easily be forestalled if too many 5-acre parcels are created with a multiplicity of ownerships and without control being placed upon their pattern of development.

It is therefore the policy of Sacramento County that:

a. No division of property shall take place in the noted Agricultural-Residential (AR-5) Gardiner-Gerber area without the demonstration that the division and development will not preclude the future installation of a logical neighborhood public street pattern and the future reasonable development of the area in a low density residential fashion.

6. Stevenson Road, Cottonwood Lane South of Elsie Avenue "DELETED"

7. Area North of Wyndham Drive, East of Valley-Hi Drive

This area is shown for commercial uses. It is, however, considered suitable for commercial, multi-family residential or a combination of the two. If the area is to be developed with a mixture of the two uses, it would be much more appropriate to utilize the Wyndham Drive frontage for the multi-family development furthering the creation of a residential neighborhood rather than a potentially unsatisfactory mix.

a. It is therefore the policy of the City of Sacramento that if the Special Area is to be developed with a mix of commercial and multi-family uses that the multi-family development shall front on Wyndham Drive.

8. Short Road Area North of Calvine Road

As a part of a larger Urban Reserve area, this relatively small area of Agricultural-Residential 5 lots is recognized as a viable reality. Although the entire area is suitable for urbanization in the distant future, Agricultural Residential uses can continue for the Special Planning area until such time as full public services are extended from the north.
9. a. **East of Stockton, South of Elsie Avenue**

In the area bounded on the east by Stockton Blvd., south of Elsie Ave., west of the Southern Pacific Railroad and north of Calvine Road one mobile home park of 15 to 20 acres would be allowed on a "floating" basis—that is in the general area but without a specific location.

b. **Area North of Laguna Creek, West of Bruceville Road**

In the area bounded by Mack Road on the north, Bruceville Road on the east, Laguna Creek 100-year floodplain on the south, and Franklin Blvd on the west, one mobile home park of 10 to 15 acres would be allowed on a "floating" basis—that is in the general area but without a specific location.

c. **Area North of Sheldon Road, West of Highway 99**

In the area bounded by the Sacramento City Limits on the north, Highway 99 on the east, Sheldon Road on the south, and Bruceville Road on the west, one additional mobile home park of 10 to 15 acres would be allowed. On a "floating" basis—that is, in the general area but without a specific location, further said mobile home parks may not be located closer than 600 feet from Highway 99 right-of-way.

10. **North of Florin Road, West of Elk Grove–Florin Road**

This area has a high noise impact from Mather Air Force Base aircraft. In the area designated AR-10 (Agricultural-Residential 10 acre size) a future potential for industrial uses must be kept in mind. A policy for no new divisions less than 10 acres must be adhered to in order to maintain this future potential.

11. **East of Stockton Blvd., North of Calvine Road**

Recognizing the near future potential for urban type uses in this area the immediate policy is to retain the "Gibson Ranch" area, as shown on the community plan, as urban reserve, projecting urban use for this property should be viewed from a General Plan vantage point under a public hearing format.

**Designated Buffer Area Requirements (Neighborhood Preservation Area)**

Located on the land use zone plan in a variety of areas is a closely dotted line that identifies areas of incompatible uses. This condition is identified in the Environmental Impact Report as having the potential to be a significant impact if mitigation measures are
not utilized. These markings call special attention to the potential for conflict between uses. Special buffering requirements are included in this section and should be conditions of approval for new uses. These buffer requirements will be implemented through conditions on site plans, subdivision maps, and use permits. The area on both sides of the line, 200 feet wide, will also be in an (NPA) combining zone described by ordinance. This combining zone will limit uses and areas of use and may include additional building requirements. The ordinance will be developed during the public hearing process and be carried through and adopted with the plan.

Outlined below are general guidelines used for ordinance development. A basic premise is that both uses along the interface of an area with potentially incompatible uses have a responsibility to reduce conflicts. If one use is fully developed then the newer use has nearly full responsibility to mitigate identified problems such as noise, aesthetic, air quality, dust, etc. If both uses are fully developed along a buffer requirement line than mitigation of any problems may be up to litigation, nuisance control or other lawful methods of mitigation.

Policies Relating to the Interface Between Specific Land Area

a. Industrial Area and Residential Area

Industrial requirements are:

1) Minimum building setback from buffer line should be 75 feet.

2) Wall/fence height requirements should be 8 feet and may include a masonry wall.

3) Planter requirement along buffer line should be 25 feet or greater.

4) Noise, dust, vibration, smoke, etc. shall be a consideration in all industrial areas adjacent to potential residential uses.

5) Outdoor lighting should not be visible from residential property.

6) There should be no industrial structure higher than 1 story within 100 feet of the residential boundary.
Residential requirements are:

1) Minimum building setback from buffer line should be 25 to 50 feet.

2) Wall/fence height requirements should be 8 feet and may include a masonry wall.

3) Planter requirements shall be 10 feet or more with evergreen trees required along buffer line.

4) Insulation in structures to FHA standards.

b. Railroad Tracks and Residential Area

Railroad track requirements:

1) Because virtually all tracks are developed and new track areas would be located in industrial areas, any noise reduction improvements to track or equipment would be industry wide and is beyond the scope of this plan.

Residential requirements:

1) Minimum building setback from buffer line should be 50 feet.

2) Wall should be 8-foot or 6-foot on 2-foot berm - cast concrete or solid masonry wall required.

3) Planting area for evergreen trees along wall/fence line 10 feet on center for trees, type of trees to be used to be suggested by landscape architect.

c. Heavy Commercial and Residential Areas

This combination of uses is in a special category. The heavy type of uses that are of concern can be found in several of the commercial zones, thus making a specific program difficult to develop. The type of uses that can be in conflict with residential uses include, traffic generating commercial, freight depot, equipment rental yards, truck service stations, and other similar type noise and activity generators.
Commercial requirements are:

1) Projects shall be designed to minimize visual intrusion into adjacent developments.

2) No commercial structure higher than one story should be constructed within 100 feet of the residential zoning boundary.

3) Driveways serving commercial development should not open onto residential streets.

4) No noise should be generated by any equipment which results in a level higher than 60 L_n measured one foot inside the affected residential property.

5) Fences, landscaping or other measures shall be used to screen delivery bays, garbage areas, or similar facilities from adjacent properties.

6) Outdoor lighting shall be oriented and shielded to prevent glare upon adjacent properties.

Residential requirements are:

1) Minimum building setback from buffer line should be at least 25 feet.

2) Fence along buffer line should be 8 feet in height and of a durable heavy material such as cast concrete or solid masonry.

3) Insulation and noise suppression material within structure should be the FHA standards.

14. Floodways and Floodplains

Floodways and floodplains are self-实施ing areas surrounding waterways (i.e., Laguna Creek) that are designed to exclude urban development, preserve natural areas, provide open space, and allow trailways for bicyclists, pedestrians and equestrians. Adoption of the plan will also mean adoption of the zoning which will accommodate the above.

The preliminary land use plan for the unincorporated area south of this plan's study area is called the Laguna Community Area. Contained in that preliminary plan is a proposal for a Special Planning Area Zone (SPA) for the floodplain of Laguna Creek. In the South Sacramento community area a portion of the Laguna Creek floodplain is located within the Sacramento City Limits. Because Sacramento City does not have a similar zoning procedure to the (SPA) the following concepts are suggested as development guidelines in and near Laguna Creek. They are:
a. Protect and preserve the floodplain in as natural a condition as possible.

b. Provide a natural and lasting boundary between Laguna community and the Sacramento Metropolitan area.

c. Protect future residents from flood inundation potential.

d. Provide opportunities for future open space amenities.

e. Control development through special review procedures within hazard areas.

f. Control residential densities in and near the floodplain.

g. Require open space dedications.

h. The burden of proof is placed with a project proponent as to how the flood boundary should be adjusted for a development adjacent to the Corps of Engineers' 100-year flood boundary.

Additional concerns in this general area result from two land use conditions. The first is the location of the Regional Sewage Treatment Plant located west of Franklin Blvd. and south of Unionhouse Creek, and the second is the potential for agricultural food processing plants south of the treatment plant. While every reasonable effort has been made to separate these heavy uses from residential areas the potential for some conflict exists. The land use plan has considered these problems and recommends open space uses to act as a buffer to residential uses.

Problems

Many land use decisions that should be made today for the South Sacramento area have already been made. Past decisions of boards and councils have shaped the General Plan and the decisions have been implemented with approvals of specific rezoning requests. Some of these lands have remained vacant or underdeveloped, and it is over these lands that a community plan will have the greatest influence. By adjusting the future uses of these undeveloped areas in line with current community and planning staff evaluations, the best interests of the community may be achieved.

During the research process of development of this community plan, many problems were identified. Many issues related to uses of land were examined, and the most pertinent are listed here. The identification of these "problems" are a result of field observation and review of the three tables: Existing Land Use, Existing Zoning and Existing General Plan.
Major land use related problems are:

- excessive amounts of land zoned for commercial use
  (See Table 4-R and Chapter 4, Economic Element)

- several locations of planned industrial land in excess of foreseeable need and not in a logical location
  (See existing General Plan Map 3-B)

- past approval and development of urban uses in a leap frog configuration without a subsequent infill
  (See existing land use, Map 3-A)

- development of more than "fair share" amount of mobilehome park and subsidized housing
  (See existing land use, Map 3-A and Housing Element, Chapter 8)

- impacts on residential areas of noise from freeways, major streets, railroads, industrial areas and aircraft from Mather Field
  (See Chapter 7, Environmental Element)

- older neighborhoods with a poor combination of uses, i.e., low density residential next to an auto junk yard
  (See existing land use Map 3-A)

- potential for future air quality problems because of the spread out, low density development of the community and the probable future reliance on the automobile
  (See Chapter 7, Environmental Element)

- lack of public services (i.e., parks) in some areas as a result of past poor planning actions
  (See Chapter 10, Recreation)

- existence of semi-developed urban property with excessively deep lots resulting in poor utilization of lands
  (See existing land use, Map 3-A)

- potential for increasing the concentration of multiple family residential uses in areas presently impacted by higher density residential that has social and economic problems
  (See existing land use, Map 3-A and Housing Element, Chapter 8 and General Plan Map 3-B)

- a significant amount of commercial service uses located in "strip commercial" areas and in a shopping center needing rehabilitation
  (See existing land use, Map 3-A and the Economic Element, Chapter 4)
General Development Guidelines

1. Any use permit granted for business and professional uses in residential land use zones shall be subject to the following findings and conditions in order to be consistent with the plan:

   a. The use will not constitute the beginning of a new strip commercial area or extend an existing commercial strip.

   b. A need has been demonstrated for such use in the area based on the standards in the County Commercial Areas Land Use Plan or this Land Use Plan.

   c. Projects not integrated with multiple family projects must be located on corner lots.

   d. The project shall be designed to minimize visual intrusion into residential areas.

   e. If the business and professional use is located in an RD-20 or RD-30 land use zone, and if the business and professional use does not occupy the entire RD-20 or RD-30 zoning district, the use must be designed as an integral part of the multiple family development. Floor space shall not exceed 3000 square feet or 5% of the gross floor area of the project, whichever is greater. The multiple family phase of the project must be completed prior to construction of the business and professional facilities.

   f. Driveways should be located so as to minimize impact on residential uses where possible.

2. Use permits for off-site subdivision signs shall be subject to the following conditions:

   a. The maximum period for the use permit shall be six months, renewable one time.

   b. Signs shall be for directory purposes only. Signs for advertising purpose shall not be approved.

   c. Signs shall not exceed 24 square feet in size.

   d. Signs shall not be located farther than 150 feet from the intersections of public streets.

   e. No more than one subdivision directional sign shall be permitted on a corner. Directional information for more than one subdivision may appear on one sign, in which case the sign shall not exceed 30 square feet in size.

   f. Vegetation shall not be removed for installation or reasons of visibility of the sign.

   g. A minimum bond of $500 shall be posted to ensure timely removal of the sign at the expiration of the permit period.
3. Land dedication or dedication of easements which are not to be obstructed will be taken at time of development along all designated trails.

4. Residences along major streets are to be constructed so that interior noise levels do not exceed 45 L_n dBA for a cumulative period of more than 5 minutes in any hour between 10 P.M. and 7 A.M.

5. New private driveways intersecting major streets should be strongly discouraged. Collector street intersections with major streets should be spaced to provide minimum disruption to through traffic.

6. Subdivisions on a major street (84 feet or wider) may be required to provide a bus bay to the satisfaction of Regional Transit and Public Works, additionally consideration for a shelter location must be made.

7. The implementation of the Policy areas as described herein is to generally comply with the suggested guidelines.

8. Subdivision design should be as energy conscious as possible.

9. New mobile home parks are to be discouraged until such time as a more equal distribution of parks occurs in the unincorporated county area and require a plan change and zoning amendment anywhere in the plan area except as noted in Policy area statement.

10. Concentration of multiple family residential uses must be avoided in areas that are presently negatively impacted by economic and/or social conditions. Utilization of locations having shopping and transit facilities should be maximized in terms of multi-residential uses.

11. The land use zone plan proposes to regulate industrial uses and noise through the use of the industrial park zone and the designated buffer areas with the Neighborhood Preservation Area Zone.

12. Reduction of commercial areas, both planned and zoned that existed at the time of plan development, is a major feature of this plan. These commercial areas are grossly in excess of identified community and regional needs.

13. The area designated Agricultural-Residential 5 located west of Elk Grove-Florin Road, south of Florin Road and north of Union House Creek is envisioned as a potential urban expansion area. Thus it differs significantly from the normal condition of other Agricultural-Residential 5 areas that are planned to remain in that category for the foreseeable future.
CHAPTER TWO
ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND PLAN ALTERNATIVES

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the various environmental impacts of the proposed community plan as required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Sacramento County Environmental Impact Report Guidelines. The analysis conducted as background information in the development of the plan serves as a data base for the environmental assessment of the plan. That information is contained in the subsequent chapters contained in this report.

I. The environmental effects which cannot be avoided if the plan is implemented.

A. Significant Impacts

1. Air quality along high volume traffic corridors, major commercial area parking lots and the larger air basin of which the Sacramento Metropolitan area is a part, would be adversely affected if the project is implemented. The increase is a result of more vehicle miles traveled within the project area. A companion impact associated with transportation is increased noise levels throughout the community along certain streets.

2. Traffic would significantly increase with project implementation. Some major thoroughfares are projected to be close to their rated capacity by the year 1985. The resulting traffic congestion will add to the degradation of air quality in the project area.

3. Use of limited groundwater will continue to lower the water table throughout the South Sacramento Metropolitan area. Provisions to mitigate the shortfall of water supply may yet be a number of years away because of a lack of determined coordination between water purveyors of the area to pursue the use of additional surface water as is done by the City of Sacramento.

4. Significant potential for conflict exists between proposed land uses as shown on the project's land use plan. Areas including industrial/residential uses exist in various sections of the project.

5. Development consistent with the project presumes the construction of four elementary schools and one junior high school by 1985. A further less than significant by-product of the project will be a continued overcrowding of schools that presently serve the high growth area. This impact will be only relieved and not totally resolved by new school construction.
B. Other Impacts

The project identifies other impacts that are less than significant. The less than significant impacts include:

1. Hydrologic impacts due to increased urban runoff. (pages 10-11 through 15)

2. Reduction of animal habitat. (page 7-35)

3. Loss of open space. (page 7-35)

4. Use of limited natural resources. (pages 7-31 through 34)

5. Increasing demand for all services to meet the population needs. (pages 10-1 through 10, 11-1 through 32)

6. Loss of agricultural lands. (page 3-1)

7. Loss of development rights to land subject to special residential building setback requirements. (pages 1-16 through 19)

8. A further increase in the ratio of multiple family/single family dwellings based on greater emphasis placed on multiple family land use by the project. (pages 3-12 and 8-1)

9. A further increase in the ratio of renters/owners based on an increased emphasis on multiple family housing by the project. (pages 3-12 and 8-1)

10. Additional local street maintenance may be required with increased transit service. (page 6-11)

11. Local impacts to neighborhoods resulting from housing problems that include: concentration of mobile homes, concentration of subsidized housing units, and housing in need of rehabilitation. (Map page 3-12 and Chapter 8)

12. A potential loss of historical sites and/or structures. (page 7-37)

13. A continuing decrease in air quality in parking areas of major commercial centers. (page 7-18)

14. A continuing increase in reported crime. (page 11-31)

15. Lack of a public tree planting program will continue the unpleasing view on major streets in the unincorporated area and without trees the air quality may be worse than with trees because of the turbulence factor. (Chapter 7 and page 10-16)
16. A potential for air quality reduction and a concern for aesthetics near the developing Sacramento Regional Waste-water Treatment Plant. (page 11-8)

II. Irreversible environmental changes involved which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented:

Irreversible environmental impacts from the implementation of the plan will come primarily as a result of commitments of limited natural resources and disruption of the natural physical environment.

Commitments of limited natural resources would include the use of aggregates, asphalt, metals, and petroleum products and fuels for the construction of structures and streets. Long term use would involve the use of natural gas, water, and energy to provide structures with heating, air conditioning, and plumbing conveniences.

The natural physical environment would be disrupted through alterations to landforms and the installation of utilities which would have the effect of irreversibly committing land to urban uses, since large expenditures of capital would be necessary to restore the land to its previous state. Further, destruction and simplification of natural plant and animal communities is a likely result of the plan and would be virtually irreversible.

III. Relationship between local short term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long term productivity.

Cumulative and long term effects of the implementation of the plan include a reduction in the range and variety of the environment, a loss of habitat for certain plant and animal communities, and adverse impacts on human health and safety.

The short term use of land for agricultural residential, residential, business and professional, commercial and industrial uses precludes the long term use of such land for intensive agricultural purposes, and eliminates the aesthetic amenities associated with open space. It also poses greater risks to human health and safety in that more automobile traffic would be generated than with a plan more oriented to agriculture or open space. This means a greater reduction in local air quality, higher noise levels, and more traffic and circulation problems that contribute to safety hazards.

Justification for implementing the plan now, as opposed to reserving an option for further alternatives in the future, is based on three principles. First, the proposed community plan is a reflection of the needs and goals of the community as identified and expressed by the community members. Second, the continued development of the community, as outlined on the community plan at this time, reserves development possibilities for the future for this
and other areas of the county which are less suitable for development at this time, because of their distance from the central city and/or ongoing viable agricultural production. Third, the plan is flexible enough to be altered in the future should conditions or needs in the community change.

IV. The growth-inducing impact of the proposed action.

To the extent that the proposed community plan projects and accommodates future population and urban growth, the plan is growth-inducing. The plan projects a holding capacity of about 158,000 persons for the South Sacramento study area. This is significantly more than the 1975 population of about 62,000 persons.

Because of the existing urban infrastructure and development which predominates in South Sacramento, much of the growth projected will represent infilling of vacant areas. The plan proposes that the growth of undeveloped areas will take place contiguously within already developed and developing areas. This "New" growth then will, as it occurs, utilize the existing infrastructure as well as providing its own.

The growth inducing impact of this plan goes beyond its boundaries and in a similar fashion activities outside of the study area will affect the residents and uses of the plan area. Cumulative impacts of growth and development outside of the study area will have the potential to affect the South Sacramento community area's air quality local circulation systems, school facilities and other services. This impact is extremely difficult to quantify; however, its existence and potential must not be ignored.

V. Mitigation Measures

A. Air Quality

Mitigation Mesures. The following measures and plan policies could help to reduce identified air quality problems and work towards the attainment and maintenance of Federal air quality standards.

. Public transit routes and schedules should be re-evaluated to determine intra-community travel needs. One or more predominantly east-west routes should be established and include Fruitridge Road and 47th Avenue. (page 6-15)

. Continued Implementation of City/County Bikeway Plan. (page 10-3)

. Additional consideration and utilization of ideas found under "Additional and Alternative Transportation Means," public transit, park and ride, para-transit, bikeways, and railroad transportation. (pages 6-11, 12 and 13)
Programs and policies contained in plan which, when adopted, will work toward the goal of Federal Air Quality Standards. (such as pages 7-18 through 24)

When the Sacramento Valley Basin Air Quality Maintenance Program is adopted, the South Sacramento community plan should be amended to incorporate those appropriate mitigation measures contained in the adopted Air Quality Maintenance Program.

Noise mitigation measures relating to transportation conditions along freeways and arterials include the use of noise barrier walls (to be developed by project), deeper backup lots or separation from rights-of-way, and conformance with County Noise Ordinance. (pages 7-27 through 30)

B. Traffic

Mitigation Measures. The following measures and plan policies will help to mitigate potential congestion problems identified in the plan.

- Adopt plan policies relating to traffic. (pages 6-13 through 6-17)

- Develop streets to planned standards of size with appropriate traffic control measures as required.

- Develop, as funding becomes available, an east-west major street connector between I-5 and Freeway 99 along former Route 148 to lessen traffic congestion from Laguna community area and giving better access to and from city, Valley Hi, and Meadowview areas. (page 6-15)

C. Use of Limited Groundwater

Mitigation Measures. The plan recognizes that groundwater depletion is a basinwide problem and not limited to South Sacramento. Plan mitigation proposals are really countywide in scope and include:

- A plan for conjunctive use of ground and surface water. (page 7-34)

- Future subdivision be designed to convert water distribution systems to surface water use. (page 7-34)

D. Significant Potential for Conflicts Between Land Uses

Mitigation Measures. During the development of the community plan, areas of potential conflicts between various uses of land were identified. While this impact is very local, it has the potential to be significant if mitigation measures aren't implemented. (pages 1-16, 17, 18, and 19)
. Use of designated buffer area or NPA's (Neighborhood Preservation Areas) as shown on the community plan. These areas propose policies that would work toward reduction or elimination of the identified conflict. (pages 1-16 through 19)

. Redesign of the Land Use Plan compared to adopted zoning and/or adopted General Plan designations. (Land Use Map, page 3-12; General Plan Map, page 3-6 existing zoning)

E. Impaction of Schools

Mitigation Measures. The impaction of both the Elk Grove and Sacramento School Districts because of population increase will result in the need for specific action to mitigate this condition.

. Policies recommended to school districts for school construction will, if implemented, provide the housing of students for education purposes. The implementation of these or similar policies will be entirely in the affected school district's purview. (pages 9-1 through 7)

VI. Alternatives to the Proposed Action

A. No Development

Obviously, the no development concept is the least likely alternative to be considered and recent history of the area indicates that a no growth policy would be contrary to all that's gone before. The effect would be to avoid the impacts described in other sections of this report that are related to population increases and significant changes in non-residential related land uses. Existing open space would remain, road traffic would not increase to any substantial degree, and the need to expand most public services would not be likely. This situation would be changed if the previously approved projects were to be constructed. Presently, there are a number of subdivisions and other residential projects that are approved but unconstructed. However, the population related increases that might occur under the situation of allowing development of already approved projects would have the least significant of impacts than any other alternative. There would be, associated with the no development concept, significant impact in the hardship faced by those owners of vacant or under-developed land who would perceive further development to be in their economic interest. Such impact could, by some, be viewed to include all area residents and local governments in a negative fashion.
B. Continuation of Existing Plans and Zoning

Because the South Sacramento study area is governed by a number of jurisdictions, there presently exists a variety of plans for the future. These plans include the Sacramento City and County General Plans; community plans such as the City of Sacramento, Valley Hi and Fruitridge Community Plans; and Park District and School District Plans, etc. Further, there exists the control over land use of zoning in both the City of Sacramento and the unincorporated area. Continuation of the existing plans and zoning would result in impacts that might be considered greater than the proposed project (South Sacramento Community Area Plan), for a number of reasons. The reasons are both organizational and physical. In terms of population, there would be a small percentage population difference between full development under the General Plan compared to the project because a number of acres of land proposed for commercial use on the General Plans is proposed to be developed for multiple family use under the project. This revision seems justified based on a full analysis of commercial needs found in Chapter 4. This situation will continue.

A trend in most communities recently has been an increase in the ratio of multiple family housing compared to single family units. This occurrence—and it is proposed by the project—can be beneficial from an energy conservation viewpoint. Normally, fewer resources are utilized per multi-unit; better insulation is incorporated into the structure and, in the South Sacramento case, these housing units are located along major transportation routes with good access to transit. There no doubt will be a theoretical population increase and, hence, an increase in the need for services required by the project. However, these factors have been included in the plan considerations and, as such, their impacts should be lessened. The cumulative impacts of air quality reduction, noise level increases and groundwater depletion are spoken to in the project and General Plans both, and while in neither case are the issues resolved, they may be better described with more localized programs proposed in the project. The project makes reference to industrial area relocation and definition, buffer area proposals where industrial and residential uses have a common boundary, and other procedures to reduce conflict between uses. A final difference is that the project has investigated current conditions within all jurisdictions serving the community and includes recommendations addressing identified problems; whereas, the existing plans do not have the same current overview and, as such, are to some extent narrow and outdated.
C. Reduced Density

As an alternative, this proposal would be closest to the project itself. A reduced density alternative would be a proposal that would about halve the allowable density of a number of undeveloped properties in the study area. As a recommendation, it would be straightforward in its application. Certain property shown for commercial on the project land use map would be shown for Residential Density 20 (RD-20) resulting in a population increase; some property shown as Residential Density 20 would be proposed for Residential Density 10 (RD-10), and so on through the residential categories. These changes result in an overall population decrease. The result of this would be a decrease in the holding capacity figure for dwelling units by about 6,075. This would translate into a reduction in the holding capacity from about 158,000 to about 140,000 persons. This calculation is rough and it assumed a population per household of 2.9, the same as the 1975 census for the area. While only an estimated figure, the reduction would be about 11% of the holding capacity of the project. Almost half of this figure would be based on the significant change from land recommended for agricultural urban reserve to land placed in the Agricultural-Residential V (5 acre minimum size) category. While this population reduction could be of some importance in reducing impacts accrued under higher population, the need for metropolitan area expansion must enter into any consideration of this land use decision. Additionally, there may be individual economic impacts which would vary, and there may be an effect on some population dependent services relative to transit.

D. Increased Density

An additional alternative to be considered would be increasing the residential density in special areas. Several changes to the project could increase the holding capacity of South Sacramento to a significant degree (10% or more). Present vacant or underdeveloped lands in both the City of Sacramento and the unincorporated county area could conceivably accept higher densities than are proposed by the project. This would entail changes to RD-40 and RD-30 for lands presently shown for RD-30, 20 and 10.

Advantages and benefits to the increase of density would include (but not be limited to), transit opportunity for more persons, increased density near commercial areas with a potential for less automobile usage, potential for increased housing opportunities and locations for a broader economic range of persons, concentration of suburban areas rather than continual expansion of the suburbs, possible decrease of need for some additional infrastructure and possibly allow a greater efficiency in public services (transit, streets, parks, schools, etc.). Obvious disadvantages may include,
development of housing that is not marketable in this portion of the metropolitan area, increased need for changes in capacity of present infrastructure (schools, parks, sewers, etc.), potential for increased social conflict associated with higher densities, less opportunity for detached single family home ownership, potential for concentration of lower economic persons compared to other similar areas of the county without similar densities.

It would be expected that the holding capacity of this community area could be increased to between 175,000 and 180,000 persons if a concentrated effort was made at proposing and developing the area at increased densities.

VII. Organization and Persons Consulted

An extensive list of organizations and persons consulted in the preparation of this community plan/EIR can be obtained from the Sacramento County Department of Planning and Community Development, 827 7th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

VIII. Public Policies, Laws, and Regulations Related to the Project

Article 5 of Chapter 3 of the California Government Code, Section 65300 requires legislative bodies to adopt comprehensive general plans to guide physical development. The community plan, though not a part or element of the General Plan is considered a refinement or extension of the Sacramento County General Plan (1973). Other documents that affect the project include the SRAPC Regional Transportation Plan (1976), the National Clean Air Act (1970), the Mather Air Force Base Air Installation Compatible Use Zone report (1975), and the general park district master plans.
CHAPTER THREE

LAND USE ELEMENT

EXISTING LAND USE

The existing land use of South Sacramento was surveyed and recorded during the summer of 1975. Table 3-A is a detailed summary of land use categories by acreage of data areas. A broad summary discloses that for the total area, land used for Agriculture was 30%; for Residential, 19%; for Commercial, nearly 4%; for Industrial, nearly 7%; for Public, 13%; and 27% of the area was vacant. The picture that emerges from these statistics is of a community in the process of conversion from agricultural use to urban. The existing land use, Map 3-A displays clearly the pattern of development that existed at the time of survey. The major residential areas have developed in solid blocks, with large areas of vacant or commercial land separating them. The residential areas extend southward from Fruitridge Road on the north to the Valley Hi area near Mack Road on the south. The western boundary of residential use is Franklin Boulevard, and residential extends easterly to Power Inn Road. Areas easterly of Power Inn Road south to Elsie Avenue contain a use mixture of Industrial, Agriculture and vacant. The area south of Elsie Avenue, east of Freeway 99, is largely used for agriculture and small lot rural residential. The portion of the community area west of Franklin Boulevard from Campbell Soup Company south to almost Florin Road is mostly developed as industrial and commercial. The area of the community south of Florin Road, west of Franklin Boulevard, and the portion south of Mack Road and the Valley Hi area is for the most part vacant, or is used agriculturally.

Commercial uses are located along major streets, and large commercial centers are located along Florin Road at its intersection with Franklin Boulevard and Stockton Boulevard.

ANALYSIS OF TRENDS

The South Sacramento community has had a variety of growth patterns during the last 10 years; single family development grew strongly during the late 1960's and then fell off, with multiple family construction occurring in the early 1970's. Mobile home parks have had a steady increase in number for the entire period. The area's growth has been lower than other portions of the unincorporated county areas, but faster than the City of Sacramento. Commercial and industrial uses have developed steadily with some major commercial development occurring in the Florin Road area at Stockton Boulevard and at Franklin Boulevard. This development pattern has led to the potential for conflicts between certain land uses. The Environmental Impact Report for this community plan identifies these conflicts as having the potential of being a significant impact if mitigation measures aren't developed and implemented.
TABLE 3-B

ASSUMPTIONS FOR PROJECTIONS

I. Population

A. Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>Persons (2023)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1975 actual growth rate</td>
<td>2% per year</td>
<td>62,757 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>56,819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>62,757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975 to 1985 projected growth rate</td>
<td>2.3% per year</td>
<td>78,928 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>62,757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>78,928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985 to 1995 projected growth rate</td>
<td>2.8% per year</td>
<td>104,155 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>78,928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>104,155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Holding Capacity - 158,000 persons

The holding capacity is the number of persons who, in theory, could live in an area based on the land use proposals of an adopted plan.

All South Sacramento population projections were developed with the county General Plan community populations considered.

B. Population per Household

For all existing dwellings, the 1975 population was reduced by 10% in future projections. For future dwellings, the following persons per dwelling unit type was used. (New units only.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Persons per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Res. 5</td>
<td>3.5 persons per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD-2</td>
<td>3.5 persons per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD-5</td>
<td>3.5 persons per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD-10</td>
<td>2.5 persons per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD-20</td>
<td>1.8 persons per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD-30</td>
<td>1.8 persons per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>1.9 persons per mobile home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Housing

The following units per acre by type were used for 1975 undeveloped land; existing development was held constant.

- Ag. Res. 5: 0.2
- RD-2: 1.8
- RD-5: 4.0
- RD-10: 8.5
- MH
- RD-20: 20
- RD-30: 28

Vacancy rates used were:

- Ag. Res. 5 thru RD-5: 2.0%
- RD-10: 9.0%
- RD-20 and RD-30: 13.0%

III. Special factors were used in developing the Holding Capacity figure; these included consideration of:

1) Conversion of land designated Agricultural Urban Reserve
2) Deep lot utilization
3) Demographic trends of household size reduction

Tables 3-C through 3-G together indicate the projected future uses and population growth of the South Sacramento community. Table 3-B defines the various assumptions upon which this future is based. These assumptions were derived from analysis of the professional literature, and the recent trends of the county as a whole and, more specifically, the community itself.

Maps 3-A and 3-B indicate the results of past development as it now exists. Map 3-C is the Land Use Zone Plan Map.

IV. Countywide Population

For purposes of comparison and to gain understanding of how the community plan for South Sacramento fits into the overall County General Plan, the following population projections should be reviewed (Table 3-H). These estimates are based on State of California County projections and consideration is given to Sacramento Regional Area Planning Commission projections. It should be noted that a disagreement occurs between the community plan and General Plan projections for this community. This
GENERAL PLAN LAND USE
As Amended (See Note)

RESIDENTIAL
□ AGRICULTURAL-RESIDENTIAL (Under 1 du/ac.)
□ LOW DENSITY (1 to 2 du/ac.) *
□ MEDIUM DENSITY (3 to 30 du/ac.) *

PUBLIC & QUASI-PUBLIC
□ HIGH SCHOOL
□ MEDICAL (HOSPITAL)
□ CEMETARY
□ OTHER PUBLIC & QUASI-PUBLIC
□ FIRE STATION
□ LIBRARY

COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL
■ COMMERCIAL AND OFFICES
■ INDUSTRIAL (INTENSIVE)
■ INDUSTRIAL (EXTENSIVE)

OPEN SPACE
△ RECREATIONAL
□ AGRICULTURAL-URBAN RESERVE

NOTE:
This land use map is an interpretation of the City of Sacramento and the County of Sacramento General Plans. As such, it does not pretend to represent them, but is to be used only as a guide when considering land use alternatives during the development of the South Sacramento Community Plan. Any specific land use questions should be directed to the appropriate jurisdiction.

The City of Sacramento General Plan shows no residential density differences.
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TABLE 3-C

POPULATION CHANGES AND PROJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>4675</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>4249</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>4335</td>
<td>4860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2649</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2436</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>2710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>9392</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>9824</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>10694</td>
<td>11952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>7381</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>7868</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>9581</td>
<td>12005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3053</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3416</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4268</td>
<td>4852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>6229</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7039</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7902</td>
<td>8401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5295</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6988</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>8146</td>
<td>9072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>4881</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>7687</td>
<td>7988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>9029</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>10465</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>11850</td>
<td>12990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4613</td>
<td>6231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4079</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5990</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7443</td>
<td>8606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2147</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3108</td>
<td>4228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2403</td>
<td>8556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>4051</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6852</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>14352</td>
<td>26091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>4192</td>
<td>28527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total S. Sac.</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>62757</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>78928</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>104155</td>
<td>158034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Disaggregation of census data and founding for the purpose of this table creates inaccuracies in specific instances which are not present in the whole.
### TABLE 3-D

**ESTIMATED DWELLING UNITS BY TYPE, PRESENT AND FUTURE (1) & (3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Area</th>
<th>1975 Existing</th>
<th>1985 Projected Total Units</th>
<th>1995 Projected Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RD-5</td>
<td>RD-10</td>
<td>RD-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2306</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14A</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14B</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Sac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) For population the vacancy factor and initial household reduction of 10% must be considered.
(2) While it is recognized that growth will occur, for the purpose of this chart mobile home units are assumed constant.
(3) Purpose of chart is for general information only and is not to be used as an absolute authority.
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### South Sacramento Area

#### Existing Zoning by Acreages (Summer 1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE</th>
<th>DATA AREA</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>14A</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>454</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1-A</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1-A</td>
<td></td>
<td>265</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2241</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1-B</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2-A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Subtotal</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>2782</td>
<td>10,307</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>399</th>
<th>1315</th>
<th>1204</th>
<th>2910</th>
<th>15.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1 AR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2 AR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Subtotal</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Major Streets & R.R. | 25 | 26 | 45 | 30 | 34 | 50 | 27 | 106 | 28 | 40 | 40 | 27 | 21 | 19 | 25 | 11 | 57 | 611 | 3.3 |

**TOTAL** | 385 | 449 | 893 | 1051 | 680 | 728 | 821 | 2683 | 672 | 1049 | 549 | 790 | 514 | 798 | 1721 | 1934 | 2860 | 18,577 | 100.0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA AREA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>14A</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Area (Acres)</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>2683</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>18,577</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural-Res.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>707</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Res.</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>9,664</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Res.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>489</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Stations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Offices</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (Int.)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (Ext.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural-Urban Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Zones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential**: This includes land use zones shown within the City of Sacramento only.

**Special Planning Area (SPA)**: Specific zoning ordinance developed for certain properties; may contain a variety of land uses such as residential, commercial or open space.

**Public-Quasi Public**: These acreage figures denote such uses as schools, parks, churches, libraries, etc. These acreages are not added to the totals since they are already computed into the land use zones.

*PS-7 B-30-24*
SOUTH SACRAMENTO
COMMUNITY AREA LAND
USE ZONE PLAN

(SEE ATTACHMENT)

MAP 3-C
using slightly different growth rate factors and the exclusion of a portion of the community and is of relatively small consequence in that some trade-offs between communities will make no difference to the total county projection for 1995. It should be understood that a holding capacity figure and a population projection for 1995 are different figures and in no way are they contradictory with one another.

Population projections for the South Sacramento area show an increased growth for the next 20 years. South Sacramento is expected to grow more rapidly because of the reduced growth potential of other sectors of the county such as Citrus Heights, Carmichael, etc. New growth can be accommodated because of the available infrastructure, terrain and available transportation networks. This accelerated growth will put pressure on schools, parks and other services, and special programs may be needed in the future to better handle these problems.
TABLE 3-H

SACRAMENTO COUNTY POPULATION PROJECTIONS*
(1975 to 1995) AND ANNUAL GROWTH RATE BY COMMUNITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community Area</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1995(s)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1995(a)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>North Natomas</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rio Linda-Elverta</td>
<td>12,434</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>North Central Area</td>
<td>51,800</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>74,450</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Citrus Heights</td>
<td>55,520</td>
<td>96,386</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>94,300</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Orangevale</td>
<td>18,474</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Folsom Area</td>
<td>9,221</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>South Natomas</td>
<td>9,002</td>
<td>26,060</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>North Sacramento</td>
<td>41,710</td>
<td>50,299</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>41,700</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arden-Arcade</td>
<td>90,651</td>
<td>99,355</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>99,250</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td>41,489</td>
<td>57,801</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>49,650</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fair Oaks</td>
<td>17,817</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>30,750</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>57,661</td>
<td>87,949</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>94,300</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>29,125</td>
<td>31,066</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>32,750</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lnd. Pk.-Pkt-Mdvw.</td>
<td>85,893</td>
<td>111,230</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>109,200</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>East Sacramento</td>
<td>77,916</td>
<td>83,937</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>78,400</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>South Sacramento **</td>
<td>58,023**</td>
<td>86,421**</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>96,300**</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Vineyard</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Laguna Creek</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>9,895</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>7,969</td>
<td>18,632</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rural Area</td>
<td>12,061</td>
<td>14,539</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>14,900</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>5,387</td>
<td>8,553</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8,450</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COUNTY TOTAL 686,498 944,197 1.6 944,250 1.6

(s) = SRAPC 7/76
(a) = Adjusted: County Planning 6177
90 = Average annual compound growth rate
*Based on State Department of Finance D-100 Projections.
**Does not include Data Area F
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CHAPTER FOUR
ECONOMIC ELEMENT

The economic analysis of the South Sacramento study area contains three parts: 1) A general overview of employment, past, present and future, 2) An industrial use study and 3) A detailed commercial areas study. The community plan considers these described economic factors and attempts to create a balanced atmosphere that promotes a reasonable level of economic growth and opportunity. This proposed balance weights the needs of the people of the community principally and material matters secondarily.

I. Employment of Residents

To consider the economic condition of an area, first we must consider the income characteristics and employment condition of its residents. The following table shows 1974 incomes, change per capita incomes - 1969 to 1974, and other potential poverty related factors by data areas.

As indicated on Table 4-A, over one-third of the households in South Sacramento are estimated to be in the low income range. These families and individuals are unevenly distributed in the South Sacramento community. The low income households are most prevalent in the older neighborhoods of the Fruittidge Pocket, the Sacramento Boulevard area, Elder Creek, Glen Elder, and Fruittidge South. Affected to a lesser extent are the Kara Tract area and the Florin-Southgate area. Median household incomes in these neighborhoods are similarly low compared to the overall South Sacramento figure. These neighborhoods are also notable for the high proportion of senior citizen residents and households headed by women. Both of these groups are susceptible to income inadequacy.

While in constant dollars the median income in South Sacramento declined between the two census years ($8,918 in 1970, $7,913 for 1975 adjusted to constant dollars) by 11.3%, the average size of households declined similarly. Mean household size fell 14.3% from 3.35 persons to 2.87 persons per household. To estimate a change in buying power among South Sacramentans, the decline in household size is taken into account by estimating the change in per capita income. The approximate per capita income rose by 2.3% for all of South Sacramento. These figures and those for median income, low income households, elderly population, and households headed by women are reported by data area.

Most of the same neighborhoods adversely affected by the prevalence of low income households (Fruittidge Pocket, Data Area F, and south, Sacramento Boulevard, Data Area 1 and 4, Elder Creek, Glen Elder, Data Area 3, and the Kara Tract, Data Area 12 and 13) have experienced high and increasing levels of unemployment (see Table 4-E. The Fruittidge Pocket area continues to be the most severely impacted.
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### TABLE 4-A

**SOUTH SACRAMENTO**

**INCOME CHARACTERISTICS AND POVERTY-VULNERABLE RESIDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Area</th>
<th>1975 Median Household Income</th>
<th>*1970-1975 Change in Per Capita Income</th>
<th>**Very Low Income Households</th>
<th>**Low Income Households</th>
<th>Proportion of Residents Aged 65+</th>
<th>***Proportion of Female-Headed Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 4</td>
<td>$6,255</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
<td>678 (39.3)</td>
<td>1032 (59.8)</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,499</td>
<td>+5.1%</td>
<td>779 (32.3)</td>
<td>1247 (51.8)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,775</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
<td>888 (20.5)</td>
<td>1294 (38.5)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,386</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
<td>564 (21.8)</td>
<td>1166 (45.1)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12,170</td>
<td>+1.9%</td>
<td>259 (11.9)</td>
<td>564 (25.9)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 &amp; 13</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>+8.6%</td>
<td>243 (15.2)</td>
<td>532 (33.3)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>10,677</td>
<td>+22.2%</td>
<td>169 (15.2)</td>
<td>354 (31.8)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &amp; 11</td>
<td>14,210</td>
<td>+3.1%</td>
<td>263 (8.0)</td>
<td>560 (17.0)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 &amp; 14A</td>
<td>11,292</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
<td>339 (17.7)</td>
<td>659 (34.4)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14,866</td>
<td>+4.6%</td>
<td>94 (7.5)</td>
<td>196 (15.7)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$10,619</td>
<td>+2.3%</td>
<td>4(19.3)</td>
<td>7696 (35.9)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Because aggregate and mean household income figures were not available, per capita income changes were approximated by the following method:

\[
\text{Per Capita Income} = \frac{\text{Total Median Household Income}}{\text{Number of Households}}
\]

**Constant Dollars**

**For definition, see Profile section**

**Data from the 1970 Census**

### TABLE 4-B

**PROPORTION OF SOUTH SACRAMENTO POPULATION IN LABOR FORCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>70-75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>+1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>+3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 4-C

**COMPOSITION OF SOUTH SACRAMENTO RESIDENT LABOR FORCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4-D

**EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF SOUTH SACRAMENTO RESIDENT LABOR FORCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Labor Force</td>
<td>Full-time Employed</td>
<td>Part-time Employed</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26,659</td>
<td>21.101</td>
<td>3,061</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>1,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(79.1)</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td>(9.4)</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15,876</td>
<td>13,570</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(85.5)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(7.9)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10,648</td>
<td>7,531</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(69.8)</td>
<td>(18.6)</td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
<td>(7.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4-E

**SOUTH SACRAMENTO UNEMPLOYMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Area</th>
<th>Labor Force</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>Labor Force</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 4</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2,663</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4,212</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 12, 13</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>3,604</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 &amp; 11</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 &amp; 14A</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,627</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,614</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,755</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,501</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One can summarize the income and employment indicators for South Sacramento residents by considering South Sacramento's condition relative to the other urbanized communities that are (part or wholly) in the county's unincorporated area. South Sacramento's proportion of low income households (36%) and unemployment rate (9.4%) are second only to these figures for the much smaller Rio Linda-Elverta community (40% and 10.7%, respectively). It has over five times as many unemployed workers and low income households as Rio Linda-Elverta, and more such workers and households than any other unincorporated area community. Conditions seem to be deteriorating in South Sacramento compared to the rest of the county according to trends from 1970 to 1975. Unemployment in South Sacramento, initially higher than experienced countywide, increased at a faster rate and estimated per capita income increased only 2.3% compared to a countywide increase of 6.9% (8.1% in Rancho Cordova). Among South Sacramento households, those headed by women and elderly persons are especially apt to have inadequate incomes and should be a focus of concern. The neighborhoods that are most severely impacted by poverty and unemployment are the most likely to exhibit social maladies as well as physical decline.

The 1970 census showed the breakdown of the labor force by major occupational groups. The composition of the resident labor force in South Sacramento differed from that of both the Rancho Cordova area and the county's overall labor force in having a much smaller proportion of professional, technical, managerial, and administrative workers (19.7% for South Sacramento versus 27.2% for the whole county) and a slightly higher fraction of service and household workers, equipment operatives, laborers, and craftsmen and foremen.

**Employment Within South Sacramento**

The situation concerning employment opportunities, where the jobs are located, in the South area is an improvement over the resident employment condition. The following tables are self-reading and the conclusion of the employment projections is that the South Sacramento area will have a medium employment growth rate through 1995. (see Table 4-K).

**Projected Employment/Unemployment Growth 1980 and 1990**

Employment per 1000 households may remain stable in the county over the next 10 to 15 years at 1.07 employed persons per households, plus or minus. This underlying assumption in SRAPC (the Sacramento Regional Area Planning Commission) employment forecasts is founded on analysis of population and employment trends between 1960 and 1970. Smaller household sizes, lower regional immigration, and shifts from base* to service industry employment between 1960 and 1970 have meant that the number of households have increased slightly faster than the number of new jobs. Past and projected employment per household relationships are given in Table 4-J.


*Base industry is manufacturing and government; service industry provides services to others, e.g., maintenance and repair, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>South Sacramento</th>
<th>Rancho Cordova</th>
<th>Unincorporated County</th>
<th>City of Sacramento</th>
<th>Sacramento County Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof., Tech., Man., &amp; Adm.</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Clerical</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (White Collar)</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen &amp; Foremen</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Farm &amp; Nonfarm)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Blue Collar)</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service &amp; Household Workers</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4-G: Employment Trends by Industry
South Sacramento 1968 & 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Employees 1968</th>
<th>Number of Employees 1975</th>
<th>South Sacramento Employment as a Percent of County-wide Employment in Each Category 1968</th>
<th>South Sacramento Employment as a Percent of County-wide Employment in Each Category 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td>3848</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>19.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans, Comm, Util.</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/sale Trade</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>4657</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>3189</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub. Admin. 1)</td>
<td>4718</td>
<td>4157</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11704</td>
<td>18317</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacto. County</td>
<td>222462</td>
<td>292709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Public Administration includes civilian and military persons.

Source: SRAPC 1968 and 1975 Employment Surveys
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY AREA</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY, AND FISHING</th>
<th>MINING</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>MANUFACTURING</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATION, AND UTILITIES</th>
<th>WHOLESALE TRADE</th>
<th>RETAIL TRADE</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>NCT ELKS-N. E. CLASS</th>
<th>FEED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natomas</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Linda</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Central</td>
<td>20430</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>3213</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>3089</td>
<td>11449</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Hts</td>
<td>7547</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3647</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>2409</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangevale</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom</td>
<td>2864</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Natomas</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. SacTo.</td>
<td>17366</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>4240</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>7656</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden-Arcade</td>
<td>28909</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>7967</td>
<td>3835</td>
<td>11333</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td>5990</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Oaks</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>19722</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>2197</td>
<td>12505</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>90669</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>5908</td>
<td>9598</td>
<td>6720</td>
<td>10611</td>
<td>3454</td>
<td>20471</td>
<td>32118</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Pk-Pocket</td>
<td>26648</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>2579</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>5255</td>
<td>13796</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East City</td>
<td>29059</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2415</td>
<td>3262</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>4106</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>11035</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South SacTo.</td>
<td>18317</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>3848</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>4657</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>3189</td>
<td>4157</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Creek</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Area</td>
<td>3978</td>
<td>2899</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>282709</td>
<td>6133</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12828</td>
<td>19802</td>
<td>16610</td>
<td>12592</td>
<td>47146</td>
<td>11061</td>
<td>74128</td>
<td>81908</td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SRARC Employment Module. Aggregation by Community Area prepared for Sacramento County.
Table 4-I  Employment
South Sacramento Data Areas 1968, 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>-294</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>2475</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>2093</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4623</td>
<td>4711</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + 11</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>-343</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11704</td>
<td>19225</td>
<td>7521</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacto. County</td>
<td>222462</td>
<td>292709</td>
<td>70247</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sacto. as % County</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: SRAPC 1968 employment statistics by minor zone (computer printout)
SRAPC 1975 employment statistics by minor zone (computer printout)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>183,800</td>
<td>240,776</td>
<td>264,600</td>
<td>351,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>153,200</td>
<td>212,182</td>
<td>245,530</td>
<td>327,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment per 1,000 Households</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>1,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Base Year 1975</td>
<td>Projected 1995</td>
<td>Annual Average Growth Rate</td>
<td>Growth Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Natomas</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rio Linda</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. N. Central</td>
<td>30,430</td>
<td>34,213</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Citrus Heights</td>
<td>7,547</td>
<td>14,636</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Orangevale</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Folsom</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>3,486</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. So. Natomas</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>5,552</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. No. Sacramento</td>
<td>17,366</td>
<td>22,586</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Arden-Arcade</td>
<td>28,909</td>
<td>33,044</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Carmichael</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>6,606</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fair Oaks</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>3,088</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Downtown</td>
<td>90,669</td>
<td>103,472</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Land Park-Pocket</td>
<td>26,648</td>
<td>36,857</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. East City</td>
<td>29,059</td>
<td>43,586</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Vineyard</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Laguna Creek</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Elk Grove</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>6,966</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Rural Area</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>6,040</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Galt</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>292,709</td>
<td>412,765</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sacramento County Advance Planning; SRAPC, Employment Module, Run October 13, 1976.
A stabilization of this relationship is based on the assumption that the predominately government employment base will assure continued population growth, but the multiplier effect of government jobs generating new jobs in other industries is low, so that jobs in services, trade and other resident industries are not expected to expand fast enough to allow employment per 1000 households to rise. Rather, employment/household is expected to remain constant at 1.07 jobs per one household through 1990.

Given the assumption that employment per household will remain relatively constant, or shrink only slightly, employment gains are expected to follow their historic regional distribution patterns. Growth in jobs will continue to happen where it has in the past, only more so. Employment, like population, is expected to become more concentrated in a limited number of areas. Job increases will take place around core industrial areas, military installations, government employment and retail shopping centers. The highest percentage gains are expected in the suburban northeast and southwest resulting from the "combined effect of available land, population pressure, shift of employment from extractive industries and manufacturing to service and government functions." SRAPC projects that traffic congestion in the downtown area will inhibit job growth somewhat, but nevertheless, the downtown will continue as a growing employment center.

The distribution of employment in 1975 and 1995 by community area is provided in Table 4-K. These projections represent the best available estimate of employment by industry by a subregional basis. They are not considered absolute and are limited by the assumptions mentioned above.

Again, the limitations of a community plan in addressing job related needs should be stressed. The staff has felt that enhancing the commercial and industrial climate in South Sacramento through proper placement and buffering controls, etc. is important, and more important, it is an available step which can be taken.

South Sacramento is fortunate in having both regional commercial and industrial facilities. A goal of this plan is to increase local employment above the 1975 level of 22.5 percent of the primary wage earners who both live and work in South Sacramento. It would seem that a goal of 40 percent resident/employees (such as the 1975 level in Rancho Cordova) would be both reasonable and obtainable given expansion in planned commercial/industrial areas.

II. Industrial Analysis

A. Existing Conditions - Overall-South Sacramento

The Sacramento County Planning Department, in cooperation with the Sacramento Area Commerce and Trade Organization (S.A.C.T.O.) has published a comprehensive survey of industrial areas in Sacramento County (Industrial Areas Survey, March, 1977). This report has stressed the need to view industrial areas on a countywide scale. Industrial development in South Sacramento will not occur oblivious to events in the rest of the county. Table 4-M (Table 3 in the Industrial Areas Survey) indicates some of the relative potentials of the various industrial areas throughout the county. The written portion of the report's conclusions is presented below. Note that the areas of concern in the South Sacramento plan area are north of Florin (a portion), south of Florin and Franklin Blvd. (These areas represent 2,782 acres out of a total of 15,200 acres zoned industrially, countywide, as of March, 1977.) The Meadowview area is recommended to be dropped from consideration as an industrial area. The south of Florin area is recommended for significant modification.

Table 4-L summarizes the existing land use acreage, and planned land use acreage in the South Sacramento portion of each sub-area. Note that the area defined in the S.A.C.T.O. study as "North of Florin" includes a large area north of Fruitridge Road to Highway 50, which is not included in the South Sacramento plan area, but which is integral to its development. The portion south of Fruitridge Road, included in the South Sacramento plan area, is less intensively developed than the northerly portion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Area 7 (North of Florin)</th>
<th>*Existing Land Use 1975 - Acres</th>
<th>Planned Land Use Zones Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Ind. (Inc. Military)</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Ind.</td>
<td>*644</td>
<td>1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind. Reserve</td>
<td>*120</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Area 12 &amp; 13 (South of Florin)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Ind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Ind.</td>
<td>*70</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind. Park</td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Area 1 &amp; 4 (Franklin Blvd.)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Ind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Ind.</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind. Park</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Approximate - Based on Subjective Criteria
TABLE 4-M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENTRAL SACRAMENTO</th>
<th>RAIL</th>
<th>FREEWAY</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>FIRE</th>
<th>SEWER</th>
<th>VACANT IND.</th>
<th>RESID'L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARDS BLVD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R ST - BROADWAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODLAKE - ARDEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CAMINO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIN - PERKINS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH OF FLORIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH OF FLORIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORDOVA - FOLSOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADSHAW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNRISE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLSOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELK GROVE - GALT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELK GROVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO AIRPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIO LINDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHGATE 880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST OF MCCLELLAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH OF MCCLELLAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTELOPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSEVILLE ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH SACRAMENTO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN PACIFIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANKLIN BLVD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXEC. AIRPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEADOWVIEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY LEGEND
(For Full Explanations See Text)

For rail, freeway, water, fire, sewer & residences
- applies to most developed and undeveloped parcels in the subarea
- applies to most developed parcels in the subarea
- applies to most undeveloped parcels in the subarea

For soils/drainage
- means no known constraints to building on most undeveloped parcels
- means some constraints to building on most undeveloped parcels

For vacant industrial parcels of various sizes
- means parcels of that size exist in the subarea
- means no parcels of that size exist in the subarea

For airport noise
- means noise of 65 dBA or more exists over most undeveloped acres
- means airport noise level is under 65 dBA over most undeveloped acres

N means no information available

Notes
1. Sunrise rail service will cease when S.B.P.R.A. closes spur to Lone Star in Rancho Cordova.
2. Folsom water distribution system is being suspended (1977) under an EDA grant.

Prepared by Sacramento County Planning Department, February 1977.
1. **Existing Conditions - Data Area 7 - Industrial**

The 2500 acres of planned land in Data Area 7 (north of Florin) is heavily impacted by noise from Mather Air Force Base (see Chapter 8) and so is well suited for industrial, as opposed to residential land uses. Considerable conflict exists, however, along the interface between the industrial area and the old town of Florin area. This has been addressed in Chapter 1 of this report under buffering requirements. Sanitary sewer lines are located along Power Inn Road; a portion of Fruitridge Road east of Florin-Perkins Road; a portion of Elder Creek Road, west of Florin-Perkins Road; and Florin Road, from Power Inn Road to Gardner Road. Much of the area would require substantial investment in line extensions, especially to the larger interior and/or easternmost parcels. Extensions would have to be accomplished concurrent with development in the area. An analysis of waste water treatment capacity can be found in Chapter 11 of this report.

Water service is provided by the City of Sacramento and by the Florin County Water District. That portion of the subarea which is within the Florin County Water District is the portion adjacent to the southern city limits, extending from Power Inn Road to a point midway between Florin Perkins Road and Elk Grove-Florin Road. City water lines are located along Power Inn Road (24"), Elder Creek Road east to Florin-Perkins Road (12", 18", 24"), Florin-Perkins Road south to Elder Creek Road (24"), and Fruitridge Road (8", 12", 24", and 30"). The Florin County Water District has indicated that water is available to all industrially-zoned parcels in the district (6" and 8" mains). It would seem that the extension of water service to presently unserved areas should not prove too difficult, and could be done concurrently with any street construction needed to provide access into portions of the subarea. (Also see Chapter 11, this report).

The subarea has reasonably good access to the Highway 50 freeway, which is north of the subarea from three to four miles. Three north-south arterials (Power Inn Road, Florin-Perkins Road, and Elk Grove-Florin Road) serve through-traffic between Florin Road and Folsom Boulevard, but only one (Power Inn Road) continues past Folsom Blvd. to Highway 50. Traffic delays may occur at either of two main rail crossings to the north of the subarea. The subarea is served by rail, with Southern Pacific tracks near the western boundary, and Central California Traction traversing the northeastern part of the subarea in a southeasterly direction. The greatest problem relative to the transportation network is with the local streets.
Many of the local streets are narrow and in poor condition, and much of the subarea is comprised of "superblocks" with no local streets to serve landlocked parcels. Power Inn Road needs widening to four lanes south of Elder Creek Road. Access to Highway 99 is also a significant problem. (see Chapter 6, this report).

Most properties in the subarea are industrially-zoned (M-1, M-2 and M-2-S). A major exception is that portion of the subarea southeast of the intersection of Florin-Perkins Road and Elder Creek Road, a great deal of which is agriculturally-zoned (A-10 and A-20). Consequently, zoning should prove to be no impediment to the establishment of new industrial uses within this subarea, with the exception of the southeastern quadrant, as mentioned.

In summary, the greatest potential for new industry within this subarea appears to be adjacent to the Army Depot on the east and south (along Florin-Perkins Road and Elder Creek Road). Land here is relatively free of incompatible uses, and the extension of rail and utility lines into the area appears feasible with little difficulty.

2. Existing Conditions - Data Areas 12 and 13 - Industrial

This 275 acre industrial area compares roughly with the south of Florin area in the Industrial Survey. Considerable land use changes have been recommended, however, to address some significant residential conflict problems in this area.

The extension of sewer lines into the unserved portions of the subarea could probably be accomplished without any great difficulty. Sewer lines exist along Florin Road, Gerber Road, French Road, Wilbur Way, the southern portion of Reese Road, and Elsie Avenue. Much of the area is presently within the Central Sanitation District. (See Chapter 11).

That portion of the subarea north of Gerber Road is within the Florin County Water District and that portion south of Gerber Road is within the Citizens Utilities Company water district. Six and eight-inch water lines are located along Florin Road, Reese Road, Gerber Road, and French Road, so that a portion of the subarea north of Gerber Road is reasonably well served. With the exception of a 10" water line on Wilbur Way, the portion of the subarea south of Gerber Road is unserved. (see Chapter 11).

Fire protection is provided by the Florin Fire District, and ISO ratings of 4 and 9 are applicable to various portions of the subarea. (see Chapter 11).
Highway 99 is approximately 2 miles to the west, with access via Elsie Avenue. The same access problem mentioned above is inherent to this area. Highway 50 is approximately 4 to 5 miles to the north. The Southern Pacific Railroad mainline passes through the subarea from the northwest to the southeast. (see Chapter 6).

3. Existing Conditions - Data Areas 1 and 4 - Industrial

This area is coterminous with the Franklin Boulevard subarea in the Industrial Survey except for the small portion west of the Western Pacific Railroad.

Data Areas 1 and 4 include 404 acres of planned industrial land. The predominant uses are Campbell's Soup Company, comprising 150 acres, and the quasi-industrial uses along 51st and 52nd Avenue, and La Grande Boulevard.

In the Franklin Boulevard subarea of the Industrial Survey, there are 79 vacant parcels: 51 (64.5%) are less than one acre; 24 (30.3%) are between 1 and 5 acres; 2 (2.5%) are between 5 and 10 acres; and 2 (2.5%) are between 10 and 15 acres, the largest being 14.76 acres. Consequently, the subarea does not have a great deal to offer future industrial users requiring large parcels. The major thrust for future development will be in the quasi-industrial and warehousing categories.

The majority of land in this subarea is zoned for industrial (M-1, M-2, M1-S, M2-S) use, with some commercial (C-2) and residential (R-1) zoning.

The Western Pacific Tracks run along the western boundary of the subarea with spurs providing rail service to a number of parcels. Highway 99 is less than 1/2 mile from the subarea with access provided at the 47th Avenue interchange. A network of smaller streets provide local access into the subarea. (see Chapter 6).

The subarea is within the Central Sanitation District. Sewer lines are provided along most of the streets.

Most of the subarea is served by the Fruitridge Vista Water Company. The District has a system of wells, two of which serve the industrial area effectively. Campbell's Soup Company is on its own well. (see Chapter 11).

This subarea is served by both the City of Sacramento Fire District and the Pacific Fire District. It has ISO ratings of 3, 5, and 9. (see Chapter 11).
The Franklin Boulevard subarea offers limited potential for industrial development at the present. The subarea is located near both rail and highway facilities, both water and sewer facilities are available, and the zoning is mainly industrial. There is, however, a limited amount of vacant land, and the predominant parcel size is generally small. Some further expansion of quasi-industrial uses is foreseen south of 47th Avenue.

B. Trends and Projections

1. Countywide Summary

- In January 1977, the county inventory of industrial acreage indicated 15,200 acres in Sacramento City and County were zoned industrial, of which 8,900 were vacant. In addition, 7,700 more acres which were not zoned industrial were located in areas designated for industrial uses in the General Plan. Of these, 6,400 were vacant. In total, the inventory found that 22,900 acres were either zoned industrial or designated for industrial use on the General Plan and 15,300 of these, or 67%, were vacant.

- Land in tracts represents almost 30% of the industrially zoned land in the county. Tracts compose almost a third of the active industrial real estate market. In terms of the total industrial land inventory in the county, industrial tracts make up only 18%.

- Since the early 1960's, Sacramento County has placed about 150 acres of land to use in industrial tracts each year.

- Without significant change in policy or economic conditions, this study forecasts that the absorption of light industrial land will be about 175 acres per year through the late 1970's and may rise to about 200 acres per year in the early 1980's.

2. South Sacramento

- Consumption of industrial property in South Sacramento will be slow. What activity does occur will probably take place mainly in the developed industrial tracts summarized in Table 4-N.

- Five of the seven industrial tracts are located north of Florin Road between Power Inn and Elk Grove-Florin Roads. In the two largest, Fruitridge Industrial Park with 196 acres and Southern Pacific Railroad's Elder...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area and Tract</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Owner or Developer</th>
<th>Year Opened</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Occupancy (%)</th>
<th>No. Vacant Acres</th>
<th>Average Annual Absorption (acres)</th>
<th>Expansion Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. So. Pacific-Elder Creek</td>
<td>Elder Creek Road-Florin Road</td>
<td>So. Pacific</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Thys I.P.</td>
<td>Thys Ct. &amp; Florin-Perkins</td>
<td>Thys</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fruitridge I.P.</td>
<td>Fruitridge &amp; Elder Creek</td>
<td>CMD</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fuller I.T.</td>
<td>Power Inn + 35-37th Ave.</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4†</td>
<td>Not active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Weyand I.T.</td>
<td>Florin + Florin-Perkins</td>
<td>Weyand</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.8†</td>
<td>No recent activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Southgate I.P.</td>
<td>Franklin &amp; LaGrange</td>
<td>Cotton, Silk,</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schneider, et.al.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments on Tracts**

1. One occupant. Park not active.
3. Two spec. buildings on site. No rail and poor freeway access.
4. Not active.
5. No recent activity.
6. Small, active with light industrial and commercial uses.
7. Forty vacant acres for sale, 35 are sold (part of land exchange).
   Occupants: Keyes Fiber, Union Carbide, Milie Trailer, General Radiator.
Creek property with 192 acres, sales have hardly moved. Two warehouse buildings were recently completed at Fruittidge Park which opens that tract to the market for ready industrial space. Fuller and Thyssen tracts cluster around the Army Depot. They opened from 1959 to 1962, and have moved slowly, partly because the developers preferred to sell land rather than lease, and Fuller did not build to suit. The tracts are only semi-active now.

- Lindale Industrial Tract, south of Florin Road, is 55% occupied. The original 163 acres has shrunk to 75 now available. Keyes Fiber, Union Carbide, Swizer Trucking, General Radiator and others occupy almost 90 acres.

- The combined activity of the six Florin-Perkins tracts has produced an average absorption of about 20+ acres per year. This annual absorption rate is probably a fair estimate of the demand for light industrial uses (including small manufacturing, warehousing and distributing) in the Florin-Perkins area. The greater part of the current industrial activity in this part of the county is intensive or heavy industrial development as characterized by the Army Depot, Proctor and Gamble, Keyes Fibre, and Teichert mining operations.

- In Data Area 7, 12 & 13, freeway access tends to be poor; water, sewer and fire fighting services are inadequate in part of the district; and there is some residential encroachment. Large-manufacturing firms have made the necessary investments to acquire acceptable water, sewer and fire protection systems while small firms and industrial tracts have operated under less than optimal conditions.

- It is estimated that the Florin-Perkins and Franklin areas will grow slowly, about 20 to 30 acres a year, in absorption of light industrial space. Most likely, the Expansion of existing manufacturers, Keyes Fibre, Campbell Soup, and others will provide most of the area's heavy manufacturing growth.

C. Problem Areas and Potential Solutions

In discussing industrial related problems, it is important to recall that the thrust of this plan is to incorporate mitigation measures into the map and document itself. The underlying assumption is that if industrial development occurs in areas designated on the plan and in accordance with the land use zone and buffer requirements (see Chapter 1), then the development is encouraged. (Exceptionally heavy, or unusual operations—large food processing plants, pollutant intensive industries, heavy metal operations, etc.—would still require special examination).
The industrial problems with suggested mitigation measures thus center on the following:

1. **Problems With Industrial Development**
   - **Emissions:** Noise, vibrations, gasses, particulates, light, etc. Of these, noise is the most potentially troublesome.
     - **Mitigation:** See Chapter 1, Implementation, and Chapter 7, Environment.
   - **Aesthetic Conflicts:** Plain unsightliness.
     - **Mitigation:** Concentration of industrial areas as indicated. Visual buffering (See Chapter 1). Full compliance with the land use zone requirements including landscaping (see Chapter 1).
   - **Energy Intensiveness:** Highly energy dependent, highly capitalized industry.
     - **Mitigation:** The unemployment rate in South Sacramento is high, especially among blue collar workers (see Chapter 5). Priority should be given to labor intensive industry which would maximize potential for utilization of the local labor force, thus cutting down on energy used in the industry as well as energy used to get to the industry. This, of course, is difficult to accomplish via a land use oriented plan. However, if selection were possible, this factor should be emphasized.

2. **Problems For Industrial Development**
   - **Residential Encroachment - Incompatible uses lead to complaints and a less desirable situation for both residents and industry.**
     - **Mitigation:** Adherence to zone and buffer requirements (see Chapter 1).
   - **Lack of Public Utilities - Considerable expenditures would have to be made in order to extend facilities such as water, sewer and natural gas.**
     - **Mitigation:** None. Costs to be bourne by developer.
Transportation Constraints - Freeway access and surface street congestion and/or condition is a problem. The interchange at Mack Road and Highway 99 is poorly developed. Southbound truck traffic from the industrial areas must take two right angle turns, including a left lane turn onto Stockton Blvd. and pass through residential areas in order to access Highway 99. Use of the east-west corridors (14th - 12th Avenue, Fruitridge Road, 47th Avenue, Florin Road) is undesirable.

Mitigation: The planning staff recommends improvement of Power Inn Road south of Elder Creek Road and extension of Power Inn Road to connect with Highway 99 at the interchange with former Route 148 at such time as the interchange and major street is constructed.

III. Retail Commercial Analysis

A. Summary

This retail market analysis for the South Sacramento study area has two major objectives.

First, the success and effectiveness of the existing commercial areas may be evaluated by comparing county and national standards to the South Sacramento commercial data. Sales dollars per square foot and the amount of vacant commercial floor space are both indicators of the well-being of commercial areas.

Second, a projection will be made to determine the future demand for commercial space in the study area. This demand projection will include necessary building area as well as lot area requirements. (The existing vacant commercial space will, of course, be subtracted from the total projected commercial space, building area or lot area, requirement when making these predictions.)

1. Overview

The retail commercial market in South Sacramento is divided into 11 different areas. These range in size from the super regional Florin Mall to small neighborhood centers scattered throughout the study area, such as those found in the Fruitridge Pocket area. Below is a list of the shopping locations used for this analysis and their classification relative to size. (These classifications are taken from the Urban Land Institute's annual publication, Dollars and Cents of Shopping Centers.) Map 4-A
shows the location of these commercial centers in the South Sacramento area. (Note that the areas around Florin and Southgate Centers have been combined with the respective Centers.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Locations</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Florin Center</td>
<td>Super Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Southgate Center</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Area Around Florin Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Area Around Southgate Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Franklin Boulevard Area</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Mack Road Area</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Power Inn/Florin-Perkins Area</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Stockton Boulevard Area</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Fruittidge Pocket Area</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Town of Florin</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) South Sacramento Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1See Appendix A for definitions of classifications.

It has been suggested that blighted commercial areas in South Sacramento are a result of high vacancy rates, which in turn are due to an excess of available commercial space. The data contained in the tables which follow show the amount of commercial space existing, occupied and unoccupied; the land area presently dedicated to commercial use; and the dollars of sales per square foot of commercial space existing, occupied and unoccupied; and the dollars of sales per square foot of commercial space as compared to existing standards.

This commercial analysis indicates that the commercial sector of South Sacramento is generally in good condition. However, a relatively large amount of vacant commercial space does exist which should be utilized as opposed to developing unimproved commercially zoned land elsewhere. This policy would help reduce the amount of vacant commercial space, minimize the trend toward sprawling commercial areas, improve the competitive posture of the existing commercial enterprises in the area (thus encourage visual upgrading of the properties), and minimize the exacerbation of circulation problems that already exist.

The data indicates that the quantity of commercial land planned for future development is more than adequate to satisfy the projected needs of the community and region through the year 1995 (and probably beyond the turn of the century). Commercial growth projections were made on the
assumption that regional shopping areas would continue to develop at a rate that would maintain the present ratio between community and regional areas. This, however, is not likely to be the case. Regional shopping areas in South Sacramento will most probably not be developing at the same rate as has occurred in the past. It is expected that more regional commercial competition will develop outside of this study area, resulting in a slow down of the regional type of commercial service in South Sacramento.

The commercial portion of this report, as well as the total plan itself, should be reexamined in 4 - 6 years. In this way, revised projections can be made based on new findings. Thus, the plan may never get to full implementation, but rather be in a continued state of refinement.

2. Methodology

The methodology for this analysis started with a 100% survey of retail establishments in South Sacramento. Eight hundred, ninety-one such establishments were found to exist in the study area. The County Assessor's "Building Records" file was consulted to gain the floor space area of these establishments (augmented by a field survey, where necessary). The State Board of Equalization provided a list of taxable sales volume figures for a representative number of businesses in the study area. This information furnished total square footage and sales per square foot by retail category (Apparel, General Merchandise, etc.) in each shopping area.

Data on number of households and median household income by minor zone was taken from the 1975 Special Census. Data on expenditure distributions for various income levels was taken from a retail study done by Development Research Associates for the City of Burbank. These figures, together with future population projections and capture rates based on square footage, were used in the computer projection for the future commercial floor space requirements of the South Sacramento area.

B. Present Retail Space Utilization

Table 4-0 shows the commercial area space needs per capita for different types of commercial areas based on the adopted county commercial standards. It is obvious that South Sacramento is substantially above the "normal standard" for building area requirements per capita in each category based on this measure. It is also apparent that South Sacramento is above the normal standard for acres of lot area, according to the 1970 Land Use Plan for Sacramento County.
Table 4-0.
COMMERCIAL AREA SPACE NEEDS
SOUTH SACRAMENTO VS. "STANDARDS"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Commercial</th>
<th>Bldg. Sq. Ft. Per Capita</th>
<th>Lot Acres Per 1000 Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento¹</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Commercial</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Commercial²</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Commercial</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Professional³</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>N.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The square footage and acreage requirements are derived by dividing the area totals by the estimated 1975 population of 62,757 persons.

2. Includes trailer and motorcycle sales, auto parts, and auto dealers

3. Includes banks, real estate and medical offices

Source: Standards; Commercial Area Standards, Land Use Plan 1970, South Sacramento; Field Survey and Assessor's "Building Records"
The real impact of this table can be seen in the totals. The
total building area per capita in South Sacramento is more
than twice the "normal standard." This could indicate that
commercial acres are already overbuilt by more than a factor
of two. The total acres of existing commercial land in South
Sacramento per 1000 persons is again greater than the South
Sacramento Standard by more than a factor of two. However, a
major point to consider when evaluating these figures is the
significant amount of regional commercial activity in the
study area (328 of 717 acres according to the 1976 Commercial
Survey). Therefore, while existing commercial land area seems
to be more than adequate to match the needs of the community
population, this effect is mitigated by the fact that much of
the existing commercial square footage in South Sacramento is
oriented to persons outside the study area boundaries, and
therefore cannot definitely be considered excessive.

In Table 4-P, the building and lot areas and vacancy rates
are listed for South Sacramento by shopping area. By far, the
highest vacancy rate occurs in Southgate Center (31.9%,
128,075 square feet). The next largest vacant area is the
area around Southgate Center. Although the vacancy rate there
is 9.9%, the total vacant area is 90,240 square feet, nearly
24% of the total vacant commercial space in South Sacramento.
The Power Inn/Florin-Perkins area has an 11.8% vacancy rate,
but this amounts to only 13,530 square feet—comparatively
little. The Stockton Boulevard area and the area around
Florin Center are each responsible for more than 50,000 square
feet of vacant commercial space.

The four areas mentioned so far with large amounts of vacant
commercial space (Southgate Center, area around Southgate,
Stockton Boulevard, and the area around Florin Center) represent
a total of 324,212 square feet, or nearly 85% of all the
vacant commercial space in South Sacramento. Of the total
commercial building area, 8.1% is vacant. This vacancy is
primarily concentrated in these four shopping areas. In
Rancho Cordova, for a comparison, the overall vacancy rate is
3.0% (only 42,363 square feet)—substantially lower than the
vacancy rate for South Sacramento.

In order to get a comparative picture of the amount of space
occupied by each retail category, the total building area per
capita and the lot acreage per 1000 persons is shown in
Table 4-Q. This table shows the ranking of the retail categories
from the one occupying the largest amount of space to the one
occupying the least amount. General merchandise heads the
list with 920,092 square feet of commercial space (nearly 20%
of the total space available). business/professional, auto
dealers and supplies, and food stores take second, third and
fourth place, respectively. It is interesting to note that
Table 4-P

1976 SHOPPING AREA TOTALS
BUILDING AREA, VACANCY RATES, AND LOT AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping Areas</th>
<th>Building Area</th>
<th>Vacancy</th>
<th>Lot Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Franklin Boulevard</td>
<td>382,777</td>
<td>11,484</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Area Around Southgate</td>
<td>914,215</td>
<td>90,240</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Southgate Center</td>
<td>401,910</td>
<td>128,075</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Florin Center</td>
<td>847,508</td>
<td>11,425</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Area Around Florin</td>
<td>619,300</td>
<td>51,470</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Stockton Boulevard</td>
<td>577,630</td>
<td>54,427</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Fruitridge Pocket</td>
<td>106,221</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Power Inn Florin-Perkins</td>
<td>114,513</td>
<td>13,530</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Town of Florin</td>
<td>227,426</td>
<td>6,918</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Mack Road</td>
<td>269,941</td>
<td>9,750</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Miscellaneous</td>
<td>251,470</td>
<td>5,385</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Totals: 4,712,911 382,704 8.1 717

Source: Field survey, Lot Area, Assessor's Parcel Map, Building Area, Assessor's "Building Records." Sacramento County Planning Department.
the fifth largest building area category is not really a
category at all, but rather the amount of vacant commercial
space existing at the time of the survey. The remaining 11
retail categories in the table constitute a total of 1,642,672
square feet, or about 35% of the total square footage.

In Table 4-R, a comparison is made between existing commerci-
ally developed land, and existing commercially zoned land by
data area. (Map 4-B, following the table, shows the data
areas within South Sacramento.) Data Areas 4 and 5 have by
far the greatest number of existing commercially developed
areas. These data areas include Florin and Southgate Centers
and the surrounding retail areas. Commercially zoned land is
set aside to the largest extent in Data Areas 10 and 14 where
future growth is expected to concentrate. The totals for this
table are again quite important. There is nearly twice the
number of commercially zoned acres as there are commercially
developed acres. Presently, therefore, there is an abundance
of commercially zoned land in South Sacramento, especially in
Areas 10 and 14.

C. Relative Success of Retail Commercial

Having already examined the building and lot areas, vacancy
rates, and the quantities of commercially developed and zoned
land in the study area, it is now important to look at the
relative "success" of the various retail categories. This is
measured in dollars per square foot of floor space and sales
per capita, and is then compared to national sales averages
and Sacramento County sales per capita for each retail category.

Table 4-S lists total sales dollars per square foot of
commercial area by retail category and shopping center size.
These figures are then compared to the national averages to
indicate the relative success of outlets in South Sacramento.
It appears that the overall success of the South Sacramento
commercial market is good. Sales per square foot are higher
than the national averages in 14 of the 24 categories/shopping
centers listed. (Note here that gross sales for drugs may be
overestimated since they were computed using a 2.5 multiplier
on taxable drug sales. (Approximately 40% of drug or pharma-
ceutical sales in the study area are taxable.))

Table 4-T points out the impact of the super regional center
(Florin Center) on the other commercial areas. This table is
a matrix of taxable sales dollars per square foot for all the
retail categories and all of the shopping areas in South
Sacramento. It is apparent that Florin Center enjoys a higher
volume of sales per square foot than the South Sacramento

\[^2\text{See Appendix B for factors used for the conversion of taxable sales to gross sales.}\]
### Table 4-2

**RANKING OF BUILDING AND LOT AREA TOTALS BY RETAIL CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail Category</th>
<th>Building Area (Square Feet)</th>
<th>Building Area Per Capita (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Lot Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Lot Area Per 1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>920,093</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Professional</td>
<td>738,390</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Dealers &amp; Supply</td>
<td>551,797</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stores</td>
<td>477,255</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>382,704</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Furn. &amp; Appliances</td>
<td>276,453</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat and Drink Places</td>
<td>263,769</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Material</td>
<td>206,670</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Shop</td>
<td>203,807</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>190,529</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>164,019</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>152,381</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motels</td>
<td>96,048</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Stations</td>
<td>53,250</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Stores</td>
<td>17,969</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor</td>
<td>17,777</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,712,911</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>717</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Building Area: Assessor's "Building Records"
Lot Area: Assessor's Parcel Map
Sacramento County Planning Department, 1976.
Table 4-R
1975/76 DEVELOPED VS. ZONED COMMERCIAL ACREAGE
SOUTH SACRAMENTO BY DATA AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Area</th>
<th>Existing Commercially Developed Land (Acres)</th>
<th>Existing Commercially Zoned Land (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total       687                              1,376

Source: Field Survey and South Sacramento Plan Area Data Packet, Section 6. Sacramento County Planning Department
TABLE 4-S

TOTAL SALES DOLLARS PER SQUARE FOOT OF COMMERCIAL AREA
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COMPARED TO NATIONAL AVERAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail Categories</th>
<th>South Sacramento Centers</th>
<th>National Averages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Super Regional 1</td>
<td>Regional 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>88.73</td>
<td>48.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>↑124.26</td>
<td>64.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
<td>187.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat and Drink Places</td>
<td>↓73.44</td>
<td>↓68.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Furnishings and Appliances</td>
<td>↓44.22</td>
<td>↑34.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>↑132.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Dealers and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>159.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Shops</td>
<td>75.36</td>
<td>↓34.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1 Super Regional includes only Florin Center
2 Regional includes only Southgate Center
3 Community includes: Commercial areas surrounding Southgate and Florin Centers, Franklin and Stockton Blvd. areas, Power Inn/Florin-Perkins area, and the Ick Road area.
4 Neighborhood includes: Fruitridge Pocket and Town of Florin areas
↓ Indicates sales averages significantly below the national level
↑ Indicates sales averages significantly above the national level
### TABLE 4-T
TAXABLE SALES DOLLARS PER SQUARE FOOT OF COMMERCIAL AREA
SOUTH SACRAMENTO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RETAIL CATEGORY</th>
<th>Franklin Boulevard Area</th>
<th>Commercial Surrounding Southgate Center</th>
<th>Florin Center</th>
<th>Commercial Surrounding Florin Ct.</th>
<th>Stockton Boulevard Area</th>
<th>Fruitridge Pocket Area</th>
<th>Power Inn/Florin-Parkins Area</th>
<th>Town of Florin</th>
<th>Mack Road Area</th>
<th>South Sacramento Misc.</th>
<th>South Sacramento Areas Combined</th>
<th>South Sacramento Avg. for Major Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPAREL</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.36</td>
<td>68.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Apparel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Apparel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unisex Clothes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>232.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe Stores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE MACHINERY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>305.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>124.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFO</td>
<td>29.36</td>
<td>66.35</td>
<td>79.70</td>
<td>34.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FURNITURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117.71</td>
<td>117.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT &amp; DRINK PLACES</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>85.60</td>
<td>63.29</td>
<td>66.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.76</td>
<td>32.60</td>
<td>128.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating Places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARS</td>
<td>35.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food</td>
<td>159.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAREHOUSE &amp; APPLIANCES</td>
<td>35.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING MATERIALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Dealers &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>327.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Parts &amp; Service</td>
<td>29.28</td>
<td>36.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Body Shops (Trans)</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto &amp; Motorcycle Dealers</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>166.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIALTY SHOPS</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td>75.36</td>
<td>59.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data not specified.
average in all the retail categories (except for the eating and drinking category) for which there is sales information available. In a super regional mall, such as Florin Center, eating and drinking places are not the "main attraction." Apparel, General merchandise, and specialty shops are probably the most sought after commercial categories in this case.

This table seems to support the general intuitions that anyone familiar with the subject area would have about the retail market. For example, from the table, the Stockton Boulevard area appears to be doing noticeably better than the Franklin Boulevard area. The areas surrounding Florin and Southgate Centers are doing very nearly the same, although the area surrounding Florin Center seems just slightly better. Even the slightest bit of familiarity with Florin and Southgate Centers will confirm the fact that Florin is much more successful than Southgate, as the table indicates. The other commercial areas included in the table do not relate to each other in enough retail categories to make a meaningful comparison. The Mack Road area, however, seems to exhibit an extremely high sales volume in the eating and drinking category. This is, no doubt, a result of the large number of restaurants and truck stops located in a relatively small area. An important point to note here is that the sales volume of Florin Center does adversely impact the sales of the rest of the South Sacramento area.

In a like manner, we can compare the quantity of retail sales in South Sacramento to the quantity of retail sales for Sacramento County as a whole. Table 4-U lists the 1975 taxable sales per capita for South Sacramento and Sacramento County. Clearly, South Sacramento is doing well as compared to the county average. General merchandise, for example, seems to do more than three times the county average in volume, and auto-related business is more than one and a half times the county average. In fact, of the 10 retail categories listed, only 3 categories, drugs, liquor, and specialty shops, are below the county average (as the arrows in the table indicate).

Thus, it can be seen that the retail market in South Sacramento is doing comparatively well. Earlier, we had found the area to have an abundance of commercial space, with a substantial amount of vacant commercial space. This fact does not seem to impair the success of the existing commercial establishments. Of course, were the vacant commercial space occupied and visually improved, the existing retail market might be even more successful, and blighted areas largely remedied.
### TABLE 4-U

1975 TAXABLE SALES PER CAPITA
SOUTH SACRAMENTO AND THE SACRAMENTO COUNTY AVERAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail Category</th>
<th>South Sacramento (1975)</th>
<th>Sacramento County (1975)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>183.47</td>
<td>120.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>1557.75</td>
<td>460.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>49.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>310.28</td>
<td>271.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor</td>
<td>33.74</td>
<td>38.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat and Drink Places</td>
<td>334.40</td>
<td>232.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Furnishings and Appliances</td>
<td>201.71</td>
<td>144.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>325.33</td>
<td>155.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Related Business</td>
<td>1256.64</td>
<td>759.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Shops</td>
<td>130.58</td>
<td>216.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Apparel includes: men's, women's, family, and shoes.
2. General Merchandise includes: variety and department stores.
3. Food Stores include: grocery and convenience stores.
4. Eat and Drink Places include: fast food outlets, restaurants, and bars.
5. Auto Related Business includes: auto parts, supplies, dealers, body shops, and motorcycle sales.
6. Specialty shops include: all other miscellaneous retail.
7. Taxable sales in South Sacramento for 1975 was obtained from the State Board of Equalization, and the population for 1975 was 62,757.
8. Taxable sales in Sacramento County for 1975 was taken from the State Board of Equalization's 1975 report, "Taxable Sales in California." The population of Sacramento County for 1975 was 686,707.
9. Arrows indicate the three categories in which the taxable sales per capita are lower in South Sacramento than the Sacramento County average.
D. Future Commercial Space Demands

As was mentioned in the section on methodology, several different pieces of data were used to set up the computer program for the future commercial needs of South Sacramento. The necessary data included:

- number of households by minor zone
- median household income by minor zone
- expenditure distributions for various income levels
  (how consumers spend their money)
- future population projections by minor zone, and
- retail market capture rates by retail category, based on square footage of commercial space for the study area.

The purpose of market capture rates is to reflect shopping patterns by geographical area. In other words, to build into the computer program an indication of what percentage of the commercial business is actually a result of purchases made by residents of the South Sacramento area. A capture rate of 1.0 for a retail category means that all of the merchandise sold in South Sacramento is sold to consumers who live in South Sacramento. A capture rate greater than 1.0 indicates that the retail enterprises are attracting people from outside the area to shop. For the purpose of this report, in projecting commercial space demands, we have assumed that the capture rates will remain the same in the future as they are now.

Table 4-V lists the South Sacramento retail market capture rates by retail category based on square footage, taxable sales, and as compared to taxable sales for Sacramento County in general. The capture rates are technically determined by the quotients of the actual square footage, or taxable sales, divided by the theoretical\(^3\) square footage and taxable sales.

Capture rates signify the number of times the total available market is captured, or how much more than the expected number of consumers actually are served by a retail category. For example, home furnishings and appliances capture more than three times the market than would ordinarily be expected, based on square footage. General merchandise, food, and building materials all capture more than twice the expected market (based on square footage) in the study area. Drugs and Liquor, on the other hand, have a capture rate less than 1.0, and therefore capture less than the expected market in that area. In these cases, consumers may go outside of the study area to make their purchases, or more probably, the drug and liquor purchases are being satisfied by food and general merchandise outlets elsewhere in the South Sacramento area.

\(^3\)Theoretical values are taken from the Urban Land Institute's Dollars and Cents of Shopping Centers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail Category</th>
<th>Capture Rates Based On 1 Square Footage</th>
<th>Capture Rates Based On 1 Taxable Sales</th>
<th>Rate Ratio of Taxable Sales Per Capita For South Sacto. vs. Sacto. Co.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.52 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>3.38 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.39 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.14 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.86 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat and Drink Places</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.18 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Furnishings &amp; Appliances</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.40 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2.10 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Dealer &amp; Supply</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.65 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Shops</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.60 : 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 These capture rates are the quotient of actual + theoretical square footages and taxable sales.

2 This capture rate is the ratio of the taxable sales per capita for South Sacramento + taxable sales per capita for Sacramento County.
The last column in Table 4-V indicates how taxable sales per capita in South Sacramento compare to Sacramento County in general. General merchandise, in this case, is shown to enjoy more than three times the sales per capita than the county average. The drug and liquor categories are again shown to be low, indicating that these markets are probably being satisfied by other types of outlets, e.g., food or general merchandise, as was mentioned earlier. Specialty shops are a different case since the square footage capture rate (1.54) indicates that this category is attracting customers from outside the study area. However, the taxable sales capture rate (0.91) indicates less than the normal expected sales volume. The capture rate ratio is even lower (0.60:1) indicating a lower volume of sales per capita than the county average. So, even though this category may attract customers from outside the study area, the sales value of each transaction must be fairly low and at the same time based on a larger relative population than the sales per capita for the county as a whole.

The commercial building and lot area demand projections from 1985, 1995, and holding capacity by data area are shown in Table 4-W, along with the existing building and lot areas shown in the first two columns. The projected 1985 total lot area demand is only about 56 acres more than that which is already developed. Therefore, within the next 8 years, (by 1985), only 8% of the land which is already planned for commercial use will be needed. This includes the concept that the current vacant floor space will be utilized first before other development occurs.

The 1995 projections require 1012 acres which is 364 acres less than what is presently zoned for commercial. At holding capacity, then, there is projected to be a requirement of about 1540 acres total. This is only about 164 acres more than what is already zoned for commercial development (1,376 acres). The point here is that there is already nearly enough commercial land zoned in the South Sacramento area to satisfy the projected demand for at least the next 40 years. (Holding capacity is expected sometime after the year 2020.) Obviously, in the short run, there is more commercially zoned land than can be utilized for commercial purposes. Since some redistribution of this land will be necessary to meet future needs, it would seem reasonable to remove some of the existing commercial zoning where it appears to be particularly excessive, e.g., Data Areas 1, 5, 10, 14 and 15. (Note: See Map 4-B for Data Area Map.) It should be understood that each data area may never have the amount of commercial needed to serve its population, some data areas will have less, while others will have more.
## Table 4-M
Building Lot Area Demand Projections by Data Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA ARE</th>
<th>Bldg. Area (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Lot Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Bldg. Area (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Lot Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Bldg. Area (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Lot Area (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>106201</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>208145</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>214035</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>166863</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>103992</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>306321</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>295712</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>729705</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>781555</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>350920</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>456975</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>568434</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>914127</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>303794</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>372476</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100103</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>619443</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>716537</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>263139</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>460976</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>518318</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>140535</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63698</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76396</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>159999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>378663</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>626816</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>437717</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1012826</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1206604</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>314795</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70657</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>167065</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>196927</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>561266</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>727358</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>84340</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>127344</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>188916</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>36640</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>113600</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>159999</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>193796</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>636098</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1094739</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14A</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40184</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20200</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>149930</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>209369</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4712911</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>6010579</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>7874740</td>
<td>1012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Figures in columns 1 and 2 are a result of a field survey by the Planning Department.

2. Columns 3, 5, and 7 are theoretical figures based on current capture rates (calculated from square footage of floor space), current expenditure distributions, and future population projections. In addition, the square footage area for motels, business-professional, and recreation, are included as 33.35% of the projected area (the same percentage that presently exists).

3. In columns 4, 6, and 8, a standard building square footage and lot area (in acres) ratio is derived from the existing commercial areas, and used to project future lot size (in acres) from the projected building area (in square feet).
As previously mentioned, the growth projections discussed were based on the assumption that regional shopping facilities would grow and maintain the same ratio between population and total shopping area as presently exists. This assumption, and thus the projection, is viewed as unlikely since much of the future demand for regional shopping areas will be met by centers outside of the South Sacramento area. In other words, regional shopping is most likely to grow at a lessening rate in the future. This theory is shown graphically in Figure 4-C. The growth of regional shopping is shown as it might occur at 75% and 50% of the projected rate. It is difficult to ascertain how fast regional shopping will expand, but most likely the rate of expansion will be substantially less than it has been in the past. As can be seen from the figure, between the years 1975 and 1995, there is a dramatic excess of planned commercial area in South Sacramento. There is thus plenty of "padding" provided in the commercial expansion projections. Notice that the number of acres planned for commercial development from the Land Use Plan is about 1300 acres. This amount of commercial land, according to projections, will probably not be needed until sometime beyond the year 2040.

Due to the normal limitations of the planning process, it is unreasonable to plan, with any degree of specificity, beyond the year 1995. Therefore, the figures provided for holding capacity are really only speculative. For example, the Ag-Urban Reserve area (located in Data Area 15) is shown to experience its total development after the year 1995. Presently, there is no commercial or other urban development shown here, and the extent of development to occur between 1995 and holding capacity is unknown at this time. Thus, before holding capacity is reached, this plan should have been reevaluated 3 or 4 times in order to furnish a more accurate projection.

E. Problems, and Policies

The South Sacramento retail commercial areas are generally in good condition. There are many areas which are attractive, well landscaped and economically successful. These serve as good examples of how retail commercial areas can prosper. The preceding analysis has, however, identified several problems which presently exist in the South Sacramento commercial area:

1. There is an excess of existing commercial space available that is not being utilized.

2. As a result of this vacant space, and for other reasons, the surrounding commercial areas are poorly maintained and thus, to some extent, appear to be "run down."
FIGURE 4-C
PROJECTED COMMERCIAL ACREAGE REQUIREMENTS
WITH REGIONAL SHOPPING AREAS GROWING AT 100%, 75% AND 50% OF PROJECTED RATE

1 This projection is based on Regional Shopping amounting to about 45.8% of the total commercial area.
2 Projected rate based on a constant ratio between regional and community shopping. This projection is viewed as unlikely.
3 Although a commercial vacancy rate of 6.1% existed in 1975, vacant space is not included in the future projections.
3. Presently, there is an excess of vacant commercially zoned land in South Sacramento. This tends to encourage the development of new commercial building space without regard for the existing vacant commercial area that is already available. To the extent that this results in an over-built situation, the excess commercial may have a negative impact on existing commercial enterprises.

4. To emphasize the extent to which commercial land has been over-provided for in South Sacramento, the 1995 commercial needs already appear to be met by the present Land use Zone Plan. There is nearly twice the amount of land zoned for commercial uses as is presently needed.

Therefore, the commercial zoning plan is adequate at least through the year 1995. As a result, there is commercial land that will remain undeveloped for a long period of time. Under these circumstances, it would be appropriate to utilize the existing, but vacant, commercial space presently available, rather than to develop new commercial areas at a separate location. This would help to control commercial sprawl and thus keep from exacerbating circulation problems that presently exist. This program should first be implemented at Southgate Center, where the vacancy rate is nearly 32%, and second in areas around Southgate where the next largest amount of vacant commercial space exists (as shown in Table 4-P).

A more specific list of problems for each shopping area is included below. The commercial area improvement programs initiated in each area should move to alleviate the problems listed, and thus hopefully improve the success of the commercial outlets in these areas. These problems can only be rectified by the property owner and should be brought to their attention. It should be recognized, however, that many of these suggestions are purely cosmetic in nature. The basic problem can only be solved by limiting commercial expansion in the area.

Commercial Appearance Problems by area in South Sacramento

Franklin and Stockton Boulevard Areas:
- Parking areas and vacant lots littered with debris
- Buildings need maintenance - painting, landscaping, etc.
- Excessive window signs
- No uniformity to external signs - too many and too large
- Often a problem of inadequate off-street parking
- Some parking areas unpaved
- Discontinuity of sidewalks or none at all
- Weeds growing up through sidewalks and parking areas
- Landscaped and planting areas non-existent or not maintained
- No bike lanes along Franklin and upper Stockton Blvd. (north of Fowler Ave.)
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- Retail is too spread out - walking distances are excessive
- Irregular building set-backs

Commercial Surrounding Southgate Center:

- Vacant auto dealer across from Luther Burbank High School
- Vacant furniture store near State 99 north of Florin Road
- Inadequate landscaping in older commercial areas across the street from and east of Southgate Center

Southgate Center:

- Store front signs not uniform
- "Southgate Center" sign is unattractive
- Inadequate landscaping in parking area and along street
- Vacancy problem is both a symptom and a cause of deterioration
- Lacks an additional large department store to provide a variety of shopping

Commercial Surrounding Florin Center:

- Some planting areas poorly maintained
- Some inadequate landscaping and planting areas
- Weeds in sidewalks
- Vacant auto dealer east of Florin Center
- Vacant drive-in south of Florin Center
- Too many signs in some areas

Florin Center:

- No obvious problems in appearance

Fruitridge Pocket Area:

- Buildings need maintenance - painting, landscaping, etc.
- Security problem requires wrought iron fencing across store front
- Neighborhood generally run down

Power Inn/Florin-Perkins Area:

- Inadequate landscaping
- Tin sheds containing "marginal" enterprises
- Vacant service station at Power Inn and Elder Creek
Town of Florin:
- Vacant drive-in on Florin near Kara Dr.
- Inadequate landscaping
- Poorly maintained buildings
- Failure to capitalize on old town "theme"

Mack Road Area (Problem Area East of State 99):
- Inadequate landscaping and maintenance of planting areas
- Circulation problem with conflict between trucks and autos, and freeway ramp layout.

South Sacramento Miscellaneous:
- Inadequate landscaping both street and parking lots
- Too many signs
- Inadequate sidewalks
- Vacant service stations at: Fruitridge and 44th Street
  Sampson and 47th Avenue
- Combinations of all above mentioned problems

It is recommended policy of this plan that:

1. Emphasis be placed on occupation/rehabilitation of existing vacant commercially developed floor space,

2. A stabilization and/or reduction in the amount of land zoned for commercial uses be immediately effected through the implementation of this plan, and

3. A strict control over the utilization of existing and zoned commercial space be exercised in the future.

These policies are reflected in the Land Use Map and if used as guides in future decision making should help to solve the problems that South Sacramento has had for the past several years with its retail commercial market. Hopefully, with proper attention from local government and the proper maintenance by the private sector, retail commercial businesses in specific areas of South Sacramento can improve and effectively compete with successful commercial areas elsewhere in the county, thus continuing to serve as an employment base for its population.
CHAPTER FIVE
SOCIAL ELEMENT

Introduction

Social services can be community organized and run programs as well as local and other governmental activities, and includes preventive health care and education for low income and welfare families; child care facilities; programs of transportation for the handicapped and disabled. The programs are designed to enable families and individuals to improve their lifestyle through community involvement and services.

Social services appear to be needed most in areas of low income and high unemployment. Of nine Sacramento area communities, the South Sacramento Plan area has one of the highest percentages of people receiving welfare (only the Rio Linda - Elverta area has a higher percentage (25%) of welfare recipients). With a population of 63,000 in South Sacramento, 22% or 14,000 people are receiving some type of welfare, including social security; 7,700 or 36% of South Sacramento households are of low income; and 2,500 people, or 9% of the South Sacramento population in 1975, were unemployed. These statistics indicate a potential need for many types of social services in the South Sacramento Plan area.

The following is a brief outline of six suggested social service programs that could be needed in South Sacramento to help improve the quality of the community, not only for the low income families, but for all ages and all income levels.

It is important to note that some of the outlined programs are already developed and being operated while others remain in the idea stage. Further, it should be understood that plans are being developed and money set aside for construction of multipurpose service centers in the Sacramento County unincorporated area and the City of Sacramento. During fiscal year 1976-1977, the Board of Supervisors assigned development priorities of these centers based on funding from Federal Community Development Block Grant Monies in various community areas of the county including South Sacramento. Within the area, two multiservice centers are proposed. One is to be operated by the Fruitridge Park and Recreation District, and the second by Southgate Park and Recreation District in cooperation with another local group. A special study was conducted and should be referred to for more information: "Multi-Service Center Study," Arthur Young & Company. A third center, Oak Park Area, would provide services to residents of the northern portion of the community.

Many of the services and programs outlined below can be provided at these centers; however, additional help is provided by churches and other public interest organizations.

Suggested Services and Programs

A. Health Care

Health care in the form of prenatal services, family planning, dental and eye clinics, and health screening and evaluation is one
of the greatest needs in an area such as South Sacramento that has 36% low income and 7% elderly people. A health care program on the community level can treat minor problems as well as instruct and educate its citizens in preventive medicine.

A complete health care program would include counseling services, aid in dealing with drug and alcohol abuse, and a central phone number for suicide prevention, crises and other emergency stress situations. Many mental and physical problems can be identified in the early stages and treated at an intermediary health care facility in the community before a need arises for full hospitalization and treatment involving high costs.

B. Child Care

South Sacramento, having a large number of low-income families and a high percentage of women who are the single-parent head of families, has a need for low-cost child care facilities. Child care needs could be met by the business community, government agencies and volunteer programs involving young, elderly and handicapped people of the community. Preschools, which provide a beginning education for the 3-5 year old, is another aspect of child care that can be expanded.

C. Nutrition

A nutrition program would basically insure that all people in the community have the means by which to acquire proper nutrition every day. Free and reduced-price breakfasts and/or lunches could be provided at schools for children from low-income families; a nutrition education program for adults could be provided at the schools in the community; a group meal program for the elderly could be organized at neighborhood churches and community centers.

D. Job Information and Referral

This program would have members of the community work with the local Chamber of Commerce and other civic groups to form a job information, referral and skills match function, covering jobs within - as well as outside - the community. Many jobs, both paid and volunteer, would be created by the social services programs.

E. Paratransit

This program would insure maximum mobility for disabled citizens of the community. There are over 4,000 handicapped or disabled people in South Sacramento who need aid in travelling to and from jobs, shopping centers, grocery stores, church, etc.
F. **Information**

Of great importance is an efficient program to inform the community of the social services that are available to them. The community newspaper could include a directory of programs in the area; bro- chures and flyers could be distributed and posted at churches, schools, grocery stores, the community center, public buildings, etc.

The idea of providing broad social services on a community level is a relatively new concept. As communities have grown into sprawling suburbs, a desire to relate to a small entity - to feel a part of a community again - is becoming increasingly evident. Rapid growth and the exodus to the suburbs has created low income pockets, which in turn has created a need for social services that are difficult, if not impossible, to find except on a large, costly scale. Organizing these services at the community level, on a relatively small scale involving volunteers, can offer personal satisfaction and pride in one's community, while at the same time improving the quality of life for all members of the community.

**South Sacramento Demographic Profile**

The following profile describes the characteristics of the South Sacramento community. It tries to present the wealth of available statistics about the community's population in an understandable form. The demographic information has been compiled in four categories: housing characteristics, population characteristics, economic characteristics, and social characteristics. These are really not discreet aspects of the community but are arbitrarily separated for the convenience of discussion. The text is meant to provide the reader with an overview of South Sacramento and some distinguishing characteristics of its neighborhoods. For those wishing to study individual census tract areas, this discussion can provide a means of entry into the accompanying reference tables, which otherwise are formidable pages of numbers.

Most of the data presented in this section is taken from two sources; the 1970 U.S. Census of Population and Housing and Sacramento County's 1975 Special Census, or is derived from these census sources. Crime statistics for the unincorporated portions of South Sacramento were developed in cooperation with the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department. Estimates of deteriorating housing units were made during a windshield survey conducted by the Community Plan staff. All statistics are arrayed in rows representing the geographics data areas (census tracts) of the community and columns showing individuals characteristics. See Map 5-A. The bottom rows are totals for the South Sacramento community and Sacramento County and their incorporated and unincorporated portions.
Housing

Age: Of South Sacramento's 1975 housing stock, one of every seven dwellings was built before 1950. The community's north-to-south sequence of development has resulted in most (86%) of this older housing located in the northerly neighborhoods of the Fruitridge Pocket, City Farms, Fruitridge, and Fruitridge Manor areas (Data Areas F, 1, 2, 3, and 4). Today, one-quarter of the residences in these "older areas" of the community are those built before 1950, while two-thirds of the residences were constructed before 1960. In the "newer areas" of the community (Data Areas 5 through 15), only 4% of the housing was built before 1950. Most of this is in the vicinity of the Town of Florin. Less than one-quarter of the housing in the new areas dates from before 1960.

Type: The housing stocks of both the newer and older areas of South Sacramento share the community average proportion of single family housing (62%), although the neighborhoods encompass a range from 30% (in the unincorporated parts of the City Farms-Bowling Green area) to 86% (in the unincorporated portion of the Parkway area) single family units. Multiple family housing, representing 29% of the community's housing stock, is slightly more prevalent in the older areas, but is unevenly distributed and amounts to half or more of the housing in the incorporated portion of the Parkway area and in incorporated City Farms-Bowling Green. Mobile homes, which make up a much bigger share of the housing supply in South Sacramento (9%) than elsewhere in the county, comprise as much as 46% of the housing in the Florin Fruitridge Industrial Area.

Tenure: Homeowners make up a bigger share of the residents in the newer areas (73%) than in the older areas (57%). Among neighborhoods, the proportion of renters ranges from 74% in the unincorporated part of the City Farms-Bowling Green area to 19% in Meadowview, Parkway, and Kirchgater.

Rental and Mortgage Payments: The typical monthly mortgage payment and contract rent are much lower in the older areas than in the newer areas of South Sacramento. The 1976 median monthly mortgage payment is $123 in the older areas and $168 in the newer parts of South Sacramento. Median payments of owners range from $114 in the western part of the Fruitridge Pocket (tract 44.02U), the eastern part of the Fruitridge area (46.01U) and the Glen Elder neighborhood (48I) to $201 in the Valley Hi area. The median monthly rental payment is $111 in the older areas, but is probably greater than $150 in the newer areas.

Deteriorating Units: A survey by automobile to assess deterioration of housing units determined that almost three-fourths of South Sacramento's housing showing external signs of structural or cosmetic problems is located in the older areas. An average of 7% of the housing in the older areas was judged deteriorating (as much as 18% in the City Farms and eastern Fruitridge Manor Areas) while an average of only 2% of the housing in the newer areas was classed as deteriorating (6% in tract 51).
# HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

## TABLE 5-A

|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|

## Notes:

2. Source: Staff windshield survey in 1975.
3. Incorporation portion of the census tract.
4. County Unincorporated Area total includes the figures for the cities of Folsom, Isleton, and Salt.
5. Unincorporated portion of the census tract.
Subsidized Housing: Six percent of the residences in South Sacramento are subsidized owner or rental units, but this housing is not evenly distributed throughout the community. The City Farms-Bowling Green, Florin Mall, North Lindale, Fruitridge Industrial-Florin-East, Florin, and Kirchhater areas all have fewer than 2% subsidized housing units. Four of every five subsidized rental units are located in the older areas of South Sacramento where they account for 16% of all rental units. Nine of every ten subsidized owner units are located in the newer areas of the community where they comprise 8% of all owner-occupied housing. The highest concentration of subsidized rental units is in the western part of Fruitridge Manor (tract 32.02I) where these units constitute 68% of all occupied rental housing. The highest concentration of subsidized owner units is in the unincorporated part of the Parkway area (tract 49U) where such units account for one-third of all homeowner units.

Population

Population Growth: Between 1970 and 1975, population growth in South Sacramento kept pace with that in the unincorporated county (over 11%) and far exceeded the growth of the City of Sacramento (2.5%). While the newer areas of South Sacramento gained 25% more residents in this five year period, the older areas lost 2% of their population. Population changes in individual census tracts ranged from a loss of 11% in the eastern part of the Fruitridge area (tract 46.01U) to a gain of 98% in the Valley Hi area.

Household Number and Size: During the first half of the Seventies, high rates of household formation and declining average household size were characteristic of Sacramento County. South Sacramento reflected the county and unincorporated area trend with a 30% increase in households. As numbers of household proportionately outgained population, the average size of South Sacramento households dropped from 3.3 persons to 2.9 persons. Part of this decrease is explained by the more than doubling of the stock of multiple family dwellings in South Sacramento between 1970 and 1975. While in 1975, these units still accounted for only 30% of all housing in the community, their average size (1.18 persons per unit) is much smaller than the typical single family unit in South Sacramento. Apartment construction was only one contributing factor, however, since average household size declined during the period even in neighborhoods where the number of households remained virtually constant. Overall decreases in household size occurred in both the older areas (from 3.1 to 2.7 persons) and the newer areas (from 3.6 to 3.1 persons) of South Sacramento.

Age: From 1970 to 1975, the median age of South Sacramentans increased from 24 to 27 years, as was the case in the county's unincorporated area. The proportion of minors (18 years or younger) in the community declined from 41% to 35% while the proportion of senior citizens (of ages 65 or more) increased from 5% to 7%. The older areas tend to be home for more senior citizens and fewer minors than the newer areas, but there is evidence that younger families are moving into some older neighborhoods. The eastern part of the Fruitridge Pocket area (tract 44.01U) was the only tract in the community in which the proportion of minors increased between 1970 and 1975.
## TABLE 5-8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA AREA</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Persons per Household</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Persons 15-64</th>
<th>Persons 65+</th>
<th>Percent of Households 15-64</th>
<th>Persons 65+ as Percent of Total Persons 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fruitridge Pocket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 44.06r</td>
<td>2317</td>
<td>2217</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2157</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>3055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 44.02r</td>
<td>2930</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2180</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>2166</td>
<td>2423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fruitridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.01u</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.01a</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fruitridge Manor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 50.01i</td>
<td>6700</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4030</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 50.02i</td>
<td>6700</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4030</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fruitridge Manor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 50.01i</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>5300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 50.02i</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>5300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fruitridge Manor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 50.01i</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>5300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 50.02i</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>5300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. North Lindale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.01a</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.02a</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 12 &amp; 13 Fruitridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.01a</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.02a</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 15, North Lindale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.01a</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.02a</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 15, North Lindale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.01a</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.02a</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. End of North Lindale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.01a</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.02a</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. South East End</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.01a</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.02a</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. South East End End</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.01a</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.02a</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. South East End End</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.01a</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.02a</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>4291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- **Pop. 1970** refers to the population as of 1970.
- **1979** is the population for the year 1979.
- **1980** is the population for the year 1980.
- **1981** is the population for the year 1981.
- **1982** is the population for the year 1982.
- **1983** is the population for the year 1983.
- **1984** is the population for the year 1984.
- **1985** is the population for the year 1985.
- **1986** is the population for the year 1986.

- The table includes data on population, households, persons per household, youth, persons 15-64, persons 65+, and percent of households 15-64.

- The data is organized by Tract and other data areas as indicated.

- The table does not include non-respondents.

- Data is provided for various geographical areas within the specified range.
Ethnic Minorities: The ethnic mix of South Sacramento residents (26% minorities) is more like that of the City of Sacramento (29%) than the unincorporated area (10%). Again, there is a dramatic difference between the older and newer areas of the community. Non-whites account for one-third of the residents in the older areas including 16% blacks, 13% Chicanos, and 5% other non-Caucasian. Non-Caucasians make up one-fifth of the residents in the newer areas, including 8% blacks, 5% Chicanos, and 6% other minorities. The proportion of non-Caucasians in individual census tracts ranges from as low as 10% in the Fruitridge Industrial, Florin-East, Florin area (tract 51) to 75% in the incorporated part of North Lindale (tract 48I, and Glen Elder neighborhood).

Economic

Income: Median household incomes for South Sacramentans in 1970 and 1975 were situated between the median household incomes for the City of Sacramento and the unincorporated county. In the newer areas of South Sacramento, the 1975 median household income ($12,300) is close to that of the unincorporated area of the county, but in the older areas of the community, the 1975 median household income ($8,268) is only two-thirds of this level. Among data areas, median incomes range from $6,255 in the Fruitridge Pocket area to $14,366 in the Valley Hi area.

To estimate the change in buying power from 1970 to 1975 among South Sacramento residents, the decline in household size can be taken into account by estimating the change in per capita income. After adjusting for inflation, the approximate average per capita income of South Sacramento residents rose 2% between 1970 and 1975. However, the gain was concentrated in the newer areas (with a 5% increase) while residents of the older areas experienced declining incomes (-6%). The lowest income tract with substantial population located in the newer areas of South Sacramento, North Lindale's incorporated section (primarily the Glen Elder subdivision), showed one of the largest proportionate gains in per capita income (+13%).

Low Income Households: Only two out of every three South Sacramento households answered the income question in the 1975 Special Census. Based on these responses and using HUD-specified income ceilings for various sized households, estimates have been made of low (below 80% of the county median) and very low (below 50% of the county median) income households. While the procedures used probably overestimated the numbers in these low income categories, they place over one-third of the community's households (36%) in the low category and more than half of these (19%) in the very low category. Two-thirds of these households are found in the older areas of South Sacramento where 47% of all households have low incomes, and 28% have very low incomes. In contrast, in the new areas, only 25% of the households have low, and 12%, very low incomes.

Employment: Between 1970 and 1975, South Sacramento's labor force was more adversely affected by rising unemployment than was most of the county. The greatest impacts were felt by workers with lower income,

older areas of the community where unemployment rate increased from 8.2% to 11.9%. In these older areas of South Sacramento, unemployment among non-Caucasian workers and young workers (ages 16-21) is even more severe, and much higher than among the same groups in the newer areas.

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Areas</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newer Areas</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>7,834</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>9,656</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>9,433</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>11,767</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17,167</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>21,423</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For women workers who live in the newer areas, unemployment (9.8%) is higher than for male workers from the same areas. Female workers residing in the older areas experience a higher rate of unemployment (11.5%), but not as high as that affecting male workers (12.1%) in these areas.

Occupations: In 1970, the labor force of the newer areas of South Sacramento was employed in a range of occupations similar to that characteristic of the entire County's labor force. The older areas, on the other hand, were the place of residence for a much smaller proportion of white collar workers (47% versus 58% in the newer areas) and a correspondingly larger proportion of blue collar workers (38% versus 30%). Professional, technical, managerial, and administrative workers comprised 24% of the work force living in the newer areas, but only 13% of the work force in the older areas.

Households Without Cars: In 1970, almost four times as many households in the older areas of South Sacramento compared to the newer areas had no automobile available. However, the proportion of these carless households (10.4%) in South Sacramento's older areas was still considerably less than the average for the City of Sacramento (18.8%). The county average is 11% since the unincorporated area has only 4% carless households.

Social

Families Headed By Women: In 1970, thirteen percent of the families living in South Sacramento were headed by women. These families were more prevalent in the older areas of the community where they comprised 16% of all families. In contrast, only 9% of the families in the newer areas were female-headed. An exception is the Glen Elder neighborhood (tract 481) where 24% of the families were headed by women.

Health Care and Disabilities: In South Sacramento, 62% of the respondents to the 1975 Special Census indicated that their source of primary health care is a private physician. Among South Sacramento neighborhoods, there is little variation in the proportion of residents relying on private physicians. However 11% of the respondents in the older
## SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

### Change in K-12 Student-Age Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>9,324</td>
<td>11,180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>8,087</td>
<td>10,038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>6,326</td>
<td>7,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruitridge Pocket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 44.01u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 44.02u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.City Farms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.01u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.02u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.03u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 46.04u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 32.01u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 32.02u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 47a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 47b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 48a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 48b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 5a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 5b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rate of Crimes per 1000 persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Rate (1974)</th>
<th>Rate (1982)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

2. Source: Sacramento County Sheriff's Dept. Patrol Division (1975 Demands for Service)
3. Incorporated portion of the common tract
4. County Unincorporated Area total includes the figures
5. Rate of crimes per 1000 persons
areas of the community indicated the UCD-Sacramento Medical Center or County Health Clinics as the source of health care, while only 4% of the respondents in the newer areas rely on these sources.

Educational Attainment: The 1970 census indicated that the adults of 25 or more years of age living in newer areas of South Sacramento were more likely to have graduated from high school than such adult residents of the older areas of the community. Seventy percent of these adults in the newer areas were high school graduates compared to 52% in the older areas. The median number of years of school they completed was 12.4 years in the newer areas versus 11.8 in the older areas. The lowest achievement was found in City Farms (29% graduates; 8.9 years completed) and eastern Fruitridge Manor areas (37% graduates; 10.3 years completed).

Changes in School Age Population: Over the five year span from 1970 to 1975, the South Sacramento community exhibited widely fluctuating K-12 level student populations in its neighborhoods. The newer areas gained 10% more K-12 age residents as a result of residential development in the Valley Hi and Parkway areas. Most of the established newer neighborhoods experienced sharp declines in K-6 level students and, in one case (the Florin Mall area), the 7-9 level students. All the newer areas showed gains in 10-12 level populations. The older areas of South Sacramento lost 13% of their K-12 level student population with losses especially high at the K-6 level but also at the 10-12 level. The Fruitridge Pocket showed gains in primary, intermediate, and high school age populations, suggesting a turnover in resident families in this older area.

Crime: Crime statistics are only available for the unincorporated portion of South Sacramento, which obtains its police services from the County Sheriff’s Department. The unincorporated part of the older areas experience crimes in both people and property-oriented categories at rates about 50% higher than occur in the unincorporated parts of the newer areas. The property-oriented crimes tabulated include arson, burglary, grand theft, and auto theft. People-oriented crimes include assault, battery, robbery, rape, and murder.
CHAPTER SIX
TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

Introduction

The transportation element for the South Sacramento community plan focuses on the present and future conditions of the transportation system of the community. The study rests on several fundamental assumptions, all of which were reinforced in researching the technical documents which went into the element. Among those assumptions are:

1) Transportation is not an end in itself, but is pursued as a result of some other activity.

2) The transportation element of the plan is to be focused on the movement of people. The movement of goods is also of concern but is not specifically addressed in the plan.

3) The locations of the various possible land use zones within the community play key roles in determining the transportation patterns of the community.

4) Despite continuing and projected improvements in public mass transit and other forms of movement, use of the private automobile is and will continue to be the primary form of transportation within the community for the foreseeable future.

5) Having almost remained constant in the recent past, the expected development in the community as reflected on the land use zone plan will have a profound effect on transportation needs. It can be assumed that the movement of people will, over the life of the plan, nearly double from its present rate.

Number five was not actually one of the original assumptions, but it was discovered early enough in the process to become a primary consideration.

This element of the community plan is divided into four sections:

Section A - Travel Behavior - outlines the various reasons and destinations in the community's movement from place to place. The section also deals with the projected increase in travel demand as development takes place.

Section B - Circulation - considers the routes that travel flows take and will take. It attempts to point out those portions of the community's street system which will be subject to the greatest impact as community development proceeds.

Section C - Considers Additional and Alternative Transportation Means - although the private auto is the predominate transportation mode within the community, other means are and can be utilized to greater or lesser effect.
Section D - summarizes the study and outlines the conclusions which can be made - most are obvious. It also addresses the most obvious actions which can be taken to alleviate the problems identified in the earlier portions of the report.

A. Travel Behavior in South Sacramento

Data for this part of the analysis was obtained primarily from the California State Department of Transportation, Sacramento Area Transportation Study. This work, originally completed in 1968, is regularly updated and is the primary source of information about travel behavior in the region. The most useful unit of analysis in the report is a division of the Regional Analysis District (RAD), the sub-RAD. The South Sacramento community is covered by six sub-RADS. Unfortunately, for rigid analytical purposes, only two of the sub-RADS are wholly within the community. The remaining four have only part of their areas within the South Sacramento community area.

The sub-RADS represent the origin points for trips taken within the region. Travel behavior is shown for auto and, to a lesser degree, for transit uses (bus). In some cases, the rate of transit utilization is too low to appear in the data and in other cases, no transit facilities exist.

Map 6-A shows a typical trip destination map used in the analysis. The map shows trips originating in sub-RAD 1803. Only the eastern half of the sub-RAD is within the South Sacramento community area. The boundaries of the South Sacramento portion are Fruitridge Road on the north, Sacramento Boulevard and U.S. 50-99 Freeway on the east, Mack Road on the south, and the Western Pacific railroad tracks on the west. The principal streets within the area are east-west Florin Road, and north-south Franklin Boulevard. The trips shown are those made by auto from home (within the sub-RAD) to work. Analysis of the map shows the following: the greatest proportion, above 25 percent, of trips to work are to work places within the sub-RAD. A somewhat smaller proportion are to downtown Sacramento. Lesser proportions are scattered within the city and unincorporated area including Elk Grove. A measurable amount crosses the bridge to Yolo County. A comparison of this map with the one showing home-to-work trips via transit would show, along with the great preponderance of auto travel, that of those who do ride the bus, the greatest percentage work downtown. Also shown would be the greater freedom of direction available to auto drivers.
Table 6-A shows a compilation of data from the various sub-RADS.

**TABLE 6-A**

**TRIPS BY TYPE CATEGORY PER DAY**

**ALL SUB-RADS - 1975**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home to work</td>
<td>27,896</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home to shopping</td>
<td>19,306</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home to other</td>
<td>57,710</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work to other</td>
<td>36,206</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other to other</td>
<td>11,112</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>152,230</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For the entire South Sacramento community, the great preponderance (98%) of trips are taken by auto. Five categories of trips for each transportation mode are shown. Home-to-work and home-to-shopping trips are self-explanatory; home-to-other refers to recreation, school, medical facilities, etc.; work-to-other includes trips between the work place and locations other than home, work-related or not; other-to-other trips end neither at home or the work place; typically, they are combined with other purposes such as errands run to the dry cleaners or drug store.

The greatest percentage of all the trips generated within South Sacramento also end within the community; typically, within the same or adjacent sub-RAD. The greatest out-of-community attraction is the home-to-work trip to downtown Sacramento which, at 19 percent, is third on the list of trip types. The greatest amount, by far, of shopping is done in sub-RADs 1803 and 1703 which contain the Southgate and Florin Shopping Centers. As noted above, the auto is the predominant mode of transportation within the community. Transit facilities are used for only a very small proportion of the community's travel; about four percent home-to-work and only about two percent of all trips.

**Travel Behavior by Community Data Area Groups (Sub-RAD or Portion):**

**Data Area F**

Data Area F is a very small portion in the southwest corner of sub-RAD 1702. The greatest proportion (above 25%) of all trips to any sub-RAD stay within 1702 itself. Other trip destinations appear to be evenly scattered to surrounding sub-RADs, each receiving, typically, between 5 percent and 10 percent. The only notable exception is found in the home-to-work trip type where two of the four sub-RADs which make up downtown Sacramento each receive between 15 percent and 25 percent of the total, sharing the percentage with the home sub-RAD. Data Area F appears to be the greatest proportional user of transit with 2.9 percent of all trips taken by bus.
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Data Areas 1, 4, 8, & 9

These Data Areas comprise the eastern half of sub-RAD 1803. As briefly discussed earlier, the greatest proportion (25%+) of all trips is within the sub-RAD. The second, but less than 15 percent, is to the east, sub-RAD 1703. The third trip generator is home-to-work travel to one of the four sub-RADs downtown. Home-to-shopping trips are either within the home sub-RAD or to 1703 which contains the Florin Shopping Center. Only about 1.8 percent of the total trips are by transit, and the greatest trip type, almost half, is home-to-work with, again, the highest proportion having downtown destination.

Data Areas 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, & 11

These Data Areas comprise all of sub-RAD 1703. Typically, the greatest proportion of all trips stay within the sub-RAD. Unusually, the home-to-work downtown destination does not strongly predominate as in other areas of the community. From this area, the auto driver apparently goes to work in any direction in measurable amount, south to Elk Grove, east to Rancho Cordova, or west to Yolo County, as well as to the central city.

Data Areas 7, 12, & 13

These three Data Areas comprise all of sub-RAD 1731. The greatest single proportion of trips is east to adjacent sub-RAD 1703. Unusually, downtown Sacramento has relatively little attraction as a home-to-work destination with each of the downtown sub-RAD claiming less than five percent. By far, the major home-to-work destination is sub-RAD 1703 with the home area coming second. Transit facilities are limited and are used seldom enough to not appear in the data.

Data Areas 14 and 14A

These two Data Areas comprise the extreme northeast corner of sub-RAD 1811. The greatest percentage (25%+) of trips starting within the area go to the sub-RAD adjacent to the north. The second greatest proportion stay within the sub-RAD. One noticeable feature of the available data is the relatively large number of other-to-other trips that must be created by Cosumnes River College. Transit ridership accounts for 2.6 percent of total trips and, as is typical, the greatest type-destination is home-to-work, downtown.

Data Area 15

Data Area 15 is the extreme western corner of sub-RAD 1732. Of all the trips generated by this area, the largest proportion (25%+) stay within the sub-RAD. The others appear to be equally scattered to the north and northwest with no sub-RAD claiming more than 10 percent of the total. A difficulty with data interpretation is that this sub-RAD also contains Elk Grove with most of its trips undoubtedly oriented in that direction.
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The data clearly demonstrates that the great majority, both proportionately and absolutely, of all trips starting within South Sacramento also end within the community. The only exception to this is the case of the downtown Sacramento orientation of home-to-work trips which receive something less than 19 percent of the total. Shopping and errands trips most typically are directed at the Southgate-Florin Mall areas.

The predominant mode of travel used by the community is the private automobile. Only about two percent of all trips are taken by transit. Transit utilization is hardly noticeable at all for trips within the community boundaries. The main ridership consists of those home-to-work trips, again, to central Sacramento, where it accounts for not quite five percent of the total.

It is difficult to project or even envision the future of the community holding any great change for travel behavior except increasing numbers of trips of all types. The continued growth of office, commercial and industrial land use during the life of the plan may slightly increase the proportion of home-to-work trips staying in the community. The Regional Transit District is predicting increased bus ridership. Although transit facilities will be considered in a separate section of this report, it would appear that a greatly changed route and scheduling program will be required. In addition, there will need to be a drastic change in public attitudes toward the private automobile, whether brought about economically through rising fuel and related costs, socially via government intervention, or by a combination. A separate section of the report also deals with traffic flows and street utilization. It would appear that South Sacramento can, however, expect slower traffic movement on many presently adequate streets and increased congestion on several streets that are at this time subject to unsatisfactory stop and go movement.

B. Projected Travel Demand

The development which is projected on the South Sacramento community land use zone plan will be accompanied by additional travel demand. This future demand will be accommodated by the existing or improved transportation system. Table 6-8 shows the projected travel increases for the various data areas of the community plan. In total, the increased travel in the community area to be expected is 280,900 daily trip ends by 1985. The basis for the table is the development of the community by 1985 as shown on the plan, with trip generation rates by type of land use as established by the California Department of Transportation and adapted by the Sacramento County Planning Department. Presently, daily trip ends amount to about 150,000.

Given the time and resources at hand, it is unfortunately not possible to project the future demand by trip type. The proportions of trip types will, of course, vary from data area to data area. Certain implications can be derived, however.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Area</th>
<th>Single Family</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Total Additional Trip Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d/u</td>
<td>Trip Ends</td>
<td>d/u</td>
<td>Trip Ends</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trip Ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>2,702</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>4,526</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>4,218</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>10,174</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>3,785</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>4,199</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) 14A</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>6,897</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,616</td>
<td>43,852</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>28,785</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sacramento County Planning Department.

Note: 1) Figures have been rounded.

2) Residential development is on a per-dwelling-unit basis while commercial and industrial calculations are on a per-acre-of-development basis.

3) 1975 trip ends were 150,000. Page 6-7
For example, Data Area 8 can expect the major portion of the future trips to be of the "home-to-somewhere" type as most of the undeveloped portion of the area is shown for single-family development. Another large proportion of the future travel demand of the data area, however, will be brought about by the future commercial development allowed for on the plan. The difference between the two in the fact that one acre of commercial development can be expected to generate up to ten times the amount of traffic as an equal area of residential development. Careful perusal of the table and the community plan's land use zone map can also give one an idea of where in the data area the traffic will be generated and in which direction it will likely proceed.

C. Circulation

The preceding sections detailed the travel behavior of South Sacramento residents. It was easily found that most all trips for whatever purpose utilize the private automobile. This section is concerned with the traffic flows, present and projected, associated with the automobile within the confines of the community. The Department of Public Works of both the city and county keep count of the traffic flows on the major streets of the community. Traffic counts are regularly taken and recorded at the same locations.

For purposes of this report, identified traffic flows at twelve locations were analyzed. Map 6-8 shows the locations of the analyzed and projected twenty-four hour counts. At each location, the primary figure shown is the count taken in the year 1976. The second figure, (in parenthesis) is a projection of future traffic flows at that location if development occurs in the manner shown on the community land use plan. Although the projection of any future human activity is at best tenuous, the figures given are at least indicative of the traffic flows to be expected. The projections were made by assigning the trip ends generated by the various land-use types in each data area, (at full 1985 development) to that data area's boundary streets. These trips were then summed, with allowances for "escapes" and interior friction, toward the freeway and/or Florin Road. A quick check of flows existing shows highest traffic density in the vicinity of these two streets. An allowance was also assumed for the probable direction of traffic flow based on the type of trips likely to be brought about by the varying land uses.

An additional consideration which may also be inferred for selected locations is the effect of traffic generated by development outside the community area. The greatest future effect will be caused by development to the south and west in the Laguna community, and the continued growth of the Meadowview area. On the streets considered in the analysis, the impact of traffic from outside the community will be felt primarily on Florin Road, Franklin Boulevard and at the Mack Road interchange. Additional trips have been added at the three locations to account for trips initiated outside the community. The direction and amount of future traffic will be affected by the timing and locations of development. Development in the western Meadowview of
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southern Laguna areas, for example, would more probably generate
traffic oriented toward Freeport Boulevard and I-5 Freeway, or Elk
Grove Boulevard and Highway 99, rather than South Sacramento surface
streets. The improvement of the former Route 148 transportation
corridor as a major street would also serve to alleviate, if
not prevent, an intolerable impact on local streets. The city,
county, and state are presently studying funding methods for this
improvement.

Experience shows that most of the major streets within the South
Sacramento community are more than adequate in handling the present
traffic flows. Service standards call for a stable flow of traffic
of moderate volume. Drivers may be somewhat restricted in their
freedom to select their own speed, change lanes, or pass. This
threshold is equivalent to 1,000 vehicles per hour per lane. A
fallback standard is also used. In this instance, traffic flow is
unstable and operating speeds are affected by the increase in
traffic. Drivers have little freedom to maneuver, and comfort and
convenience are low, but such conditions are tolerable for short
times. This level of service is equivalent to about 1,500 to 1,800
vehicles per hour per lane. These standards are referred to as
level of service "C" and "D" in the most commonly used highway
planning reference documents. At present, with the exception of a
part of Florin Road, none of the roadway links shown fall below
level of service "C" except for very brief "rush-hour" periods.
Even with the projected increases, as large as they are in some
instances, it would appear that flows will, in general, remain at
least level "D."

Note must be taken of the existing and predicted situation at two
specific locations. On Franklin Boulevard south of Florin Road and
on 47th Avenue near Stockton Boulevard, it is expected that traffic
will increase nearly 45 percent and 30 percent, respectively. One
saving grace for the future is that much of the increased flow can
be expected to be related to the shopping areas along Florin Road or
to the intersection of 47th Avenue and Stockton Boulevard where
additional commercial development has been proposed. The timing of
such trips will be adjusted by individual choice if traffic becomes
intolerable during any specific period of the day. The problem of
peak traffic times for home-to-work trips will continue to increase
in magnitude.

Another area of grave concern is in the south portion of the community.
Trip projections indicate approximately 31,000 trips per day centering
on the Mack Road–Elsie Avenue, U.S. 99–Stockton Boulevard area
(dashed circle on Map 6-B). This is an increase of approxi-
mately 110 percent. This traffic will also be of many varying types.
Home-to-work trips will be associated with the increased residential
development of Data Areas 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 14A. Industrial
related trips, south on Power Inn Road, will be generated by activity
far to the north in Data Area 7. Many trip ends will be associated
with an increase in the commercial development, the Valley Hi-Mack
Road area.
Circulation Summary: Analysis of the circulation patterns, present and future, of South Sacramento shows essentially the following:

It can be expected that as development occurs in the pattern shown on the land use plan, traffic flows throughout most of the community will be subject to great increase. Severe congestion can be expected at specific locations. The greatest percentage increase in traffic can be expected in the Mack Road area. Since, however, much of this traffic will be associated with development of a presently open and undeveloped area, it is possible to assure that the situation does not become intolerable by making those improvements mentioned for this area on the previous page.

D. Additional and Alternative Transportation Means

As indicated, the private auto is the predominant transportation mode by a large measure. The Regional Transit system ranks a very minor and poor second. This section of the transportation element discusses not only transit facilities, but also several other present and possible ways of movement within and without the South Sacramento community.

1. Public Transit

As noted earlier, the predominant number of trips taken in South Sacramento remain within the community. These trips are also predominantly shopping or "other" oriented. Despite this, public transit facilities available to the community are best suited, and thus mostly utilized, for home-to-work trips to the central city.

Nearly a dozen and a half routes serve the community. This is a greater number than any other community in the county, except downtown Sacramento itself. Despite this, only one route crosses the community in an east-west direction across the freeway at any location other than Florin Road. Bus travel from point to point in the community is difficult, if not impossible, without a trip interpreter at Florin Center. This is demonstrated by manipulation the figures of Table 6-A. Of all trips in the South Sacramento area, only about 1.7 percent were by transit. Of the home-to-work type, however, nearly 5 percent were by bus. It will be recalled that the greatest number of trips to destinations outside the community were home-to-work types to downtown Sacramento. The north-south orientation of bus routes from Florin Center to downtown Sacramento then becomes explicable.

It would appear that if transit utilization is to be increased, it will have to be for trips of other than the home-to-work variety. If an increase in shopping and "other" type trips is to be facilitated, a reorganization of bus routes to allow greater freedom of travel within the community itself will be necessary. Presently, (August 1978) some changes have been made to the routes that recognize these concerns.
2. Park and Ride

Possible extension of transit utilization would be found in the park-and-ride concept. This idea, wherein home-to-work commuters drive to a central spot and then use express buses to the downtown area, has been explored and found feasible.

3. Para-transit

Para-transit service includes several travel modes which lie between the regular transit system and the private automobile. The first thought of is the for-hire taxi cab. The chief advantage of para-transit is its ubiquitous nature which allows point-to-point travel of almost any pattern. This greater flexibility is, however, associated with higher cost.

Para-transit services are suggested for areas which have low mobility groups such as the young, elderly, or handicapped. At the county level, these services are being provided at a minimal level by a host of agencies. Regional Transit operates one such system.

4. Bikeways

By 1975, there were over 200 miles of bikeways in Sacramento County. The existing facilities consist of both on and off street paths. They provide access to a variety of activity, including commuting to work, recreation, school trips and short distance shopping.

As a mode of transportation the bicycle can, for many short trips at least, be considered a viable alternative to other means. Although emphasis has been placed on recent years on facilitating bicycle ridership, it has become obvious that only the most hardy and intrepid persons use or will use the bicycle for traveling long distances on a regular basis.

See Chapter 10, Recreation and Parks for the Bikeway Plan where Map 10-B shows the portion of the proposed county bikeway system which lies within the South Sacramento community.

5. Railroad Transportation

The South Sacramento community is served by three rail lines. Although, when transportation is considered, thought is most often given to the movement of people, the movement of goods must not be forgotten. Rail service is provided to the community by the Western Pacific Railroad, whose line serves as the community's western boundary, the Southern Pacific Railroad and the California Central Traction Company Railroad, both of which serve the community's eastern industrial areas. As the industrial development of the community continues, these lines will continue to pay an important role.
Although it has not been seriously considered, mention has on occasion been made of utilizing the Western Pacific line right-of-way for a fixed rail commuter facility between the southern portion of the community and downtown Sacramento. Practicality aside, a great change in public attitudes would be necessary to make such a feasible reality. One problem, or series of potential problems created by the presence of the rail lines is in that all the rail-street crossings are at grade level. As traffic flows in the community increase, it can be expected that the inconvenience and crossing accident potential also will rise. Future transportation facility development in the community should well consider the possibility of grade separation at rail crossings.

E. **Conclusion: Problems and Opportunities**

Many of the transportation problems which face the South Sacramento community are similar to those of the urban/urbanizing region in which it lies. It can be assumed that the future of the community will generally show:

1. Increasing traffic flows at amounts and locations directly related to the future development pattern of the community.

2. Despite emphasis and encouragement toward the use of alternative transport modes such as public transit and bicycling, the predominant means of transportation will continue to be the private automobile.

3. Despite the increase of traffic flows and peak periods of congestion, congestion will not generally become intolerable over the life of the plan (1995) if a street improvement program is carried out as reflected on the major street and highways plan (See Map 6-C, Major Streets and Highways) as it may be modified by the currently (1978) ongoing Transportation Study. (Note the E.I.R. for this community plan identifies traffic flow increase as potentially significant.)

Despite the many possible problems that do or will exist, it must be noted that it is not too late to seek and find favorable solutions.
NOTES

1. The intersection of Duluth, Cotton, Shasta, Jacinto and Calvine with State Hwy. 99 and Frontage Road are subject to further study.

2. This plan depicts both City of Sacramento and unincorporated county areas future street network. Because of variations in street size and nomenclature between jurisdictions, this plan is described as a functional major street and highway plan. The principal area of difference between the two jurisdictions is the thoroughfare/major street, as such some county arterials have been shown in the city/county major street/thoroughfare category for purposes of describing function. For specific additional information, reference should be made to the appropriate area General Plan.
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This report has identified several specific problems to be faced by the South Sacramento community. Below is a listing of the major concerns accompanied by policies which would alleviate or prevent them.

Problem: Future development in the southern portion of the community, both incorporated and unincorporated areas, may well cause severe circulation problems if the existing major street pattern is not, at the same time, bolstered to accommodate the traffic it brings.

Policy: It is envisioned that the ongoing Transportation Study will provide several partial solutions. The problem is a complex one, the exact magnitude of which will depend on the pattern of future development. Specific policies should include:

Program: 1) The widening and continued development of Franklin Boulevard.

2) Widening and improvement of Meadowview Road and its connection with Mack Road. The re-evaluation of the Power Inn Road-Elsie Avenue connection and an improved and/or alternate Mack Road-Elsie Avenue-Power Inn freeway connection.

3) The development of an east-west major street connecting Freeways U.S. 99 & I-5. This street should follow the alignment of the transportation corridor that was to have been called State Route 148, now unadopted as a route.

Problem: Public transit serves the needs of the home-to-work commuter to the central city; however, intra-community, point-to-point travel without a transfer is a tenuous proposition at best. Especially unsatisfactory is movement in an east-west direction across the freeway.

Program: Re-evaluate public transit routes and schedules to determine intra-community travel needs. One or more predominantly east-west routes should be established, and include Fruitridge Road and 47th Avenue.
Problem: Further industrial development in the northeastern portion of the community poses the specter of increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic passing through residential and commercial areas, as noted in the industrial discussion, Chapter 4. Specifically, the traffic can be projected to flow along Fruittidge Road and 47th Avenue-Elder Creek Road to and from the freeway.

Program: Develop a street improvement program to reorient heavy industrial traffic north to Highway 50, north of the community, and South to Freeway 99, rather than east-west through residential-commercial areas. Specifically, this will require the widening and improvement of Power Inn Road.

In addition to the improvements of the presently unsatisfactory Mack Road freeway access would be to extend Power Inn southward to the intersection of the former Route 148 and proposed major street (arterial) with Freeway 99.

Problem: The major streets in the community are presently providing an acceptable level of service. As future development occurs with concomitant increases in travel demand, the level of service on some of these streets will, however, decline. Indeed, at a few specific locations, severe congestion can be expected.

Program: Concurrently with community development, a program of widening, traffic control installation, and general improvement should be undertaken as is reflected on the major street and highways plan.

Although not strictly a concern of this Transportation Element, any program of street improvement should also include the consideration of street tree planting as outlined in Chapter 10 of the community plan.

Problem: "At grade" rail crossings in the community at present cause concern for their accident potential as well as inconvenience.

Policy: It should be an established program that all future major rail crossings be separated where feasible. Considering the large amount of traffic the street carries, the Florin Road crossing of the Western Pacific Railroad should also be evaluated to determine the feasibility of grade separation in the near future.
Problem: In some areas, the City of Sacramento and the unincorporated county area boundary is the centerline of a public street or the line cuts a street at right angles. This condition of jurisdiction may result in the street being developed utilizing different development standards and having an unusual and/or undesirable appearance.

Policy: As development occurs along jurisdictional boundary streets, the City of Sacramento and County of Sacramento will cooperate and coordinate development standards with the object being a consistency of size, type of improvements and development.
CHAPTER SEVEN

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

I. Air Quality

Existing Conditions:

Air quality conditions in South Sacramento are (as everywhere) a result of emission characteristics, both local and upwind, and meteorological factors. A number of pollutants can be found in the air in Sacramento, however, this analysis will concentrate on those which have historically exceeded established air quality standards, namely oxidant (smog) and carbon monoxide (See Table 7-A). Particulate matter has also been a problem, but is largely of agricultural origin and is not treated here. The environmental impact report identifies air quality as a major impact due to violation of current and anticipation of violation of future air quality standards.

Both California and the U.S. Government have set up standards for air quality (See Table 7-B) which are based on health criteria. It is against these standards which the number of days of violation are measured. Oxidants are secondary (i.e., formed by the reaction of two or more primary pollutants in the atmosphere, after they have been emitted) pollutants that form in the air when hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides mix in the presence of sunlight. They are pungent, sometimes appear brown or grey in color, crack rubber, weaken some fabrics, injure plants, cause stinging and watering of eyes and damage the human respiratory tract. Carbon Monoxide, on the other hand, is an invisible and odorless gas. It results from the incomplete combustion of fossil fuels used to operate internal combustion engines and affects the human body by reducing the blood's capacity to carry oxygen, causing headaches, fatigue and slowed reactions.

Meteorological conditions have varying effects on the different pollutants (See Table 7-C). Unfortunately, conditions in Sacramento, combined with the city's location, frequently tend to propagate adverse air quality. The Sacramento air basin lies in the northern portion of the Great Valley, enclosed by the Coast Range on the west; the Sierra Nevadas on the east; the Cascade Range to the north and the San Joaquin Valley air basin to the south. In summer, light winds flow from the Bay Area, through the delta and extend to the northern parts of the basin, warming as they move across the hot valley floor. Late fall is characterized by cold air draining off the mountain slopes into the basin. Photochemical smog in the summer and early fall is enhanced by many warm, sunny days and frequent high pressure temperature inversions where relatively cooler stagnant air is trapped below. Carbon Monoxide, nitrogen oxide and particulate matters are highest in late fall and winter when there is little interchange of air between the valley and the coast.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIR BASINS</th>
<th>OXIDANT</th>
<th>CARBON MONOXIDE</th>
<th>SULFUR DIOXIDE</th>
<th>SULFATE</th>
<th>NITROGEN DIOXIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STD. (HOUR)</td>
<td>EPI. (HOUR)</td>
<td>STD. (8 HR.)</td>
<td>EPI. (12 HR.)</td>
<td>STD. (24 HR.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH COAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CENTRAL COAST</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CENTRAL COAST</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHEAST PLATEAU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACRAMENTO VALLEY</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT BASIN VALLEYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHEAST DESERT</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNTAIN COUNTIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE TAHOE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
A BASIN-DAY OCCURS WHEN THE APPLICABLE STANDARD/EPISODE CRITERION IS EXCEEDED AT ONE OR MORE AIR MONITORING STATIONS.
--- INDICATES NO DATA AVAILABLE.
* SEE TEXT CONCERNING BOUNDARY CHANGES.
EPISODE CRITERIA ARE FOR STAGE 1 LEVELS.
SOURCE: CALIFORNIA RESOURCES BOARD.
# TABLE 7-B

## AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>California Standards</th>
<th>National Standards</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.10 ppm (200 ug/m³)</td>
<td>Ultraviolet Photometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxidant (Ozone)</td>
<td>12 hour</td>
<td>10 ppm (11 mg/m³)</td>
<td>Non-Dispersive Infrared Spectroscopy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>40 ppm (46 mg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>Annual Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saltzman Method</td>
<td>100 ug/m³ (0.05 ppm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.72 ppm (470 ug/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
<td>Annual Average</td>
<td>80 ug/m³ (0.03 ppm)</td>
<td>Conductometric Method</td>
<td>365 ug/m³ (0.14 ppm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 hour</td>
<td>0.04 ppm (105 ug/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.5 ppm (1310 ug/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Particulate Matter</td>
<td>24 hour</td>
<td>100 ug/m³</td>
<td>High Volume Sampling</td>
<td>75 ug/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfates</td>
<td>24 hour</td>
<td>25 ug/m³</td>
<td>AITL Method No. 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Day Average</td>
<td>1.5 ug/m³</td>
<td>AITL Method No. 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.64 ppm (45 ug/m³)</td>
<td>Conductometric Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocarbons (Corrected for Methane)</td>
<td>3 hour</td>
<td>160 ug/m³ (0.74 ppm)</td>
<td>Same as Primary Standards</td>
<td>Flame Ionization Detection Using Gas Chromatography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylene</td>
<td>8 hour</td>
<td>0.1 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.5 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility Reducing Particles</td>
<td>1 observation</td>
<td>In sufficient amount to reduce the prevailing visibility to less than 10 miles when the relative humidity is less than 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPLICABLE ONLY IN THE LAKE TAHOE AIR BASIN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>8 hour</td>
<td>6 ppm (7 mg/m³)</td>
<td>NDIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility Reducing Particles</td>
<td>1 observation</td>
<td>In sufficient amount to reduce the prevailing visibility to less than 10 miles when the relative humidity is less than 70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES:

1. California standards are values that are not to be equaled or exceeded.
2. National standards, other than those based on annual averages or annual geometric means, are not to be exceeded more than once per year.
3. Concentration expressed first in units in which it was promulgated. Equivalent units given in parentheses are based upon a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 mm of mercury. All measurements of air quality are to be corrected to a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 mm of Hg (1,013.2 millibar). ppm in this table refers to ppm by volume, or micromoles of pollutant per mole of gas.
4. Any equivalent procedure which can be shown to the satisfaction of the Air Resources Board to give equivalent results at or near the level of the air quality standard may be used. See page 7-3.
5. National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect the public health. Each state must attain these standards no later than three years after the state's implementation plan is approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
6. National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant. Each state must attain the secondary standards within a "reasonable time" after implementation plan is approved by the EPA.
7. Reference method as described by the EPA. An "equivalent method" of measurement may be used but must have a "consistent relationship to the reference method" and must be approved by the EPA.
8. Prevailing visibility is defined as the greatest visibility which is attained or surpassed around at least half of the horizon circle, but not necessarily in continuous sectors.

4/7/76 ARB FACT SHEET 36 (Revised) Source: California Air Resources Board
From its own viewpoint, South Sacramento is favored in that, for the majority of the year, it is upwind from the metropolitan area. From the regional viewpoint, however, growth in South Sacramento will generate emissions which have the potential of adversely affecting the entire metropolitan area. For the purposes of this analysis, the broad assumption has been made that South Sacramento has the same air quality characteristics as those measured at the Air Resources Board air monitoring station at 10th and P Streets in Sacramento, since this is the closest source of reliable data.

Trends and Projections

It is generally recognized that, as more human activities occur on and over the land, air pollution will increase. This trend will, fortunately, be strongly counteracted in the near term by more stringent vehicular emission control regulations (if enforced). In Sacramento County in 1973, for example, the Air Resources Board estimated that 56 percent of the organic gases and 77 percent of the oxides of nitrogen (the two main "smog" ingredients) were from motor vehicle sources. By 1990 these figures are expected to have greatly decreased, bottoming out at 18 and 30 percent respectively of their 1974 per car levels (after this, new vehicle population will again begin to increase auto emission levels). Stationary sources are not expected to follow suit however, and will become a larger portion of total emissions. It is generally agreed that technological controls can go only so far in emission control and that land use controls, economic measures, and conservation will become more important in future years. Air quality improvement and energy conservation are very closely correlated.

The State Air Resources Board has declared portions of the Sacramento Air Basin to be an Air Quality Maintenance Area (See Map 7-A) and will publish an Air Quality Maintenance Plan (to be finished October 1979) which will recommend control strategies for local agencies. An Air Quality Maintenance Area is an area which either exceeds, or is expected to exceed, published air quality standards (See Table 7-B). This plan attempts to anticipate and incorporate several of the recommended control strategies.

The trends analyzed below concentrate on oxidant (in the form of its precursors - reactive hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen) and on carbon monoxide, since these are the pollutants which have exceeded the standards recently in Sacramento County.

Oxidant

Research has been done by the Air Resources Board to correlate land use and air quality (See draft Land Use/Oxidant Precursors Emission Study, California Air Resources Board, 1976). Results have not been satisfactory enough in the opinion of the Air Resources Board staff, to be recommended as a bona fide technique for predicting future emissions based on future land use, or for
AQMA Boundaries
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Source: SRAPC March, 1977
judging land use plans as they relate to air quality. The links between activities which occur on and over the land, meteorological conditions, land use designations and air quality are so tenuous as to be unpredictable via a land use plan. Nevertheless, the planning staff was sufficiently impressed with the correlations established that an attempt to predict via this technique was thought worthwhile. However, we would like to release all responsibility from the Air Resources Board for the accuracy of this procedure.

The technique consists of multiplying known areas of particular types of land use by theoretical factors which relate the land uses to emission types and qualities. The theoretical factors (regression coefficients) used were developed especially for the Sacramento urban area and predict reactive hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen emissions from both stationary and mobile source emissions.

The degree of confidence in the relationship between the factors of interest (in this case, land use and emissions) is roughly expressed by a statistic generated via the regression methodology commonly known as $R^2$. The following scale applies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R^2$ is:</th>
<th>The Relationship Between Land Usage and that Emission is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00 to .04</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.04 to .16</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.16 to .49</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.49 to 1.00</td>
<td>High to Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $R^2$ statistics for the predictability of emissions from land use in the Sacramento Urban Area in 1974 are:

- For Reactive Organic Gases from Motor Vehicles: 0.80
- For Reactive Organic Gases from *Non-Motor Vehicles: 0.50
- For Oxides of Nitrogen from Motor Vehicles: 0.79
- For Oxides of Nitrogen from *Non-Motor Vehicles: 0.59

*Note: Large point sources would have to be accounted for independently. In South Sacramento, the large point sources are Campbell Soup and the Army Depot which together accounted for approximately 21 percent of the reactive organic gases and 3 percent of the oxides of nitrogen in 1974. (See Land Use/Emissions Study, p. 34.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carbon Monoxide</th>
<th>Concentrations are directly related to source strength.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Concentration is a complex function of the source strength of ozone precursors such as hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides (NOx). Increased NOx emissions may cause ozone concentrations in some areas and decreased amounts in other areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wind Speed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carbon Monoxide</th>
<th>Concentration decreases with increasing speed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>The correlation between wind speeds and ozone concentrations is generally poor in most areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dilution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carbon Monoxide</th>
<th>Emissions released near the surface maintain highest concentrations with light winds and strong stability. There is a frequent diurnal peak during the night or morning hours, and a less frequent peak during the afternoon hours, both of which coincide with periods of high stability, light winds, and low dilution.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>The diurnal peak of ozone concentration most frequently occurs during the afternoon with maximum sunlight and when atmospheric conditions are generally more unstable than the night or morning hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Temperature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carbon Monoxide</th>
<th>Concentrations are not a function of temperature.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>High average concentrations occur under conditions of high average temperatures and average monthly temperatures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carbon Monoxide</th>
<th>Highest concentrations develop near the source and are dependent on the distance between the source and the receptor. Carbon monoxide concentrations may vary from thousands of parts per million (ppm) at the tailpipe of a motor vehicle, to the order of 1000 ppm in a street with heavy traffic, and to a few ppm in a community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Due to complex photochemical and meteorological processes, maximum ozone concentrations are often not in the area of heaviest concentrations of ozone precursors such as hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** California Air Resources Board
TABLE 7-D

REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS RELATING
LAND USE TO EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Motor Vehicular NOx</th>
<th>Non M.V. NOx</th>
<th>Motor Vehicular ROG</th>
<th>Non M.V. ROG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential 1</td>
<td>0.59349</td>
<td>0.29295</td>
<td>0.88716</td>
<td>0.21831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 2</td>
<td>1.5967</td>
<td>2.2580</td>
<td>1.4912</td>
<td>0.36711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Non Mfg.</td>
<td>0.03918</td>
<td>0.75291</td>
<td>-0.04099</td>
<td>0.31405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Mfg.</td>
<td>2.5805</td>
<td>-2.1199</td>
<td>3.3550</td>
<td>0.02448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2.7147</td>
<td>1.3255</td>
<td>3.6722</td>
<td>0.46057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Public</td>
<td>0.50745</td>
<td>0.50217</td>
<td>0.31706</td>
<td>0.32317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Interchange</td>
<td>2.4125</td>
<td>0.57033</td>
<td>7.6348</td>
<td>-0.31719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>4.8052</td>
<td>0.24396</td>
<td>6.1519</td>
<td>-0.35516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airports/R.R. Yards</td>
<td>0.09171</td>
<td>4.6301</td>
<td>0.09714</td>
<td>1.6884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Lane Area</td>
<td>24.105</td>
<td>1.9380</td>
<td>42.920</td>
<td>1.0941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y-Intercept</td>
<td>-16.043</td>
<td>12.891</td>
<td>-10.653</td>
<td>7.8305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Land Use/Oxidant Precursor Study - ARB
  Table 5.7 Land Use Emission Functions and Coefficients, Sacramento Minor Study Area, 10 independent variables, 1974.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Categories</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>Holding Capacity</th>
<th>General Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential 1</td>
<td>1,369.9</td>
<td>2,395.2</td>
<td>3,677.1</td>
<td>4,381.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>228.8</td>
<td>430.0</td>
<td>321.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Non-Manufacturing</td>
<td>316.5</td>
<td>436.5</td>
<td>966.6</td>
<td>778.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Manufacturing</td>
<td>121.24</td>
<td>241.24</td>
<td>415.8</td>
<td>362.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>251.4</td>
<td>319.9</td>
<td>405.6</td>
<td>514.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Building &amp; Public Facilities</td>
<td>340.8</td>
<td>408.2</td>
<td>492.4</td>
<td>410.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Lane Area</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Interchange</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport/Railroad Yard</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>4,711.64</td>
<td>3,026.1</td>
<td>695.1</td>
<td>342.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>156.7</td>
<td>280.5</td>
<td>253.8</td>
<td>225.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HECTARES</td>
<td>7,430.8</td>
<td>7,430.8</td>
<td>7,430.8</td>
<td>7,430.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The above land use areas have not been recomputed based on the adopted community plan. For purposes of demonstration the above figures are adequate.
## TABLE 7-F

**Reactive Organic Gases and Oxides of Nitrogen—Predictions in Kilograms per Day**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>NOX</td>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>NOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 1</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Non-Manufacturing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Manufacturing</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>-257</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Building &amp; Public Facilities</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Lane Area *</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Interchange *</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport/Railroad Yard</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking *</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1974 Emission Characteristic Totals: 3,986 | 5,897 | 1,189 | 624 | 7,683 | 10,656 | 2,854 | 1,560
Motor Vehicle Adjustment Factors: 1.24 | 1.05  |       | .18 | .30   |         |       |       |
Total after Adjustments to Date: 4,943 | 6,192 |       | 1,383 | 3,197 |

*Based on ARB Motor Vehicle Emission Adjustment Factors. The adjustment to the 1974 data is to 1973 for use in comparison with ARB Emission Inventory Data available for that year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Motor Vehicles</th>
<th>Non-Motor Vehicles</th>
<th>Motor Vehicles</th>
<th>Non-Motor Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>NOX</td>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>NOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 1</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>3,887</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 2</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Non-Manufacturing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Manufacturing</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>-769</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Building &amp; Public Facilities</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Lane Area</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Interchange</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport/Railroad Yard</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>11,149</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>1,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total after Adjustments</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>2,544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Air Quality

In order to translate these figures into actual air quality measurements in parts per million, a simple procedure known as the proportion model was used. The ratio between air quality in 1975 and air quality in 1995 were basically presumed to be in the same ratio as emissions in 1975 are to projected emissions in 1995 (See Table 7-H). The methodology is shown below as applied to CO. A similar calculation was performed for oxidant using our regression derived data. The 1974 ROG was used since that is the year calculated in this analysis. ROG emissions are considered to be the best predictor of future oxidant levels. Results are shown in Table 7-H.

Proportional Method for Predicting Future Air Quality

\[
\frac{1995 \text{ Co Air Quality}}{1975 \text{ Co Air Quality}} = \frac{1995 \text{ Co Emissions}}{1975 \text{ Co Emissions}}
\]

\[SO\]

\[
\frac{1995 \text{ Co Air Quality}}{20 \text{ ppm for 8 hours}} = \frac{33.0 \text{ tons/day}}{49.4 \text{ tons/day}} = 13 \text{ ppm for 8 hours (worse case - 1975)}
\]

Problems Noted

The results of this analysis appear mixed. While the oxidant hourly concentrations are not projected to exceed the standards in 1995, they do so later as plan holding capacity is approached and as technological reductions are overcome by population pressures. Carbon monoxide never appears to come within acceptable limits and could be even worse than predicted in isolated circumstances.

The South Sacramento plan, however, should not be construed as having direct control over these factors. As previously noted, the future air quality in South Sacramento will depend largely upon state and federal vehicle emission control measures.

The primary source of the precursor pollutants (i.e., RHC NOX, etc.) in the formation of oxidants as well as CO is the internal combustion engine. The reduction of pollutant concentrations, therefore, is directly dependent upon controlling emissions from the internal combustion engine by reducing the use of the private automobile in favor of a more efficient mode of travel. The plan, however, has only an indirect effect on these factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATIONARY SOURCES</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>TOG</th>
<th>PART.</th>
<th>NOX</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>CO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Solvent Users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Coating</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degreasing</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metallurgical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and AG Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticides</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combustion of Fuels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Industrial</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Heaters</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Burning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Debris</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Improvement</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conical Burners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incinerators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Area Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Fires</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Fires</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constr. and Demol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Equip: Mowers, Etc.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, STATIONARY</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 7-6

**AVERAGE EMISSIONS OF POLLUTANTS - 1973**

**SACRAMENTO COUNTY**

**SACRAMENTO VALLEY AIR BASIN**

**TONS PER DAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOBILE SOURCES</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>TOG</th>
<th>PART.</th>
<th>NOX</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>CO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motor Vehicles-On Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-Duty Vehicle Exh</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. &amp; Heavy-Duty Veh Exh</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy-Duty Diesel Exh</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Exh</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaporation</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crankcase</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jet Aircraft</strong></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piston Aircraft</strong></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Railroads</strong></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Off-Road Veh</strong></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MOBILE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL, ALL SOURCES (Tons/Day)**

110 134 33.0 82.4 5.1 609

Total in Kilograms/Day

99,790 74,752 552,476

Adjustment for South Sacramento Share (based on population)

.091 .091

Total - South Sacramento

9,081 6,802

Less - Adjustment for Point Sources

.79 (less 21% - see p. 7-6) .97 (less 3%)

Estimated South Sacramento Share Using Emissions Inventory

7,174 6,598

Estimated South Sacramento Share Using Regression Methodology

6,132 6,816

Difference

-15% +3%
### Table 7-H

**SOUTH SACRAMENTO AIR QUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co</td>
<td>ROG - Oxidant</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td>ROG - Oxidant</td>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>Oxidant</td>
<td>ROG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emissions in tons/day</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality ppm - hourly avg.</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Emissions were calculated in the previous analysis.

** Air Quality data was from the three year summary of California Air Quality Date 1973-1975: ARB.

*** Unable to predict Co emissions beyond 1995 given available methodology.
If California vehicle emission controls are implemented as proposed, the total production of pollutants resulting from vehicular travel in South Sacramento should decrease. However, emission control strategies would only be effective in reducing pollutant emissions significantly if legislation does not curtail their implementation, and only until vehicle growth finally exceeds emission control improvements after 1995. The plan can emphasize additional reduction strategies in order to insure reduced oxidant levels, but has no jurisdiction to directly affect these most crucial factors.

A concern associated with carbon monoxide is potential localized effects found immediately adjacent to major sources. In urban communities, the major generators of carbon monoxide are roadways. It is known that concentrations of carbon monoxide adjacent to major roadways can and do surpass NAAQ standards, the problem appears not always to be localized in nature, but common to larger areas subjected to substantial cumulative amounts of vehicular activity. Such areas are large shopping centers such as Florin and Southgate Centers, and other areas where large numbers of vehicles concentrate.

The problem becomes especially acute when sensitive receptors such as children or elderly persons are involved. Parks with tot lots, elderly housing, schoolgrounds and other similar facilities are currently found too close to large emission sources in South Sacramento.

Realizing the limitations on the plan's ability to control many of the critical factors involved, we have, nevertheless, proposed a series of mitigating measures which should serve to reduce pollution to the extent possible.

**Mitigating Factor Which Will be Implemented if This Plan is Adopted**

The majority of current housing units in South Sacramento are single family units (71 percent compared to 68 percent countywide). Under this plan, this figure is expected to be reduced at holding capacity to 59 percent. Thus, the number of higher density units will become relatively greater, especially along the major corridors. Implementation of this program should be followed because of increased potential for use of transit facilities along these more dense corridors with an attendant reduction in all emission levels. However, this results in the undesirable side effect of locating additional persons closer to emission sources. This unfortunate dilemma can be somewhat mitigated by implementation of the setbacks indicated in Table 7-J. Unfortunately, an undesirable setback situation already exists in several places, particularly along Highway 99. A 100-foot residential building setback from the highway is recommended policy in all future developments. These setbacks could be used for parking in multi-family areas, commercial areas, or industrial areas. Special buffering areas and setbacks are set forth in the Implementation Section of this report.
FIGURE 7-B
SACRAMENTO AQMA CARBON MONOXIDE EMISSIONS
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TOTAL EMISSIONS
549.0 TONS/DAY
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OTHER VEHICLES
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6.0%

MISCELLANEOUS SOURCES
3.1%

WASTE BURNING
4.1%

1995
TOTAL EMISSIONS
366.8 TONS/DAY

MOTOR VEHICLES
52.9%

OTHER VEHICLES
11.1%

AIRCRAFT
20.8%

MISCELLANEOUS SOURCE
9.5%

WASTE BURNING
5.7%

SOURCE: ARB DECEMBER, 1976
Adoption of this plan will also serve to further solidify and strengthen the bikeway plan which in itself would work toward lower emission levels.

The plan also seeks to provide for distribution of community oriented services (schools, parks, neighborhood commercial, etc.) evenly, thus decreasing some trip lengths. This has especially been emphasized in the mixed use areas of Fruitridge and Florin.

Also of note is the fact that average commuting distances in South Sacramento are less than in other representative areas:

**TABLE 7-I**

**COMmutING DISTANCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Average Distance to Work in Miles</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Heights</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1975 Special Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden-Arcade</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1975, Special Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>SATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sacramento</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1975 Special Census</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sacramento Area Transportation Study, CalTrans (1974)*

From this perspective, it would be advantageous from an energy and air quality viewpoint to locate more people in South Sacramento than in some other communities, given similar transportation modes. Another conclusion which can be logically derived from the oxidant analysis is that quantitative land use differences such as those between the South Sacramento plan and the existing general plan do not make significant differences in air quality. It would take radical differences in the quantities of the varying land uses to make a difference. This type of radical difference is impossible given existing development patterns. Thus from an overall air quality/land use perspective, there is no difference between this plan and the existing plan alternative. However, we do believe that the plan contains recommendations which will effect transportation alternatives and also microscale recommendations which can have a demonstrable effect on air quality.
Program and Policies Which Should be Adopted by Sacramento County or Other Governmental Entities

(1) Implementation of the transit improvements indicated in Chapter 6.

(2) Increased landscaping requirements and more definitive placement of trees and shrubs in subdivision and zoning ordinances to increase wind turbulence and dispersion:

**FIGURE 7-C**

**LANDSCAPING FOR INCREASED WIND MOVEMENT**

Placing trees and plants next to structures can also reduce wind pressures against exterior walls of the structures in the windward direction. Conversely, in the leeward direction, trees tend to break up the vacuum effect on the lee side. In general, trees and shrubs reduce pressures and the possibility of pollutant infiltration into buildings. For air quality reasons, as well as aesthetic and ecological concerns, there is considerable value in preserving mature trees and wooded areas of a site, and in placing buildings in optimum relation to the natural features. Coniferous vegetation is particularly effective and may strain as much as 80% of the larger particles and 34% of the smaller particles from the air. Deciduous vegetation, on the other hand, is only half as effective.
(3) Parking should not be allowed in such massive proportions as those found around Southgate Center and Florin Mall.

Large masses of parking space tend to concentrate pollutants. Smaller parking arrangements set back from buildings are more favorable for dispersion. This reduces peak concentrations near any given structure, although the average concentration exposure throughout the development may increase.

(4) New perks should be located away from and/or upwind of major emission sources.

(5) An indepth study to predict carbon monoxide concentrations along major roadways in the Cordova community was performed with the help of the California Air Resources Board Technical Staff. Predictions were made for 1980 and 1985 with the Caline 2 linear dispersion model assuming worse case conditions, traffic volumes, and traffic flow characteristics. These data seemed appropriate for similar road systems in South Sacramento. Based on these criteria, minimum setbacks from the roadway edge of pavement were determined to allow attainment of eight hour NAAQ standards at occupied structures in the year 1980 assuming all proposed emission controls are implemented. The one hour NAAQ standard was not found to be surpassed along any of these roadway based on worst case criteria based on these setbacks.

Table 7-J includes suggested minimum setbacks and predicted traffic volumes for selected roadway segments. The analysis conducted for this report is for a non-elevated roadway section without intersection with an average vehicle speed of 35 miles per hour. The determination of setback criteria for intersections or for slower speed would require additional analysis.

Other Control Strategies Which Should be Considered

(1) Refinement of regulations controlling industrial process losses.

(2) Various tax incentives/disincentives, fees, tools, etc.

(3) Parking controls.
## TABLE 7-J

**PROJECTED ROADWAY VOLUMES AND SUGGESTED SETBACK FROM SELECTED MAJOR ARTERIALS IN SOUTH SACRAMENTO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fruitridge Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Highway 99</td>
<td>29,200</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near 44th Avenue</td>
<td>24,850</td>
<td>26,090</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>47th Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Highway 99</td>
<td>27,860</td>
<td>30,115</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Stockton Blvd.</td>
<td>14,480</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Florin Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Highway 99</td>
<td>46,060</td>
<td>57,055</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near 65th Street</td>
<td>37,510</td>
<td>46,683</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Power Inn Road</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>22,042</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mack Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Highway 99</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>21,086</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Franklin</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>12,753</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Franklin Boulevard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of 47th Avenue</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>16,845</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Florin Road</td>
<td>18,990</td>
<td>27,590</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stockton Boulevard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of 47th Avenue</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Florin Road</td>
<td>11,590</td>
<td>14,756</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Inn Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Fruitridge</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>16,615</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Florin</td>
<td>4,360</td>
<td>22,042</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sacramento County Planning Department, Adaptation and Interpolation of the Citrus Heights Community Plan.
(4) Traffic flow modification strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Approx. Percent* Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Much improved public transit</td>
<td>Approx. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improved transit and tax on auto use</td>
<td>Approx. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Auto Free Zones (e.g., Los Angeles Central Business District)</td>
<td>Approx. 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increased Parking Cost</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Four-Day Work Week</td>
<td>Approx. 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Exclusive Bus and Car Pool Lanes</td>
<td>Approx. 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exclusive Bus and Car Pool Lanes with 3 Cents/Mile Tax</td>
<td>Approx. 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Increased Commuter Car Pools to Achieve an Average Auto Occupancy of 1.5 on Freeway</td>
<td>Approx. 4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the above VMT reductions are not additive, i.e., measures 7 and 8 implemented together would not necessarily result in a 7.6 percent VMT reduction but probably a much lower figure.

*Source: AREB

II. Noise

Existing Conditions

The undesirable effects of excessive noise have been well documented. Both the Noise Element of the Sacramento County General Plan and the County Noise Ordinance (6.68) have addressed themselves to the mitigation of noise impacts. They have spelled out acceptable standards for noise emissions which apply to South Sacramento. The thrust of these as they apply to residential areas are outlined below.
Exterior Noise Standards

A. The following noise standards apply to all properties within a designated noise area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Area</th>
<th>County Zoning Districts*</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Exterior Noise Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RE-1, RE-2, RE-3</td>
<td>7 AM - 10 PM</td>
<td>55 dBA**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-1-A, R-1-B, R-2</td>
<td>10 PM - 7 AM</td>
<td>50 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-2A, R-3, RM-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RM-2, RTH, A-1-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: These would be equivalent to the AR-I, AR-II, AR-V, RD-1, RD-2, RM-1, RM-2, RD-5, RD-10, RD-20, and RD-30 Land Use Zones.

**See the end of this section for a definition of terms.

B. It is unlawful for the specified exterior noise standards to be exceeded for the duration of time set forth below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cumulative Duration of the Intrusive Sound</th>
<th>Allowance Decibels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Cumulative period of 30 minutes per hour</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Cumulative period of 15 minutes per hour</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Cumulative period of 5 minutes per hour</td>
<td>+ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Cumulative period of 1 minute per hour</td>
<td>+ 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Level not to be exceeded for any time per hour</td>
<td>+ 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interior Noise Standards - this refers to the maximum tolerable levels for the interior of any apartment, condominium, townhouse, duplex or multiple dwelling unit during the hours of 10 PM to 7 AM:

(1) 45 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 5 min. in any hr.
(2) 50 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 1 min. in any hr.
(3) 55 dBA for any period of time.
MAP 7-D

NOISE IMPACTS

SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA COMMUNITY PLAN

NOTE: NOISE CONTOURS FROM EXECUTIVE AIRPORT HAVE NOT BEEN APPROVED BY THE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION AND THUS ARE APPROXIMATE WITH RESPECT TO APPLICATION OF RESOLUTION 77-301 AS EXPLAINED IN THE PROGRAMS AND POLICIES SECTION. SEE MAP IX-5

ALL NOISE CONTOURS EXPRESSED IN dBA UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

○ = AREAS OF KNOWN NOISE CONFLICTS

SOURCE: NOISE ELEMENT FOR THE SACRAMENTO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN- SEPT. 17, 1975
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Exemptions include school activities, public gatherings, activities conducted in open-space areas, anything connected with emergencies, noises associated with construction, providing these activities comply with time limits mentioned above, agricultural operations, maintenance of residential properties, and maintenance and operation of aircraft or airports.

For specific information concerning standards around schools, churches and hospitals, and for information on industrial and equipment standards, please refer to the County Noise Ordinance.

Problem Areas

Known noise contours in South Sacramento are shown on Map 7-D. The primary noise conflicts in South Sacramento have stemmed from:

A. Airplane noise from Mather Air Force Base and Sacramento Executive Airport.

B. Highway 99 and other major traffic arterials.

C. Railroads.

D. Specific Industries.

E. Heavy commercial uses.

The problems arise mainly from conflicts between these sources and residential uses. Some very bad examples of residential/industrial and residential/highway conflicts currently exist in South Sacramento. Residential encroachment around the industrial area along French Road, south of Florin Road has become a significant problem. Houses currently exist only 40 feet from Highway 99 in the Parkway area. Neither situation is desirable and can create serious problems.

Programs and Policies

The recommended programs aimed at mitigation of noise impacts are detailed in the Implementation and Land Use portions of this text. Briefly, they include:

A. Continuation of industrially planned uses in the area affected by Mather Air Force Base CNEL 70 noise contour, and in the area affected by Executive Airport.

B. Full implementation of Resolution 77-301 (See Items 1. (a) and (b) below) amending the Land Use Element of the Sacramento County General Plan concerning Airport Land Use Compatibility.
Resolution 77-301

1. It is the policy of Sacramento County to regulate land use in the vicinity of airfields in a manner that promotes the health, safety, peace, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the inhabitants of the airfield environs, while protecting the airfields from the encroachment of incompatible uses which would impair their efficient operation.

a. Those land uses which are inherently incompatible with airfield operations, based upon the following performance standards, shall be restricted:

(1) Uses which release into the air any substance which would impair visibility or otherwise interfere with the operation of aircraft, such as, but not limited to, steam, dust, and smoke.

(2) Uses which produce light emissions, either direct or indirect (reflective), which would interfere with pilot vision.

(3) Uses which produce electronic emissions which would interfere with aircraft communication systems or navigational equipment.

(4) Uses which would attract birds or waterfowl, such as, but not limited to, operation of sanitary land fills, maintenance of feeding stations, or growth of certain vegetation.

(5) Uses which extend into the air within ten feet of the approach-departure surfaces and/or transitional surfaces.

b. Noise levels and accident potential associated with airfield operations make it necessary to limit the density of development and the intensity of use in the vicinity of airfields. It is the policy of Sacramento County that:

(1) The Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Policy Plan guidelines for airport land-use compatibility, as well as the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Report guidelines for the appropriate military airfield, will be considered during the hearing process on any planning matter within an airfield environs. (References to noise levels in the following statements relate to the noise contour maps included in the AICUZ Reports and the ALUC compatibility plans for each airport as they are developed. Interested parties may substantiate or modify the noise contour data by retaining a qualified acoustical consultant to reassess a noise site exposure through adequate noise monitoring).
(2) Any reduction of lot sizes for residential uses where the noise level exceeds 70 Ldn shall be deemed as inconsistent with this plan.

(3) Where the noise level is 65 to 70 Ldn, denial of residential developments may not be warranted solely because of noise impacts, but the potential noise impact in conjunction with other concerns (i.e., circulation, design, density, etc.) may compound the potential problems for future residents such an extent that denial is warranted.

C. The 100-foot residential building setback from Highway 99 as recommended in the air quality section of this report accompanied by a noise attenuation barrier (wall or berm) of acceptable standards. Planting of trees and shrubs in these areas is encouraged. (See Implementation Chapter, Designated Buffer Areas).

D. Noise attenuation barriers along railroads.

E. Buffering of heavy industrial areas with light industrial or the industrial park land use zone and/or lower density residential development. As a minimum, there should be a 75-foot building setback and noise attenuation barrier along any industrial/residential interface.

F. A similar but lesser setback should exist between heavy commercial uses as in E above.

The mitigation measures recommended in this plan make no guarantees that noise levels will actually be reduced to the 50 dBA (nighttime) called for in residential areas in the County Noise Ordinance. Rather they are a balance between noise reduction and what seems a reasonable demand put on property owners.

There is also an entire spectrum of construction related techniques (insulation, double windows, etc.) which were felt beyond the purview of this plan, but which are certainly recommended in order to reduce interior noise levels to the Ldn 45 dB standard mentioned in Measure 5 of the Implementation Section of the Noise Element of the County General Plan and in the Noise Ordinance.
III. Energy

Existing Conditions

Both governmental and private entities have been concerned with and have moved toward energy conservation in South Sacramento. Community Development Block Grant funds have been allocated for home insulation, Sacramento Municipal Utility District actively encourages conservation policies and builders have become increasingly cognizant of the sales aspects of energy saving options in new homes.

Unfortunately, however, much of the development which has already occurred has been built under a "cheap energy" philosophy which, while not working purposely against conservation, has not worked actively toward it.

For example, many of the housing units are oriented east/west instead of the north/south orientation widely recommended for minimization of heating and cooling costs. Major traffic arterials have few trees, creating a hotter street environment. Residential streets are regulated to unnecessary widths (in some experts' opinions) which increase heat through asphalt exposure. (Note: There is considerable debate surrounding this issue. Is the increased demand for cooling caused by wide streets and exposed asphalt offset by a similar decreased heating demand in winter?) Shade tree coverage in many parking areas, such as Southgate Center's, are almost non-existent. The problem of lack of shade trees is especially acute in South Sacramento because of the scarcity of natural tree coverage.

Transportation in South Sacramento is heavily auto-oriented. Ninety-three (93) percent of the primary wage earners who responded as having worked on the last working day in South Sacramento in the 1975 census rode in an automobile, compared to 90 percent for the same group countywide. Although commute distances are somewhat shorter than in other unincorporated areas (See Air Quality Section, this report), it is clear that increased transit ridership holds great potential for reduction of energy consumption in the community.

Recommended Policy Directions

The following policies are largely reiterations of the neighborhood planning standards developed by the Planning Department to implement the objectives of Energy Council with respect to Energy Conservation and Solar Energy utilization in residential developments. Several others have been added.
A. Yard area requirements for single family homes, duplexes and
duplexes should provide for complete flexibility in the
location of these structures on lots, subject to review and
the following criteria.

(1) The appropriate authority has approved the buildable area in
conjunction with and in the same manner as a tentative map;

(2) The buildable area does not exceed 50% of the buildable area
of the lot;

(3) The buildable area provides the potential for more
structural surface area exposed directly to the sun’s
rays for a longer portion of the calendar year than would
be provided using the standard yard area requirements,
taking all of the buildable areas of the subdivision into
consideration, and allowing for the designation of one
story height limitations on such buildable areas where
necessary to protect the solar exposure of buildable
areas on adjacent lots.

(4) Planting of deciduous trees in conjunction with (3) above.

B. In all residential subdivisions over 5 lots, and applying only
to lots of less than 20,000 sq. ft., 80% of all such lots in
such subdivisions meet sunlight access requirements as follows:
Either;

(1) A straight line drawn from a point midway between the
side lot lines at the required front yard setback line to
a point midway between the side lot lines at the required
rear yard setback, is oriented to within 22-1/2 degrees
of true north; or,

(2) The designated buildable area of the lot is so located
that no two story residence may legally be constructed
within 40 feet inside of an arc 22-1/2 degrees either
side of true south from said buildable area and that no
one story residence may legally be constructed within 20
feet, inside the same arc, and that the designated buildable
area is oriented within 22-1/2 degrees of true east and
west.

Less than 80% requirement may be considered provided that a
finding is first made that compliance with this requirement is
infeasible due to: configuration or orientation of the
property; the nature of surrounding development; or, existing
physical features of the site such as topography or vegetation.

C. Construct parking lots to provide 50 percent shading (noon,
August 21) assuming maturity or 15 years growth.

D. Implementation of the land use and transportation aspects of
this plan which are oriented toward increased transit ridership,
bicycle usage, and shorter distances between home and shopping
and/or public facilities.
IV. Groundwater

Existing Conditions:

Presently, South Sacramento depends almost entirely on groundwater for its water needs. The City of Sacramento supplies surface water through its distribution facilities and the other providers are 100% groundwater. The base of fresh groundwater in South Sacramento is the bottom of the Mehrton Formation. It is 800 feet below sea level in the eastern part of the area and 1300 feet below sea level in the western part of the area (Map in CDWR Bull. 104-11). The formations below the Mehrton Formation contain salt water and wells should not extend into them. The formations above the Mehrton Formation, the Laguna, Fair Oaks, and Victor Formations, are waterbearing sequences. Palco-stream channels within the formations form aquifers from which water can be pumped (Map of in CDWR Bull. 118-3).

The water is principally a sodium, calcium, magnesium bicarbonate type. Near the surface, the total dissolved solids (TDS) content averages 200 milligrams per liter (mg/l). This level is well within the acceptable limit for consumption of 1000 mg/l. Below 400 to 500 feet, the TDS increases dramatically to 2000 mg/l at the bottom of the Mehrton Formation. Some wells contain excessive amounts of iron and magnesium. Although it is not a health problem, the high iron and magnesium may stain laundry or have a disagreeable taste.

Groundwater recharge occurs primarily along-stream channels. Where streams have been channelized and cement lined, no recharge can take place. Some recharge occurs from percolation of rainwater, but it is limited because of the hardpan underlying most of South Sacramento. No artificial recharge areas exist in Sacramento County.

Trends and Projections:

Urbanization tends to decrease percolation from precipitation, but due to the hardpan, percolation is naturally poor in South Sacramento and urbanization will probably not significantly affect annual recharge to the groundwater basin for this area.

From 1941-1970, throughout the county, the water table dropped 35 feet. If this trend continues, by 1995, the water table will be approximately 65-73 feet below sea level in South Sacramento. This figure is a minimal figure and does not take into account increased pumping due to increased development in South Sacramento.

Problem Statement:

Groundwater levels in Sacramento County have been lowering in recent years at the rate of about one foot per year. Increased pumping in the South Sacramento area may severely deplete the water supply in that area. Pumping at lower depths for water may lower the quality of the water.
Policies

The Planning Department recommends the following programs and policies:

A. Conjunctive use of groundwater and surface waters with the objective of stabilizing groundwater levels should be established as the primary water management objectives of all water purveyors within Sacramento County.

B. Future subdivisions should have water service systems that can convert from groundwater to surface water distribution when surface water becomes available to the area.

V. Geology

The South Sacramento area lies within a broad alluvial plain called the Victor Plain. It was deposited in the Pleistocene and ranges in thickness from 0 feet in the east, to more than 100 feet in the west. The surface is gently undulating and dips about five feet per mile to the west. The lower surface dips about 11 feet per mile. The plain consists of unconsolidated sand, silt, and clay, with lenses of stream channel gravels. To the east of the study area the underlying Arroyo Seco Gravels are exposed; and to the west, in the floodplains of Laguna Creek and lower Morrison Creek, the overlying basin deposits are exposed. The basin deposits consist of unconsolidated clays from flood overwash.¹

Geologic Hazards

A. Groundshaking: No major faults have been identified within the area, however, groundshaking might be felt if faults in the foothills to the east of the area or faults in the Coast Ranges to the west of the area became active.

B. Liquification: During groundshaking, the potential for liquification, the phenomenon where the ground flows out from beneath a structure, is present. If the ground is saturated, such as after a heavy rain, the potential is increased.

C. Subsidence: Evidence for subsidence has not been found in the Study area, but localities of known subsidence due to groundwater withdrawal exist near the area. As more development occurs within South Sacramento, there will be an increase in groundwater withdrawal and subsidence may occur.

¹For a more complete discussion of the regional geology see California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 118-3 or California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin 190.
VI. Soils

Three soil types occur in the South Sacramento Study Area: 2

A. San Joaquin loam—brownish red, strongly developed, slightly acid. Derived from granitic material. Hard pan 3 feet below surface. Permeability slow. Fertility low. Agricultural use - dry farm grain and pasture, irrigated shallow root crops.


The San Joaquin loam and the Alamo Clay occur together and cover about 90% of the Study area. They are both rated on the USDA Soil Conservation Service Land Capability Classification as Class III if irrigated and Class IV if dry land. This rating suggests that the land can be used for agriculture, but with limitations due to soil, drainage, or topography. Shallow rooted crops or hay crops and pasture are best suited for this area.

The Freeport Clay is rated as Class III and is suitable for shallow rooted crops.

Both the Freeport Clay and the Alamo Clay are expansive clays and subject to shrinking and swelling. This characteristic should be taken into consideration when construction is planned. According to the preliminary Laguna Creek Area Study, "the shrink-swell clays can be removed or engineered for construction relatively easily, but at a cost penalty of approximately $1,500 per dwelling unit".

VII. Plant and Animal Communities and Related Impacts

The South Sacramento Community Plan encompasses an area that gently slopes from east to west with drainage in the north section from northeast to southwest, and drainage in the south section from southeast to northwest. Three significant streams drain the area and two have been channelized. Morrison and Elder Creeks are

---

2 The Soil Conservation Service is currently revising the Soil Survey, Sacramento Area, California, and some of the soils may be renamed and boundaries redefined. Interested parties should consult with the SCS for accurate identification of the soils on specific lots.
placed in channels, and Laguna Creek is in a more natural state with marsh areas, and broad but shallow floodplains. Additionally, smaller streams (some also channelized) drain the area including Florin Creek, Union House Creek and Strawberry Creek. Formerly, the project area was grassland with pockets of marsh areas. Little of the natural area presently exists because of man's use of the area for farming and urban development. For purposes of discussion, the existing uses in the project area are: 1) urban, 2) vacant, and 3) agricultural; the smallest of these is the agricultural use.

From an agricultural viewpoint, the project area has small value. Some irrigated pasture exists; however, much of the area is used for dry pasture. In order to use the area for production agriculture, sizeable investment would have to be made in terms of leveling, irrigation equipment and chemicals/fertilizers. Thus, it can be seen there is little vegetation worth preserving except along the unaltered streams. There are no native stands of trees; however, a scattered few remaining individual trees (Oaks) would merit preservation on an individual basis. Additionally, numerous varieties of shrubs, vines, flowers, etc., live in various undisturbed areas. The area provides some habitat for wildlife — mostly small animals and song birds. No doubt, as urbanization occurs, some creatures may adapt to the change of environment.

While it is unlikely that there are rare or endangered plants or animals in the Study area, the following list includes species that conceivably could be in the area or general region:

a) Giant Garter Snake
b) California Yellow-Billed Cuckoo
c) Thicktail Chub

Impacts created by the project will include loss of open space and conversion of vacant or underutilized agricultural lands to urban use with the loss of habitat for some species. These impacts would not be considered significant. Preservation of Laguna Creek, natural and flood areas, is a basic premise of this statement. The Laguna Creek Study developed for Sacramento County by WMRT Consulting firm speaks to this point.
VIII. Historical Study

The earliest inhabitants of the region were, of course, native American Indians. Sites of occupation have been identified near the American River and on the higher areas of the Cosumnes River and Deer Creek. The South Sacramento Study area is, however, low lying. The predominant water courses, Morrison Creek and Laguna Creek, are typically dry during much of the year. Although the area was undoubtedly utilized for hunting and other food gathering purposes, little sign of permanent occupation can be expected. Modern development has undoubtedly precluded possible uncovering of Indian sites along most of Morrison Creek. Only within the western and eastern portions of the Study area, especially the easternmost, is there much chance of finding the creek area relatively undisturbed. Even this section has suffered from agricultural encroachment. Opportunity for finding artifacts and other evidence of early occupation is much more likely along Laguna Creek. Little modern development has occurred along its banks and it largely maintains its original course. If the creek’s floodplain and floodway are left in the present state, opportunity for further investigation will remain.

The earliest development of what is now the South Sacramento community took the form of small to medium sized farmsteads. Small clusters of population were found, however, along the axis created by upper Stockton Road (Stockton Boulevard) and Lower Stockton Road (Franklin Boulevard). The small community of Florin was established at a rail stop of the Central Pacific (now Southern Pacific) Railroad. As a town, Florin in the 1870’s, and for a considerable time afterwards, consisted of the train station, a hotel, a schoolhouse, one store, one box factory, one blacksmith shop and one saloon. The upper floor of the store was used as a town meeting hall and church. Although none of the original structures remain, several old, "semi-historic" buildings are still standing. By treating the Florin Old Town area as a Special Policy area, Chapter 3, Implementation, preservation of remaining buildings should be facilitated. Action should continue in the identification and preservation of other possibly historic structures within the community area. Further historic interest can be satisfied (or aroused) in two cemeteries, Saint Roses consecrated in 1861 north of what is now the corner of 47th Avenue and Stockton Boulevard, and the Elder Creek Cemetery on the north side of Elder Creek Road about 1 mile east of Stockton Boulevard.

A well known, but no longer existing, building, the Twelve Mile House, stood at the southeast corner of Stockton Boulevard and Florin Road. This structure was a food and drink stopping point for travelers along this major transportation route.
CHAPTER EIGHT
HOUSING ELEMENT

Introduction

This report summarizes the housing trends in the South Sacramento Community from 1970 to 1975, with comparisons to the county. Although the housing stock in the community is basically in good condition, it is not without areas of concern. Therefore, the focus is on description of major housing problems and recommends programs which would mitigate them.

Summary of Housing Trends in South Sacramento Compared to County

The South Sacramento community experienced a 30.22% increase in total new housing units between 1970 to 1975, (5,392 units were added to the existing 17,843 units for a total of 23,235 housing units). (See Map 8-A) This compares to the county unincorporated area which represented a 31.73% increase from 114,632 to 152,329 total housing units.

Mobile homes represented the greatest percent increase at 171.90%, when an additional 1,291 mobile homes were added to the existing 751, creating a total of 2,042 mobile homes in the community. Multiple family units indicated the second greatest percent increase at 112.80% and accounted for the largest increase in number with 3,534 new units, raising the total from 3,133 to 6,667. However, single family homes only showed a slight increase of 3.73% during this period, with only 520 new units added to the existing 13,959, increasing the total to 14,479 single family homes.

The greatest increase in the county unincorporated area was also attributed to mobile home units which represented a 121.3% increase, when an additional 3,980 mobile homes were added to the existing 3,280, raising the total to 7,260. Multiple family construction represented a 93.4% increase, when 21,510 new units increased the existing total from 23,017 to 44,527 multiple family units. Single family construction accounted for a 13.2% increase, raising the total from 88,744 to 100,430, representing 11,687 new single family units.

In 1975, 66% of all households were owners and 34% were renters in the community, which compares to the county's 65% owners, 35% renters. The overall vacancy rate in South Sacramento was 6.5%, which included a 1.6% vacancy rate for owner-occupied units and 12.1% rate for renter-occupied units. The county's vacancy rate was lower than the community, indicating a 5.7% overall vacancy rate, including 2.2% for owner-occupied and 10.4% for renter-occupied vacancies.
The proportion of owners and renters remained approximately the same from 1970 to 1975 for the South Sacramento community and the county. This can be attributed to the large increase in owner-occupied mobile home units, and the high vacancy rate for renter-occupied units which is due in part to the large amount of new multi-family construction.

The 1975 Special Census indicated the median mortgage payment was $149 and median rental payment was $135 in the community. The county's median mortgage payment was $174, while rental payments exceeded $150.

In September of 1976, the average sales price for an existing home in the community was approximately $31,000, which was lower than the average sales price for an existing home in the county which was about $37,439.

In the community there were 254 or 1.1% total unsound housing units, compared to the county's 1372 or 0.9% total unsound units according to the 1975 Census. Field surveys in the community revealed 1028 or 4% of the total units indicated various signs of deterioration, but not necessarily considered unsound.

The following is a brief summary of the three housing types in the community mentioned above:

Mobile Homes

Generally, mobile home parks have changed significantly from the post-war trailer courts, becoming more acceptable to the population while providing a lower cost housing unit, usually with an attractive living environment. They have become increasingly popular to a larger proportion of elderly and retired households.

In the South Sacramento community, mobile homes have tripled between 1970 and 1975. The community has a high proportion of elderly (17%) and lower income (20%) households, who may account for some of the increase in this housing type, since it provides lower cost housing units. The increase is basically due to lower land cost as compared to other areas of the county. Since property tax is assessed on the land and not the mobile home unit, an additional savings is provided, as compared to a single family unit where property tax is assessed on the land as well as the improvements. There is a license and registration fee for mobile homes, however, the payment is still significantly lower than the tax on

---

1The price of land in the South Sacramento community starts at $4500/acre and up, while in other areas of the county (U) it's $10,000/acre and up. (Source: Sacramento Board of Realtors, Multiple Listing Service) spring 1978.
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single family homes.\textsuperscript{2} The total loan amount is less than on conventional home, and although the interest rate may be 2\% or 3\% more, the term of the loan is usually shorter. Actual monthly payments are usually lower also.

The areas that have experienced the greatest growth in mobile homes are Data Areas 4, 11, and 13, with additional units of approximately 206 to 270 within each area. Data Areas 6, 7, 10 and 12 increased approximately 130 to 160 units within each area.

**Multiple Units**

Multiple family units doubled in number during the five (5) year period in the community. This increase can also be attributed to lower land costs in the area. Since single family units are appreciating at a quick pace and becoming less affordable for the moderate income family, more households are being forced to rent longer before they are able to purchase a home. In addition, employment growth has spurred a greater demand for multiple family units in some areas of the community.

The areas which have had significant increases in multiple units and employment growth are Data Areas 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, and 14, all of which are contiguous and located in the westerly portion of the community. The employment growth is due to some expansion of commercial and light industrial, and the opening of Breuner's (south of Mack Road & east of Stockton). Other increases are attributed to retail development with the addition of Montgomery Ward and Sears around the Florin Shopping Center, increased occupancy within the Southgate Industrial Park (south of 47th, east of Franklin Blvd.) of small manufacturers and distributors, and the development of the Bowling Green Business-and Office Park (south of 52nd, east of Franklin). (See Map 8-B)

(Note: This discussion was pre-Proposition 13)

\textsuperscript{2}For example, in a representative tax code area in the South Sacramento community, the tax rate is 13.440 cents per $100 of assessed value. Therefore, on land with a market value of $5,000, the assessment would be on $1,250 (or 25\% of market value) with a property tax of $168 per year for land only. Add a new mobile home valued at $18,000 and the license fee is $318 plus $22 registration a year. However, when a single family home is valued at $18,000, the assessment would be on $4,500 with a property tax of $604.80 a year. Another important consideration is that the license fee on the mobile home depreciates over a period of 18 years, while the value on the single family home appreciates; therefore, the total property tax increases.
MAP 8-B
SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA
COMMUNITY PLAN
DATA AREA & CENSUS TRACT
GENERAL LOCATIONS OF-
ALL MULTIPLE-HOUSING
UNITS-1970 AND 1975

100 MULTIPLE UNITS 1970
100 MULTIPLE UNITS 1975
2 DWELLING UNITS OR MORE

SOURCE: 1975 CENSUS
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Single Family Home

Growth in single family units has been low in the South Sacramento community compared to the unincorporated county and other communities in the county. Although the cost of land is cheaper, lending institutions and developers have preferred to develop in other sections of the county, largely because of economic growth as well as demand for single family homes being more prevalent in other areas, such as the northeast and Rosemont sections.

The majority of new construction which has taken place recently has occurred south of Florin Road in the proximity of the Florin and Southgate Shopping Center and Freeway 99. There are only three areas with substantial development. Data Area 14 where new homes range from $25,000 to $45,000, Data Area 11 with a range from $36,000 to $48,000, and Data Area 8 with a $42,000 to $54,000 range for new homes. Presently, (August 1978), considerable growth of single family homes is occurring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Sacramento Total Households by Type Compared to the County U and County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County (incl. the City) Total Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1975 Special Census

No responses have been allocated out for owner and renters.

*1976 sales range for new single family homes.
Major Existing Housing Problems

Vacancy Rates

An adequate vacancy reservoir of standard housing should be available to provide sufficient choices to those seeking a change or new housing units. An acceptable standard for vacancy rates is 1% for owner-occupied and 5% for renter-occupied units.

In 1975, the vacancy rates for the South Sacramento community were 1.6% for owner-occupied and 12% for renter-occupied. In order to look at the vacancy situation in the community, the rates for owner and renter-occupied units were computed for minor zones, since these geographical areas provide more of a neighborhood profile within the community. Upon analysis, it was found that the owner-occupied vacancy rates and/or numbers of vacant units, for all the minor zones in the community were not substantially above the standard 1%; therefore, these will not be discussed in this section. It should be kept in mind that those units vacant for rent include single family as well as multiple family units.

The seven (7) minor zones with significantly high renter-occupied vacancy rates are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Zone</th>
<th># Renter Occupied</th>
<th># Vacant for Rent</th>
<th>Renter-occupied Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Data Area or Portion of Data Area Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>732200c</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>3 - westerly half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750020</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18 %</td>
<td>10 - northeasterly half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746200</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>2 - westerly half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744100</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>F - easterly half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747000c</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>5 - northerly half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744200</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>F - westerly half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845000</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>4 - northerly half</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Minor zones located within City of Sacramento.*

Analysis of the housing data, supplemented with field investigations, resulted in the following conclusion: on some problems which have led to high rental vacancies in the areas listed on the preceding chart.
A. All the areas indicated a need for some major and/or minor housing rehabilitation, along with some cosmetic repairs.

B. The westerly halves of Data Area F and 3, indicated a proportionately higher number of abandoned and boarded up units (than in other areas) that contribute to neighborhood decline. These units should be demolished.

C. The entire Fruitridge Pocket area has a high rate of absentee landlords, based on the proportion of single family units (20% to 30%) that are rentals. This contributes to deterioration of property, and a lack of a sense of community.

D. The northerly half of Data Area 4 has conflicting mixed land usage (i.e., industrial, residential and the location of the SMUD power substation), which causes blighting influences and depressed property values.

Emphasis should be placed on housing rehabilitation programs in these areas, as well as street improvements. This would begin to have positive physical effects within the neighborhoods.

Changes in Tenure

The proportion of owners to renters in the South Sacramento community has remained stable from 1970 to 1975, with owners totalling 66% and renters 34% in 1975; however, there are some areas that have had a shift toward an increase in renters.

The areas with the greatest percent increase in renters were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Renters</th>
<th>Percent Change 1970-1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Area 5</td>
<td>25% 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Area 11</td>
<td>25% 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Area 6</td>
<td>18% 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Areas 1 &amp; 4</td>
<td>58% 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sacramento</td>
<td>31% 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County U</td>
<td>35% 35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The change in tenure was due to development of multiple family units as the primary housing type in all the above areas with the exception of Data Area II. Development in Data Area II has consisted largely of multiple families, mobile homes and single family units. When an area begins to have an increase in renters over owners, it can be attributed not only to new multiple units but also to more single family homes becoming renter-occupied.

Some unfavorable changes that may occur when an area has an increase in renters are:

- Lack of a sense of community
- Decline in home maintenance
- Increase in the number of units needing minor and/or major rehabilitation
- Higher incidence of transiency in the area

**Number of Households Overpaying for Housing**

Overpaying for housing is based upon a generally accepted standard which states that a family should not have to pay more than 25 percent (%) of their gross income for safe and sanitary housing. However, a family may choose to pay more than 25% of their income in order to secure decent housing, when less expensive units are available.

Of the total households (all incomes) in the South Sacramento community, 11% were clearly overpaying for housing in 1975.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Households Overpaying (all income)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>22,433</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total H.H. Overpaying</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Owners Overpaying)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Renters Overpaying)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Owners Overpaying)</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Renters Overpaying)</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Those lower income households (of the total households) overpaying for housing totaled 9% in 1975.*

3Lower income households - a family of four (4) whose income is 80% or less of the median income.
Lower Income Households Overpaying (of total households)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$</th>
<th>% of Total Households</th>
<th>% of Lower Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Lower Income Households</td>
<td>4,853</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total L.I. Overpaying</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lower Inc. Owners Overpaying)</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lower Inc. Renters Overpaying)</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These families are contributing a larger proportion of their income to meet rising housing costs, leaving less income for food, medical expenses and clothing.

Renters account for the largest percentage who are overpaying for housing. This indicates that the housing market is not producing enough lower cost rental units. There is a need in the community for assisted rental programs, as well as a comprehensive homeowner rehabilitation program. Overpaying for housing in the community can produce negative effects such as scattered deterioration and additional units in need of cosmetic repairs.

According to the 1970 census, the areas where more than 50% of the renters were overpaying for housing were Data Area 1 & 4, 3, 5 and the western portion of Data Area F. Although there is no 1975 census information by data areas on overpaying, the locations with the highest concentrations of renters overpaying have probably remained the same, and may include some of the areas where new multi-family units have been developed, since rents in new units are significantly higher than older multi-family units.

Housing Condition (Suitability/Habitability*)

The 1975 Census indicated a total of 254 or 1.1% unsound housing units in the community. Yet, a 100% field survey in the area in 1975 revealed 1,028 units in need of either minor, major or cosmetic repairs.

*Suitability/Habitability is an estimation of those households living in deteriorating units, therefore should be used as an indicator only.

4Unsound - units having one or more major defects or more than five minor defects.
Residential Lending Patterns

This information is based on loans made by state licensed Savings and Loans institutions on single and multiple family dwellings for the period 1/74 through 12/75, and is an indication of lending activity in the area. These institutions make approximately 80% of all residential loans.

The largest volume of residential loans in the county have been made in the northeast and Rosemont areas. Lending rates of $2 million dollars and over per census tract in these areas correlate closely with the cost of existing housing and new construction.

Those census tracts were less than $500,000 worth of loans have been made would indicate a lack of residential lending.

The overall area in the South Sacramento community where less than $500,000 worth of loans have been made is basically north of Florin Road, with the exception of Data Area 1 & 4 and the easterly portion of Data Area 2. These two (2) areas have had slightly more lending activity ($500,000 - $1 million) which can be attributed to new construction of multiple family dwelling units. There are ten (10) data areas (Data Area F, the westerly portion of Data Area 2, Data Areas 3, 5, 6, 7, 10 & 11, 12 & 13) where residential lending activity is stagnant (less than $500,000). When lending activity is analyzed by volume per capita, many of the same sections are identifiable as special problem areas. (See Map 8-C.) However, Data Areas 6 and 11 have begun to have an increase in lending activity due to new subdivision activity and multiple family development presently taking place.

The lack of residential lending can be attributed to several characteristics in the neighborhood(s) such as:

- older housing stock which shows signs of deterioration
- history of high foreclosure
- lack of public improvements
- concentration of lower income households

As a result of the above characteristics, the neighborhood(s) have begun to undergo some of the following changes:

1) Depressed property values
2) Lower economic base in the area
3) Decline in home maintenance
4) Some abandoned units scattered throughout the community
5) Out-migration of moderate income families

---

5 Information available by Census Tracts only, and converted to Data Areas where applicable.
The lack of residential lending activity is an indicator that public assistance is needed in the area. However, determination of specific areas for program implementation (i.e., Neighborhood Preservation Program) would have to be made based upon the criteria established by the enabling legislation.

Concentration of Subsidized Units

The South Sacramento community had a total of 1,328 federally subsidized units which represented 5.7% of the total housing units in South Sacramento as of July 1976.

This represented approximately ten (10) percent of all subsidized housing units in the county. (The county had a total of 13,695 subsidized units, or 5% of all housing units.) This would seem reasonable, based on the fact that the South Sacramento population is about 10 percent of the total county population. However, other unincorporated areas have relatively few subsidized units while incorporated areas such as Oak Park, Del Paso Heights and the Central City have a large percentage. It is the opinion of the Planning staff that South Sacramento has an excessive number of subsidized dwelling units in some data areas. Rental subsidized units accounted for 52% and the owner subsidized for 48%. While there is a need for programs of this nature in the community, concentration of the units in any one small area can cause problems.

Of the community's subsidized units, 95% (or 1,279 units) are concentrated in the following areas with the greatest numbers of subsidized units listed first:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Area</th>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>Total # Subsidized</th>
<th>% of Total Housing Units</th>
<th>% of Total Subsidized Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2734</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>15.22%</td>
<td>31.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2729</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
<td>23.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10.79%</td>
<td>15.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>8.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6.07%</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3580</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.67%</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See Map 8-D)

* A large proportion of the subsidized units are located within the city. However, their impact is on a neighborhood level which discounts jurisdictional boundaries.
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### Rental Subsidized Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Area</th>
<th>Total Rental Occupied</th>
<th># Rental Subsidized</th>
<th>% of Total Rental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>34.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>29.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**  684

Rental Subsidized Programs include Section 23, 236, 221(d)3 and Rent Supplement.

### Owner Subsidized Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Area</th>
<th>Total Owner Occupied</th>
<th># Owner Subsidized</th>
<th>% of Total Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**  644

Owner-subsidized programs include Section 235.

---
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SOUTH SACRAMENTO COMMUNITY TOTAL SUBSIDIZED UNITS 6% OF TOTAL HOUSING
SACRAMENTO COUNTY UNINCORPORATED TOTAL SUBSIDIZED UNITS 5% OF TOTAL HOUSING

SOURCE: SACRAMENTO REGIONAL AREA PLANNING COMMISSION-1976
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The total 684 rental subsidized units are located within 6 data areas (Data Areas F, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 9). The total 644 owner-subsidized units are all located within 9 data areas (Data Areas F, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 13 and 14).

Some adverse effects large numbers of subsidized units may lead to within a community are:

- concentration of lower income families
- spot deterioration, major and/or minor housing repairs due to lack of income and knowledge
- increased vacancy rates
- increased foreclosures
- depressed property values
- redlining

Additional subsidized units could be located at scattered sites within certain data areas and monitored so that the total number of subsidized units in that area would not exceed the county average. These locations should be consistent with the County’s Housing Assistant Plan

Concentration of Mobile Homes

The community of South Sacramento has the highest concentration of mobile homes to total dwelling units than any of the other unincorporated communities in the county.

Mobile homes account for 8.8% or 2,043 of total housing units in the South Sacramento community compared to 4.8% for the unincorporated area, and are highly concentrated within the following eight (8) data areas. (See Map 8-E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Area</th>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th># Mobile</th>
<th>% of Mobile Homes to Total Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2729</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAP 8-E
SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA
COMMUNITY PLAN
DATA AREAS

GENERAL LOCATIONS OF
MOBILE HOME UNITS-1975

△ 20 MOBILE HOMES

SOUTH SACRAMENTO COMMUNITY-TOTAL = 9%
SACRAMENTO COUNTY UNINCORPORATED AREA = 5%
SACRAMENTO CITY & COUNTY TOTAL = 3.5%
SOURCE: 1975 CENSUS
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Concentration of mobile homes can have unfavorable spinoffs in a neighborhood such as:

- they are considered aesthetically less than desirable by homeowners.

- generation of fewer property taxes may create problems for special taxing districts. (Prior to Proposition 13).

Overcrowding

The 1975 Special Census information on overcrowding is based on more than 2 persons per bedroom. Overcrowding is usually an indication that there is an inadequate number of available larger units (4 or more bedrooms) on the market, and/or an insufficient number of new and existing rental units on the housing market at affordable rents and prices.

In the community, only 3.7% of the total households were living in overcrowding units in 1975. While this may not be a major housing problem in itself, combined with overpaying and/or living in substandard or deteriorating conditions it can then have adverse social or emotional effects on a family's living environment.

Summary of Major Housing Problems

The South Sacramento community has a number of existing housing and housing-related problems, with the greatest concentrations of these problems north of Florin Road. (See Map 8-F). One of the more obvious reasons for the lack of housing problems in the area of Florin Road south is the fact that the housing is much newer than in the northerly section of the Study area.

Housing problems are clearly detailed both by chart and map (Map 8-F) on the following pages. Review of this information shows the problems of: Unsound dwellings, high renter occupied vacancy rates, significant increases of rental dwellings in recent years, low residential lending rates, concentration of subsidized dwellings (both rentals and owner occupied), and areas having a high concentration of mobile homes as a percentage of all housing.

Unless coordinated comprehensive housing policies and programs are implemented in the immediate future to address the existing problems in the community, the potential problems will be:

- major neighborhood decline with additional housing deterioration

- higher proportion of families living in unsafe and indecent housing conditions, and overpaying for housing
### TABLE 8-A

Data Areas With Identified Existing Housing Problems (1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Area</th>
<th>Renter Occupied Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>% Increase in Renters</th>
<th>Lack of Res. Lending</th>
<th>Concentration of Subsidized Units</th>
<th>Concentration of Mobile Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 4</td>
<td>14% (east)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>29.92%</td>
<td>.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% (west)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>x (westerly portion)</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>34.61%</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>+16%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.05% 13.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+8%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.39%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.01%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- lack of residential lending which intensifies the existing stagnant housing economy and depressed property values

- shrinking economic base in the area, with insufficient funds generated to Special Districts to provide necessary services

- increased vacancy rates and abandoned units

- higher concentrations of subsidized units and lower income households

- increased social problems associated with concentrated low income, high rental neighborhoods

Housing Assistance Needs in South Sacramento

Area of Concern

This discussion is of the housing assistance needs which presently exist within the South Sacramento community. The housing needs are presented by tenure, with a further breakdown of special needs for small and large families, elderly, all minorities and female-headed households, specifically lower income households.

Definition of Housing Needs

Housing needs can be interpreted in various ways. The Sacramento County Housing Assistance Plan (HAP) defines these needs as the number of families and individuals having various housing related problems such as: 1) paying more than 25% of their income for housing, 2) living in overcrowded conditions, and 3) living in units that are substandard or in a deteriorating condition. For the individual family the term "housing needs" refers to the problems encountered in obtaining a decent and suitable dwelling unit at a price it can afford.

To assess housing needs, it is necessary to define the different categories of need existing in the community. The categories can be broadly classified as: 1) financial and 2) physical needs. Financial housing needs refer to the price of available dwelling units in the community. If a family cannot afford to rent or purchase a dwelling unit suitable for its requirements, the family has a financial need (i.e., the need for a lower cost unit or subsidies to reduce the rental payment of a family for an existing unit).

The ability to afford housing is based on the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) generally accepted standard that a family should not have to pay more than 25% of their gross income to secure decent housing (therefore paying more than 25% of gross income for housing is considered "overpaying.") Overpaying can put a financial strain on a family's budget leaving less income for food, medical expenses, clothing and transportation. It can also result in insufficient funds for home maintenance, utilities, property taxes, repair, and/or rehabilitation. Together these can lead to minor and in some cases major housing deterioration. Overpaying can be attributed to a
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combination of inadequate incomes and high housing costs which is referred to as the "cost-income squeeze." In actual situations a consider able deviation from the above rule may be warranted. For example, a family may voluntarily pay well in excess of 25% of its income for housing with certain desired features and amenities when less expensive units are available and/or their income is such (i.e., middle or upper income) that the housing costs will not reduce their lifestyle.

Physical housing needs relate directly to size, type, and location of housing units required to serve particular households. Physical housing needs are measured by the number of families residing in housing which is substandard, overcrowded or otherwise inadequate. For the purpose of this discussion, housing assistance needs are based on the above definition.

South Sacramento Community Existing Housing Assistance Needs*

The South Sacramento community had a total of 22,433 households in 1975, which represented 10% of the total households in the county (including Sacramento City). Seventy-eight (78%) percent of the households are in the moderate or upper income bracket and will not be discussed in this section, since their housing needs are met by the normal supply and demand dynamics of the housing market.

It must be noted that approximately 40% of the South Sacramento community is located within the City of Sacramento, and about 33% of the community's total lower income households in need of assistance reside within the city limits. Therefore, when comparisons in the text are made between South Sacramento and the county, the county will be representative of the total city plus county housing assistance needs.

According to the 1975 Special Census those known lower income households in need of various forms of housing assistance totalled 4,853 or 22% of the total households in the South Sacramento community (53% were owners and 47% were renters). Known overpaying lower income households in the community totalled 2,082 or 43% of all lower income households and renters accounted for more than two-thirds (2/3) overpaying for housing.

Sacramento City and County HAP's identified a total of 48,595 households in need of housing assistance, of these households 34% were owners and 66% were renters. (This represents 18.4% of the total households in the county.) As a proportion of the countywide population, there are more owners in South Sacramento in need of housing assistance than the county as a whole.

* The information and statistics presented are only available on a community-wide level and therefore refer to no specific Data Area, Census Tract or Minor Zone.

** All the statistical information presented reflects actual responding households. Throughout the 1975 Census the number of non responses were significant, therefore the percentages presented are more valid indicators than the number of actual households.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unincorporated Area</th>
<th>Incorporated Area</th>
<th>So. Sac. Total Overpaying #</th>
<th>% of overpaying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All the statistical information presented reflects actual responding households. Throughout the 1975 Census the number of non responses were significant, therefore the percentages presented are more valid indicators than the number of actual households.*

Source: 1975 Special Census Housing Cross-Tabulations

A family's housing needs for adequate space, privacy and decent standard housing have long been recognized as basic. However, when these needs are not met, they can affect the physical, psychological and social well-being of a family. In addition, deferred maintenance and deteriorating housing units adversely affect property value and neighborhood quality.

Approximately 290 or 6% of the lower income families in South Sacramento were living in overcrowded housing. (Overcrowded households in 1975, were those with more than 2 persons per bedroom.) An estimated 400-500 lower income families were living in deteriorating housing units.

Owners and renters are in need of housing assistance to mitigate the affects of overpaying, living in overcrowded and deteriorating housing units.

Owners are generally in need of the following kinds of housing assistance:

- Rehabilitation assistance through grants and/or low interest loans
- "Do it yourself" home maintenance programs
- Programs to reduce operating expenses i.e., energy conservation and insulation
- Home counseling programs on budgeting
## TABLE 8-B

South Sacramento Housing Assistance Needs Compared to the County's Housing Assistance Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of City &amp; County Needs</td>
<td>% of County (U) Needs</td>
<td>% of So. Sac. Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>16,385</td>
<td>11,253</td>
<td>2,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>32,210</td>
<td>18,977</td>
<td>2,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48,595</td>
<td>30,230</td>
<td>4,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Groups Housing Assistance Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elderly</th>
<th>Small Families</th>
<th>Large Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,824</td>
<td>29,176</td>
<td>5,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,299</td>
<td>20,310</td>
<td>3,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>2,954</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48,595</td>
<td>30,230</td>
<td>4,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Selected Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Headed Households</th>
<th>All Minorities</th>
<th>All Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17,584</td>
<td>8,178</td>
<td>22,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,362</td>
<td>3,402</td>
<td>16,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>4,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48,595</td>
<td>30,230</td>
<td>4,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sacramento County Housing Assistance Plan
Sacramento City Housing Assistance Plan
1975 Special Census Housing Cross-Tabulations
The majority of the elderly who may need housing assistance were owners at 72.6%, those who have entirely paid for their homes accounted for 42.4% of the total lower income elderly. Those overpaying for housing totalled 18% of all lower income elderly, approximately 1/2 were owners and 1/2 were renters.

| ELDERLY LOWER INCOME HOUSEHOLDS* | COMMUNITY TOTAL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated + Incorporated</td>
<td>Lower Income Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535 + 325</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Homes paid for</td>
<td>293 + 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>256 + 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>791 + 393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following chart illustrates the distribution of the selected groups.

*Total responding households

Source: 1975 Special Census Housing Cross-Tabulations

| ELDERLY OVERPAYING FOR HOUSING* | COMMUNITY TOTAL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated + Incorporated</td>
<td>Lower Income Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners Overpaying</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 + 39</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters Overpaying</td>
<td>88 + 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>146 + 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total responding households

Source: 1975 Special Census Housing Cross-Tabulations
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COMMUNITY
HOUSEHOLDS NEEDING HOUSING ASSISTANCE

ALL HOUSEHOLDS
(Selected Groups)

ALL HOUSEHOLDS
(By Housing Needs)

DETAIL
LOWER INCOME FAMILIES
NEEDING HOUSING ASSISTANCE
21.6% of ALL HOUSEHOLDS

HOUSEHOLDS NOT IN NEED OF HOUSING ASSISTANCE
78.4%*

LOWER INCOME FAMILIES NEEDING HOUSING ASSISTANCE
21.6%
(See Detail)

ALL OTHERS: 35.2%
ALL MINORITIES: 19.9%
FEMALE HEADED HOUSEHOLD: 20.9%

ALL OTHERS: 33.6%
ALL MINORITIES: 27.8%
FEMALE HEADED HOUSEHOLD: 38.6%

*Note: Percentage may not sum to 100 due to rounding.
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# Table 8-D

**SOUTH SACRAMENTO**

Total Households Compared to Housing Assistance Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>So. Sac. Total H.H. All Incomes</th>
<th>So. Sac. Housing Asst. Needs Lower Income</th>
<th>% of Total So. Sac. All Income</th>
<th>% of Total Housing Asst. Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>% of S.S. Total</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>14,806</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>7,628</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2,277</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,434</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,853</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Selected Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Families</td>
<td>16,445</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,954</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Families</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>715</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,434</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.6% (of all incomes)

## Additional Selected Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Headed Households</td>
<td>4,696</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All M Minorities</td>
<td>4,457</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>13,281</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,434</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.6% (of all incomes)

**Source:** 1975 Special Census Housing Cross-Tabulations
- Reduced property taxes for the lower income homeowner*
- Reduced redlining practices by lending agencies

Renters are generally in need of the following types of housing assistance:
- Rental assistance which would stabilize housing costs at a maximum of 25% of gross household income
- Additional lower cost rental units
- Repair and rehabilitation of existing rental units
- Educational home maintenance programs to assist landlords and tenants in reducing the cost of minor repairs
- Programs to reduce operating expenses i.e., energy conservation, etc.

**Housing Assistance Needs of Selected Lower Income Groups**

Small families (4 or less persons) in South Sacramento in need of housing assistance accounted for the largest proportion of the total (4,853) at 60.9%, followed by the elderly (1 or 2 person households, 65 years and older) at 24.4% and large families (5 or more persons) at 14.7%.

This basically compares to the county's needs, as identified in the Housing Assistance Plans which indicated that small families totalled 60%, elderly households 28.5% and large families accounted for 11.5% of the county's total needs.

The housing problems and needs previously discussed apply to the selected groups in addition to their specific needs.

**Elderly Households**

The elderly (consists of 1 or 2 persons, 65 years and older) family is usually on a fixed income i.e., Social Security and/or Retirement Payments, and generally have lower incomes than the non-elderly family. As a result, the elderly may undergo an increased burden of meeting housing expenses, with less disposable income for property taxes, utility, maintenance costs, medical expenses, etc.

*According to a report titled "Comparative Homeownership Cost", June 23, 1976, by the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission, the total support cost to operate a typical $35,000 home in South Sacramento with typical family characteristics was $1,672 a year or $139.33 a month. This figure is in addition to monthly mortgage principal and interest payments.
The following kinds of assistance are suggested to meet the elderly needs:

- Reduced monthly operating expenses through energy conservation and insulation programs
- Rehabilitation grants and/or low interest loans for minor and major home repairs
- Rental assistance programs to alleviate overpaying for the elderly renter
- Rental maintenance programs to help both the elderly renter and the elderly landlord

Small Families

Although there are no statistics which correlate household size to income and housing payment, it is estimated that approximately one-half, or 1477 small families are overpaying for housing. A total of 2% of these households are living in one bedroom overcrowded dwelling units, and may not be able to afford larger accommodations to meet their space requirements.

Small families' housing assistance needs are:

- Reduced down payments to purchase a home through the use of federally subsidized mortgage assistance programs
- Direct rental assistance
- Repaired or rehabilitated units, and
- Reduced monthly operating costs

Large Families

Approximately 358 large families are estimated to be overpaying for housing. Thirty-two (32%) percent of this group are living in overcrowded housing units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERCROWDED LARGE FAMILIES*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Size</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total responding households
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Large families' housing assistance needs are the same as small families except they need:

- Larger rental and single family units (3 or more bedrooms) at affordable prices and rents

Additional Selected Groups with potential for special housing needs.

It should be kept in mind that the following two (2) groups are a part of the total needs in the community, that their housing assistance requirements and numbers are a part of the total and/or selected groups needs which have been discussed in the previous sections. However, as identifiable groups, mention will be made of their individual needs in this section.

In South Sacramento, female-headed households* in need of housing assistance accounted for more than one-third (1/3) of the community's total needs, while all minorities** accounted for approximately 28%.

The county's Housing Assistance Plans indicated that female headed families totalled 36.2%, and all minorities accounted for 16.8% of the county's total needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unincorporated</th>
<th>Incorporated</th>
<th>Community Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Headed Household</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Minority Household</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Female headed households are those headed by a female regardless of age, family size, minority or non-minority group status.

** All minority households are members of a minority group which includes Blacks, Spanish-Americans, Orientals, American Indians, East Indians, Filipinos, and others.

*** Total responding households

Source: 1975 Special Census Housing Cross-Tabulations
In addition to the housing needs which were discussed previously, some additional needs of these groups include:

1) Female headed households require assistance in the form of additional housing opportunities in securing necessary home financing for home purchases and home management counseling.

2) Minorities require equal and fair housing opportunities in securing suitable housing by obtaining home financing, and choices of housing location throughout the county to prevent discrimination.

Summary of Existing Housing Assistance Needs in South Sacramento

A. In the South Sacramento community 1 out of every 5 households is of lower income and in need of some form of housing assistance.

B. Almost one-half (1/2) of the lower income families (or approximately 1 out of every 10 households) are overpaying for housing. The largest group, renter, comprise more than two-thirds (2/3) of those overpaying for housing.

C. Small families total about 60% of the special housing assistance needs, and require rental assistance, and reduced down payments for home purchases.

D. Elderly households account for approximately 25% of the total in need of special housing assistance and are in need of housing rehabilitation grants, low interest loans, and may have a strong need for elderly housing with group facilities.

E. Large families account for the remainder (15%) of special housing assistance, are in need of larger units to accommodate their space requirements, and financial assistance to reduce their housing cost.

Estimated Projections of Housing Assistance Needs Based on South Sacramento's Plan

According to South Sacramento's Land Use Plan, population is anticipated to increase at an average annual rate of 2.3% from 1975 to 1985. Assuming that lower income households increase at the same rate as population (2.3%) then housing assistance needs will increase from 4,853 households to 6,103 households during this period.

From 1985 to 1995, the population is expected to increase at an average annual rate 2.8%. Assuming this annual rate, housing assistance needs would increase from 6103 to 8060 households by 1995, almost doubling from 1975 to 1995. These estimates reflect no new housing policies or housing assistance programs than what currently exist.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Total Households Requiring Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>62,757</td>
<td>22,433</td>
<td>4,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>78,928</td>
<td>30,745</td>
<td>6,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>104,255</td>
<td>40,249</td>
<td>8,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, it is anticipated over the next 10 and 20 year periods, housing assistance needs will increase at a higher rate than the above estimates if significant new housing policies and programs are not implemented and existing housing assistance needs are not met. This concept is based on the following premises:

- Present rehabilitation programs are not designed to meet all existing rehab needs specifically areas outside designated target areas. In addition the existing housing stock within the community will be 10 to 20 years older, therefore, increasing the number of housing units needing minor and major rehabilitation

- Additional neighborhood decline and deterioration due to lack of adequate rehabilitation programs

- Continual increase in land costs

- The housing industry is not producing new lower cost housing, and therefore not responding to the housing needs of lower income families

- Substantial increases in the prices and rents of new single family and rental housing units, as well as existing units, and

- Household income has not and will not increase proportionately or as rapidly as housing costs

- Increasing energy costs will raise many basic living expenses

The final analysis is that significant housing problems do and will exist unless meaningful programs are implemented to address them. These programs can only partially be discussed in the context of this plan, since some will have countywide implications. The Policy and Program Section which follows will address in detail the types of programs needed to meet the stated problems.
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COMMUNITY PLAN

HOUSING GOALS, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

GOAL:
Preserve and rehabilitate, where appropriate, older, deteriorating and unsafe housing stock in the community through public and private rehabilitation programs which are affordable by all economic sectors.

Problem
- Major and minor exterior structural defects of the housing stock identified by field surveys, particularly in the older sections of the community.

Policies
- Encourage the use of existing rehabilitation programs in designated areas.
- Encourage the use of rehabilitation programs to meet the special needs of lower income renters.
- Actively seek out and utilize other sources of funds to establish comprehensive rehabilitation programs that would address the needs of owners and renters in all economic categories.

Program
* CONCENTRATE EXISTING REHABILITATION PROGRAMS IN SMALL AREAS WHERE THE GREATEST PROPORTION OF UNITS SHOW SIGNS OF DETERIORATION AS INDICATED IN THIS PLAN.

- Implement and coordinate additional rehabilitation programs funded through other sources (i.e., California Housing and Finance Agency, Mark Foran), that would address the needs of owners and renters of low- and moderate-income in designated C.D. target areas and/or outside of target areas.
[Lead Responsibility - Community Development Planning Staff]

- Develop and implement a Neighborhood Beautification Program in selected areas in the community to provide exterior cosmetic and minor repair, specifically those properties where the owner provides the labor.
[Lead Responsibility - Planning Department - Housing Planner in coordination with Housing and Redevelopment Agency]

*Programs, capitalized, will be implemented via adoption of this plan. Other programs are clearly obtainable but will require additional efforts on the part of County Planning and/or Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency staff.
Problem - Abandoned and/or unoccupied dwellings primarily in the northern areas of the community. The total number of these units is not large, nevertheless, they contribute to neighborhood decline. Reasons for abandoned and boarded-up buildings usually are:

- FHA repossessions
- Health and safety violations
- Fire damage

Policy - Stronger commitment by the county to either demolish these units, or enforcement of corrective actions to have the violations removed.

Program - Emphasis on current programs to enforce the above policy by the Building Department and Health Agency.

- Continued funding of the Community Development housing code enforcement program for the Fruitridge area.

Problem - Lack of residential lending throughout the community, particularly north of Florin Road.

Policy - Increase opportunities for all households in the community, especially low and moderate income families, to secure the necessary funds for home purchase, home repairs, rehabilitation and improvements in order to arrest and reverse neighborhood decline.

Program - Apply to the California Housing and Finance Agency for designation of Neighborhood Preservation Areas. The program is designed to stimulate private funds from lending institutions into redlined areas in order to stop decline, stabilize neighborhoods, and bring about economic self-sufficiency.

[Lead Responsibility - Planning Department - Housing Planner]

GOAL:

To maintain a sufficient amount as well as a reasonable allocation of assisted housing units in the community to meet the minimum housing assistance needs as described in the county's Community Development - Housing Assistance Plan.

Problem - Concentration of subsidized/assisted units. The South Sacramento community has one of the highest concentrations of subsidized housing units in the county. However, impaction of these units is primarily in the older areas of the community.

Policy - To disperse subsidized/assisted units throughout the county and mix them with market rate housing to prevent concentrations of lower income families and provide these families with more social opportunities.
Program  - The Section 213 Review Procedure as described in the HAP can be used as a monitoring process by the county to ensure that these units are not concentrated in any one community. By informing various housing agencies (i.e., Housing and Redevelopment, RHA, etc.) of possible impacton, dispersion of these units can be avoided in the future.

GOAL:

To provide lower cost housing (single-family and rental units) opportunities throughout the county to meet the increasing housing assistance needs of all families in the county.

Problem  - Approximately 43% of the lower income households in South Sacramento are overpaying for housing (more than 25% of gross income for housing).

Policy   - Implementation of an Inclusionary Land Use program which requires developers to provide a certain percentage of lower cost housing in new developments.

Program  - Require all sales developments of five units or more to provide 15% of the dwelling units for moderate income families and all rental developments to provide at least 10% for low income families and 5% or more of the units for moderate income families. See Attachment A in the Appendix for generalized description of a possible program.

GOAL:

To prevent unreasonably high density population concentrations in any one small area.

Problem  - High concentrations of renter occupied multiple family units in specific locations has caused congestion and contributed to deterioration of residential neighborhoods in certain areas.

Policy   - Provide a more even distribution of multiple family units.

Program  - REMOVAL OF MULTIPLE FAMILY ZONES WHERE THEY ARE TOO HEAVILY CONCENTRATED AND NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE ADOPTED PLAN.

GOAL:

To maintain the residential characteristic of neighborhoods in the community by providing a reasonable distribution of all housing types (i.e., single family, multiple family and mobile home units).

Problem  - Concentration of mobile homes in the community has had adverse financial impacts on special districts (i.e., Fire District, School Districts, etc.). (pre-Proposition 13).
Policy
- To provide for a more equitable distribution of Mobile Home Parks throughout the unincorporated areas of the county in order to alleviate negative financial impacts that affect Special Districts and to provide housing opportunities on a broader scale.

Program
- REMOVAL OF VACANT UNDEVELOPED MOBILE HOME ZONES IN SOUTH SACRAMENTO TO CURTAIL DEVELOPMENT OF ANY NEW MOBILE HOME PARKS AND SUBDIVISIONS.

Housing Programs Which the County Should Investigate and Implement Where Appropriate

Code Enforcement Program - presently, county code enforcement on existing structures are primarily on a complaint basis. Concentrated enforcement of housing and health codes used in conjunction with available rehabilitation programs could have positive physical effects in neighborhoods that show signs of decline. Implementation of this program would require a coordinated effort with the Building Department, Health Agency, Sacramento Housing and Rehabilitation Agency, as well as lending institutions.

Rental Inspection and Certification Program - would insure renters of decent, sanitary and safe housing. The County Building Inspection Department and Health Agency would coordinate their efforts and conduct periodic (either annually or every two years) inspections of rental units. Rental certifications would be issued for rental units that complied with code requirements. For those rental units that did not meet standards, the owner would be cited and given reasonable time to comply. If, after reasonable time, the owner did not make the necessary repairs, he would be subject to a fine. It should be kept in mind that this program would not include single family homes or owner-occupied duplexes for rentals. However, there should also be a program for single family and duplex certification to provide for a comprehensive program.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds can be used in the following two ways:

A. ............to leverage capital from local lending institutions.
   In a sense, the county can borrow private capital on a tax exempt and revenue secured basis and then use the funds to make rehabilitation loans. The county and bank can only take advantage of this tax benefit if the county, acting as an intermediary, puts itself between the lender and borrower. The program, in effect, gets the federal government to subsidize part of the interest on a rehabilitation loan. The interest the local rehabilitation program pays to the bank or source of funds is exempt from federal income taxes.

B. ............for the purchase of land and construction of on-site improvements to help stimulate construction of low and moderate income housing. The land and improvements could be leased at little or no cost to non-profit or private developers who would, by prior agreements, sponsor a housing development. By defraying these expensive pre-development site costs, the total construction cost would be significantly reduced and therefore the total cost of housing built would be affordable by low and moderate income people.
Marks - Foran Rehabilitation Act - under this legislation the county could issue revenue bonds or notes which would stimulate capital for housing rehabilitation loans. The county could also secure sources of loan funds at below market interest rates through issuance of tax-exempt bonds or notes. Rehabilitation financing of all types of residential properties (i.e., single family and multi-family) as well as certain related commercial properties is permitted under this Act.

Neighborhood Preservation Program - (See glossary in the Appendix)

Tax Deferment or Abatement - this would alleviate the burden of increased tax assessments, resulting from rehabilitation. Those additional taxes charged on the rehabilitated properties could be lowered and/or phased-in to the actual tax level over a number of years. It is also possible that a certain percentage of the additional taxes could be cancelled. Investigation of the State Constitution governing assessment and taxation of property would have to be made to determine whether the county would have the authority to implement such a program.
CHAPTER NINE
SCHOOLS ELEMENT

A. Sacramento City Unified School District

1. Existing Conditions

The Sacramento City Unified School District provides public school services and facilities for approximately 40% of the South Sacramento area (see Map 9-A) for all grades K-12. Table 9-A summarizes TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS for current school capacities vs. estimated enrollments. Although there appears to be some overcrowding, the problem is not significant at the present time as portables can be used to handle these excesses. No schools are impacted or on double session.

2. Problem Areas

Two major growth areas are projected for the City School District portion of South Sacramento. These areas are:

a. Parkway Elementary - Fern Bacon Junior High School - Luther Burbank High School

b. Camellia Elementary - Will C. Wood Junior High School - Hiram Johnson High School

Potential overcrowding exists at all three levels in the Meadowview area. Elementary students would have to be divided among Parkway, Bowling Green, Woodbine and possibly Edward Kemball and its Suan B. Anthony annex. Woodbine and Kemball are outside the study area, but are within two miles of the growth area. At present, all four schools combined could accommodate only 133 of the additional 371 potential students who will be generated by 1985 in the area now served by Parkway Elementary. Fern Bacon Junior High School could accommodate only 99 of the possible 242 intermediate school students to be generated in its service area and Luther Burbank High School theoretically could not accommodate any of the potential 240 high school students who will be generated in the South Sacramento portion of its service area.

Camellia Elementary could accommodate only 39 of the 166 potential new students in its area by 1985. No problems are anticipated at the junior high school level there, but Hiram Johnson High School could accommodate only 77 of the 155 new students generated in South Sacramento's portion of its service area. The additional area of concern is the Elder Creek Elementary area where none of the potential new students by 1985 can be accommodated.

The extent of the problem situation is somewhat mitigated by the anticipated general decline in school population generated from existing units. Even this decline, however, could be
reversed by increasing numbers of young families purchasing older units as the cost of new housing passes out of their reach. (The student generation factors used in the projections of school populations represents a "best estimate" at balancing these conflicting trends.)

In general, Sacramento City Unified School District welcomes new housing to these two areas on the premise that the housing will bring in middle income families which will help to alleviate the racial imbalances of the areas. (Currently, because of ethnic imbalance in the Elder Creek and Camellia School areas, a small number of students are bussed to other schools.

3. Policies

a. The Planning staff recommends construction of a new elementary facility in the Meadowview area. The Bowling Green and Parkway schools will both be unable to accommodate the future student loads projected for them. The concept of busing over 300 elementary students to surrounding area schools such as Woodbine or Kembell seems less than optimal. Since funding is the major problem (the district has the option of purchasing a site in the area), adoption of County Ordinance #1179—Regulations Regarding Temporary Relief of School Overcrowding—is an option. Statewide alterations in the method of school financing is another possibility. A further consideration would be the use of portables for the entire school at this location.

b. The District should plan for expansion of both the Elder Creek and Camellia facilities.

c. The staff makes no recommendation at this time on the potential problems at Fern Bacon Junior High School or Luther Burbank High School, except to note that a problem situation exists there and some expansion, no doubt, will be needed.

B. Elk Grove Unified School District

1. Existing Conditions

The Elk Grove School District serves the southerly 60% of the South Sacramento Plan area. Their service area encompasses most of the undeveloped portion of the South Sacramento study area. The potential for growth in this area is high and the Community Plan’s Environmental Impact Report identifies the need for new school facilities as a significant impact. The Elk Grove School District has declared its entire area impacted under both the County and City Impaction Ordinance. Under this program, new dwellings contribute money to the district and help finance new school facilities. A recent problem is funding decreases due to impacts from adoption of Proposition 13. This problem is being addressed on a Statewide level, but a workable long-range solution is unknown at this time.
### TABLE 9-A

SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Actual Enrollment 11/24/78</th>
<th>78-79 Capacity (Including On-Site Portables)</th>
<th>Excess Capacity</th>
<th>% Excess Allocable to S.Soc.</th>
<th>New Students Expected as of 1985</th>
<th>New Students at Plan Holding Capacity</th>
<th>Portables on Site 11/24/78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruitridge</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. I. Baker</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. B. Ware</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Burnett</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Warren</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder Creek</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camellia</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ridge</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| JR. High       |       |                            |                                               |                 |                              |                                  |                              |                           |
| Peter Lassen   | 7-9   | 745                        | 795                                           | 50              | 15%                          | 15                               | 2                            | 9                         |
| Will C. Wood   | 7-9   | 645                        | 930                                           | 325             | 80%                          | 97                               | 144                          | 447                       |
| Joaquin Miller | 7-8   | 490                        | 810                                           | 320             | 10%                          | 5                                | 0                            | 5                         |
| Pern Bacon     | 7-9   | 827                        | 1,110                                         | 283             | 95%                          | 99                               | 242                          | 420                       |

| HI              |       |                            |                                               |                 |                              |                                  |                              |                           |
| Hilcon Johnson | 10-12 | 2,325                      | 2,010                                         | -315            | 25%                          | 77                               | 155                          | 485                       |
| McClatchy      | 9-12  | 1,830                      | 2,335                                         | 405             | 10%                          | 7                                | 0                            | 4                         |
| Luther Burbank | 10-12 | 1,752                      | 1,785                                         | 33              | 60%                          | -                                | 240                          | 393                       |

**SM-5 B-23-24**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Actual Level</th>
<th>Actual Enrollment</th>
<th>78-79 Capacity Portables</th>
<th>Excess Capacity</th>
<th>% Excess Allocable to 6-8'sec.</th>
<th>New Students Expected as of 1985</th>
<th>New Students at Plan Holding Capacity</th>
<th>Portables on Site 11/3/78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Sam Kennedy</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>David Benson</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Florin</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Charles Mack</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Herman Leimbach</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Sierra Entepoine K-6</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Anna Kirschlar</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>James McKee</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>James Rutter</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Joseph Kerr</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Valley HI</td>
<td><strong>9-12</strong></td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Junior High Schools have been converted from 3 year to 2 year (7-8).
**High Schools have been converted from 3 year to 4 year (9-12).
2. **Trends and Projections**

   See Table 9-B.

3. **Problem Areas**

   a. Both the Reese and Kirchgater Elementary Schools, and Florin School also to a lesser degree, will be heavily impacted by future development before 1985. Reese, currently 1 student over stated capacity, will probably have more than 500 additional students generated within its service area before 1985. Kirchgater is targeted for 241 more. Neither Sam Kennedy nor Florin School will be able to absorb this overflow. Even if Kirchgater is expanded to handle its own anticipated growth, the overflow in the Reese area alone requires a new site.

   b. Both Mack and Leimbach Elementary Schools are at capacity now. (These two areas collectively will be impacted by over 600 new elementary students by 1985.) In Valley Hi an all-portable facility opened in September 1978, with impaction funds to relieve Leimbach. This new facility on the Reith site is already at capacity.

   c. Rutter Junior High School is nearing capacity. Another 500 junior high school students are expected in its service area before 1985. A new junior high school facility is recommended in the Valley Hi area.

   d. Valley Hi High School is currently at capacity with 6 portables presently on site.

   e. The holding capacity of Valley Hi south of the proposed major street (former Highway Route 148) potentially could require construction of three elementary schools.

4. **Policies**

   a. A new junior high school should be planned for the Valley Hi area.

   b. Valley Hi High School will have to be developed to its full 2323 capacity.
c. When the area bounded by Mack Road (extended), the Western Pacific R.R., former Route 148 and Franklin Blvd. is developed, an additional elementary facility will be needed to accommodate the additional 700+ students generated in this area.

d. Elementary school sites and facilities should be provided to accommodate future development south of the proposed major street corridor (former Highway Route 148).

e. The General Plan areas affected by these recommendations should be changed to reflect current thinking.

NOTE: Education Programs and Policies recommended in this report address a 1985 time horizon. A number of other facilities/policies will need to be proposed in the future as development pressure bears upon various subareas of the community. The impact of Proposition 13 approval has as yet not been fully determined. This situation may result in unforeseen problems that cannot presently be addressed.

C. Other Educational Facilities

A number of private and parochial facilities serve the area, most notably Bishop Armstrong High School, St. Peters, and St. Charles Borromeo Elementary Schools, and others.

The William Daylor Continuation High School is maintained by the Elk Grove Unified School District in the area.

Cosumnes River Junior College is a newly constructed facility run by the Los Rios Community College District in the southerly portion of the area.

The planning and operation of these facilities is not within the purview of this plan.
CHAPTER TEN

PARKS AND RECREATION, COMMUNITY AESTHETICS, AND OPEN SPACE

I. Parks

A. Existing Conditions

The South Sacramento area is serviced by three separate recreational service providers (City of Sacramento, County Service Area 4A, and Southgate Recreation and Park District) as well as several commercial and semi-private recreational facilities (golf courses, skating rinks, pools, theaters, etc.). The area also has copious open space, i.e., undeveloped and agricultural lands, especially in the south and east. There is an extensive on- and off-street bikeway system, partially existing, partially planned, throughout the area.

Map 10-A shows parks currently developed and/or planned by the three service provision entities. Note that many of the facilities are shown to be in joint use with schools. Such combined uses are desirable and contribute greatly toward satisfying the open space needs of a neighborhood or community. From the viewpoint of this analysis, however, only the areas specifically identified as "parks" are considered and identified as such.

Map 10-B indicates existing and proposed bikeways and trails. Serving two purposes such facilities add to the community's circulation pattern as well as providing open space and recreation potential.

B. Trends and Projections

All three service providers have attempted to determine present and future park and recreation needs in their master plan. Each separate service provider utilizes the most appropriate standard for its service area. Standards used in this report tend to center on the following parameters:

- Mini Park
  - serves small neighborhood
  - only alternative when large parcels not available or cost too much

- Neighborhood Park
  - within 1/4 to 1/2 mile of resident population
  - should not be across a major arterial
  - connected by on-street bike lanes or open space corridor
  - 7-8 acres or 3-5 acres if developed adjoining school grounds
  *- 5 acres/1000 pop. or 5,000 persons

*Sacramento County Neighborhood Park standards were recently changed from 2.5 to 5 acres per 1000 population. This report will show the old standard and new standard in parenthesis.
Community Park
- 1-2 mile service radius
- 10-15 acres
- serves several neighborhoods - 10,000-17,000 persons
- adjacent to high school or junior high school
- accessed by major arterial and transit

District Park
- 40-60 acres spaces for large crowds
- serves 30,000-40,000
- transit service available
- near freeway or major arterial
- geographic center of district
- off-street bikeways desirable

1. Fruitridge Recreation and Park Area - County Service Area 4A

The unincorporated area north of 47th Avenue is served by County Service Area 4A. The service area population, as of 1975, was 15,276. The projected population by 1985, 15,034. The area is almost totally developed, largely in older (circa and pre-1950) single family homes. The school age population has been declining steadily since 1960. It is significant that the median family income is low in this area and that it is entirely within the area designated for funding by the Community Development Block Grant program. Trends and projections are more fully summarized in Table 10-A.

2. Sacramento City Department of Recreation and Parks

The City of Sacramento has responsibility for providing park services in the incorporated portion of the South Sacramento community. The area had a 1975 population of 21,500 with an anticipated 1985 population of 30,800. This area can be roughly divided into an older northern portion (north of Florin Road) with a 1975 population of 11,379 and an anticipated 1985 population of 13,511, and a younger southern area with a 1975 population of 10,117 and a 1985 projection of 17,288. Trends and projections are more fully summarized in Table 10-B.

3. Southgate Recreation and Park District

The Southgate Recreation and Park District consists of approximately 14.5 square miles and encompasses much of the younger growing area of the community. A significant portion of the District's land area is either undeveloped or sparsely developed with low density agricultural use. The 1975 population of the District was 25,900 with a projected 1985 population of 33,100. In 1978, the District provided thirteen park sites consisting of 74.25 acres of land. Trends and projections are more fully summarized in Table 10-C.
During the preparation period of the South Sacramento Community Plan, the Southgate Recreation and Park District has also been preparing a Master Plan. That plan is incorporated within this document, to the end that hearings on the Environmental Impact report of the one will serve the other.

Problem Areas

1. By far, the largest per capita theoretical park acreage deficits occur in the Fruitridge Recreation and Park area, where a net deficit of 24.5 acres exists. The situation is mitigated partially by extensive use of school facilities and nearby city parks.

2. Acreage deficit in the Fruitridge, Colonial, Southgate, and Lindale-Florin areas of the City of Sacramento need to be addressed.


C. Policies

The recommendations which follow are based on analysis of demographic trends, existing acreage and subjective weighting of the effect of nearby facilities and/or joint school/park usages. The recommendations center on the neighborhood park needs of the recommended areas and completion of community parks where they address neighborhood needs. The Planning staff does not visualize any problems at the community park level provided that the current plans for the community parks at Fruitridge, Nicholas, Reservoir, Rutter, Trailhead, and Valley Hi are fully implemented, eventualities which seem very probable at this time. Note: All recommendations are oriented toward a 1985 horizon. However, the impact of Proposition 13 passage on parks is presently unclear and could pose serious problems for the future.

1. Fruitridge Recreation and Park Area

a. The two proposed mini-parks in the Fruitridge-Pocket area should be developed as soon as possible. The park sites acquisition funds have been allocated from 1976-77 Community Development Block Grant monies.

b. The Fruitridge Community Park and Community Center should be developed as soon as possible. The Service Area has purchased the site with tax revenues and the Community Center funds have been tentatively committed from future Block Grant monies.

c. A mini-park should be purchased and developed in the Sacramento Boulevard/Campbell Soup area. Funding for this park should be considered in the 1978-79 CDBG funding cycle.
d. A neighborhood park is called for in the Clayton B. Wire Elementary School area. This need is strongly mitigated by the joint use facilities at both the Wire and Ethel Baker Schools. Development of this park, while important, is of lesser priority than the others mentioned above.

e. Service Area 4A should consider raising their tax effort from $.35 to the SB 90 limit of $.395/$100 assessed valuation. (Southgate Recreation and Park District, for comparison, has a current rate of $.73 against an SB 90 limit of $.62/$100 assessed valuation.) The Service Area should also assume an aggressive posture toward applying for county, state and federal grants.

(Note: This discussion was developed prior to Proposition 13 passage)

2. City Recreation and Parks Department

a. A mini-park should be purchased and developed in the City Farms area (north of Campbell Soup). (Maple School Park)

b. The western portion of the Colonial plan area has a definite lack of facilities. Although the need is partially mitigated by facilities at Peter Burneett Elementary and Will C. Wood Junior High Schools, a neighborhood park is definitely called for there. Any funds expended for park development in this area should be oriented toward service to the entire population of this community.

c. The area bounded by Mack/Meadowview Road, Center Parkway, and City limits, and the Western Pacific Railroad has been divided into three subareas:

Area I. This area is bounded by Meadowview Road on the north, Franklin Boulevard on the east, Union House Creek on the south, and the WPRR on the west.

1) The park and open space needs for Area I can be adequately met if the City acquires a 6.5 acre site on the southern portion and utilizes a school/park program in cooperation with Elk Grove School District in the northern portion.
2) If the school district decides to release the site in the northern portion, then the City should be provided the opportunity to acquire most of the site for park purposes.

Area II. This area is bounded on the north by Mack Road, Center Parkway on the east, Union House Creek on the south, and Franklin Boulevard on the west.

1) The existence of a major park/school complex should adequately meet the needs of the residents in Area II.

2) The City should request the right to acquire a portion of the Elk Grove School District property south of Bamford Drive and adjacent to the elementary school shown on the South Sacramento Area Community Plan. It is anticipated that the school district eventually sell the property since it is not reserved by the district based on a prior school planning commitment.

Area III. This area is bounded by Union House Creek on the north, Bruceville and the City limits on the east, Sheldon Road and the City limits on the south, and Franklin Boulevard and the City limits on the west.

1) The acquisition of two park sites by the City should adequately meet the recreation and open space needs of the residents of Area III. The presence of public facilities in Valley Hi School and Cosumnes River College greatly enhance potential recreational access to residents in this area.

2) The City should attempt to develop a portion of the proposed school site west of Center Parkway and South of Mack Road in an effort to eliminate duplication of public land acquisition. In any event, the City should indicate an interest in the school site for park purposes should it be declared unnecessary by Elk Grove School District.

d. The proposed community park along Power Inn Road at the underground water reservoir should be developed as soon as practicable. Funding for this site should receive consideration prior to the currently planned 1980-81 funding cycle.

e. Development adjacent to or incorporating recreational easements and off-street bikeways should provide for appropriate access to the local street system.
### TABLE 10-A  PROJECTED PARK NEEDS BASED ON NEIGHBORHOOD PARK ACREAGE STANDARDS
FRUITRIDGE RECREATION AND PARK AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINOR ZONES</th>
<th>CORRESPONDING PARK PLAN AREAS</th>
<th>1985 PROJECTED POPULATION</th>
<th>EXISTING ACREAGE 1975</th>
<th>1985 THEORETICAL PER 1000 POP.</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE EXISTING/THEORETICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>744200</td>
<td>A + B</td>
<td>4249</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>(-)9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845030</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>(-)3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746200</td>
<td>D, E + F</td>
<td>9518</td>
<td>10.0*</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>(-)11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10-B  CITY OF SACRAMENTO DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINOR ZONES</th>
<th>CORRESPONDING PARK PLAN AREAS</th>
<th>1985 PROJECTED POPULATION</th>
<th>EXISTING ACREAGE 1975</th>
<th>1985 THEORETICAL PER 1000 POP.</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE EXISTING/THEORETICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>845030</td>
<td>Fruittidge (Por)</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>(-)3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732200</td>
<td>Colonial (Por)</td>
<td>7871</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(-)1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845010</td>
<td>Southgate (Por)</td>
<td>11674</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>(-)18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748000</td>
<td>Lindale- Florin (Por)</td>
<td>3045</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(-)7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896530</td>
<td>Valley Hi (Por)</td>
<td>6691</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(+)8.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes the acreage planned /shown as "community park" which also fills the needs of a neighborhood park.

**The excess park acreage in this area is deceiving. There is an average in the immediate Valley Hi Park area, however, neighborhood parks will still be needed in other parts of the Valley Hi area as defined by the Park Department as development occurs. The 12 acres planned in this area includes only the three additional park sites proposed in the portion of the Valley Hi area which is being considered in the South Sacramento plan study area.
## Table 10C
**SOUTHGATE RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINOR ZONES</th>
<th>CORRESPONDING PARK PLAN AREAS</th>
<th>1985 PROJECTED POPULATION</th>
<th>EXISTING ACREAGE 1975</th>
<th>ACREAGE SUMMARY 1985 THEORETICAL NEED PER 1000 POP.</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE (EXISTING/THEORETICAL)</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL ACREAGE PLANNED BY SERVICE PROVIDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>845000</td>
<td>1-Bowling Green</td>
<td>2770</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5 14</td>
<td>(-) 0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849001</td>
<td>2-Parkway Estates</td>
<td>4803</td>
<td>20.5*</td>
<td>11.0 24</td>
<td>(+) 9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747000</td>
<td>3-Nicholas Area</td>
<td>3818</td>
<td>13.3*</td>
<td>14.5 33</td>
<td>(-) 1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747020</td>
<td>4-North Parkway</td>
<td>2736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750020</td>
<td>5-Southgate Library Area</td>
<td>2187</td>
<td>16.5*</td>
<td>5.0 11</td>
<td>(+) 13.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750010</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748010</td>
<td>6-Larchmont-Lindale</td>
<td>3951</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.0 20</td>
<td>(-) 4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750000</td>
<td>7-Lindale</td>
<td>5336</td>
<td>22*</td>
<td>12.0 26</td>
<td>(+) 10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751170</td>
<td>8-Florin</td>
<td>2340</td>
<td>4.5*</td>
<td>10.5 24</td>
<td>(-) 6.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751170</td>
<td>9-East Florin</td>
<td>2455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>750010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793310</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793320</td>
<td>11 Kirchhater</td>
<td>6227</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14 31</td>
<td>(-) 12.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793320</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes the acreage planned/shown as "community park" which also fills the needs of a neighborhood park.

1/2 = portion of minor zone.

SAT-7 B-15-16
**BREAKDOWN OF ACREAGE SOUTHGATE DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Parkway - Crofoot Park</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Park</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florin Creek Park</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Central Area - Trailhead Park</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylor Sports Field</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Nicholas - Sky Park</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) North Parkway - Nicholas Park</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Reese/Rutter -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutter School</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutter Park</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reese School</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) &amp; (9) Florin, Florin East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florin Civic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Park</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florin School</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Southgate Recreation and Park District

a. The Nicholas Community Park Development should proceed on schedule.

b. Trailhead Park should be expanded to district park size as funding becomes available.

c. To provide greater recreational opportunity to residents of the northern portion of the District, consideration should be given to joint development of the City's Reservoir Community Park northeast of the Larchmont-Lindale area.

d. Development of the community school park near Rutter Junior High School should proceed on schedule. The District currently has seven acres that are contiguous to the school. Master planning and development of both the school and park site could meet the needs of residents in the immediate area.

e. Neighborhood parks are justified immediately in the Florin, East Florin and Kirchgater areas. These needs are mitigated by the relatively large amounts of open space in these areas, and also in the Kara Tract area by the development of tennis courts at the Florin School. Development of parks in these areas should proceed when practicable.

f. Retention of recreation easements along Florin, Elder, and Union House Creeks where shown as bikeway on Map 10-B should be accomplished. Wherever possible, especially when the opportunity arises such as a condition on a rezone or subdivision, bikeway and hiking and/or riding trail easements 30 feet in width should be taken along all creeks and canals.

II. Flooding

A. Problem Statement

As the need for housing increases in the South Sacramento area, the Planning Department expects increased pressure from developers for permits to build within the 100-year floodplains. Unchecked development in a floodplain may increase the flooding hazards to homes within the area. Additionally, the potential for increased volumes in flood channels exist because of increasing amounts of land covered with impervious surfaces. Water quality in streams will no doubt decrease as more areas are urbanized. Taking into consideration the restrictions set by the Cobey-Alquist Flood Plain Management Act, and the needs of the community as it continues to grow, the Board of Supervisors decision must be made as to how to zone the areas affected by flooding.
B. Physiography

The South Sacramento area is contained within the Morrison Creek drainage basin. The topography of the basin is very flat. Slopes are between 10 and 45 feet per mile. Drainage direction is to the southwest, but locally it may be virtually non-existent. Some flood problems arise from the inability of standing water to drain off the land rather than from running water inundating an area.

The five main streams, from north to south, are:

1. Morrison Creek: the largest stream. Completely channelized within the study area, but subject to flooding south and east of the Army Depot.

2. Florin Creek: During the summer of 1977, Florin Creek has been channelized in a section west of Stockton Boulevard and west of Highway 99. Future flooding is unlikely in this area and a restudy of flood potential should be made by the Corps.

3. Elder Creek: Channelized and not subject to flooding. East of the Southern Pacific Railroad, the creek is unchannelized and may flood.

4. Unionhouse Creek: Channelized, but flood prone just east of the Western Pacific Railroad. North Unionhouse Creek is channelized but subject to flooding east of Highway 99.

5. Laguna Creek: Unchannelized and has a wide floodplain, some of which remains wet all year round.

C. Present Trends

In 1976, the Army Corps of Engineers compiled flooding and flood control information for the Morrison Creek Basin to be used as part of the Flood Insurance Study (FIS) for the Federal Insurance Administration. In the recent past, the Corps has recommended that all creeks within the area be channelized to accommodate the "standard project flood." Recently, the Corps has suggested that a re-evaluation of the plan is in order. As noted above, reaches along some of the creeks in the South Sacramento area still flood, and in areas such as along Florin Creek the County has gone ahead with, or is planning, improvements of the channels.
D. **Restrictive Legislation**

The Cobey-Alquist Flood Plain Management Act of California restricts construction in flood prone areas. It states in part:

> Construction of structures in the designated floodway which may endanger life or significantly restrict the carrying capacity of the designated floodway shall be prohibited. ... Developments shall be permitted within the restrictive zone in accordance with local agency policy, giving full cooperation to the protection of human life and the carrying capacity of the floodplain.

Additionally, there is federal legislation concerned with flood insurance programs under which the county places property subject to flood hazards in a special zone. The Planning Department notes that some development has already occurred within the floodplain, mainly along Florin Creek. However, this floodplain boundary is subject to modification.

E. **Programs and Policies**

The Planning Department recommends that the following policies be adopted for flood prone areas:

1. No structures shall be built within the area designated as floodway by the FIS (Map 10-C).

2. Land within a 100-year floodplain (shading, Map 10-C) shall be designated a flood combining zone. The main effects of this zoning are:
   a. Buildings may not be more than 2 stories or thirty feet in height.
   b. Buildings designed for human habitation must have a first floor elevation no lower than required by the Sacramento County Water Agency Engineer or the Sacramento City Public Works Department. Further, as established by the Federal Insurance Administration, a more specific minimum requirement is that the first habitable floor elevation must be at or above the 100-year flood level.
   c. Minimum lot or parcel size shall be that required by the basic zone, but no less than 20,000 square feet.
   d. Minimum lot or parcel width shall be that required by the basic zone, but no less than seventy-five (75) feet.
3. Structures already built within the floodplain shall be exempt from the flood-combining zone regulations, but owners will be notified that the flood potential exists during the land use zone hearing process inherent to this plan.

4. Unchannelized streams shall be left in their natural state, consistent with flood prevention requirements, and their 100-year flood boundary designated as floodway (policy 1). Streams affected by this policy will be portions of Laguna Creek, and South Unionhouse Creek east of Highway 99.

5. For that portion of Laguna Creek located within the Sacramento City limits, it is suggested that development be regulated in a similar fashion as is proposed for flood prone areas within the Laguna Community area in the unincorporated county. It is proposed that an ordinance be adopted by the Board of Supervisors that generally conforms to the following:

**DRAFT CONCEPT**  
SPA (Special Planning Area) - Laguna Creek

**INTENT (May include but not limited to)**

a. Protect and preserve the floodplain in as natural a condition as possible.

b. Provide a natural and lasting boundary between Laguna community and the Sacramento Metropolitan area to the north.

c. Protect future residents from flood potential.

d. Provide opportunities for future open space amenities.

e. Promote the "village" concept as shown on the adopted sections of the Laguna Community Plan.

f. Control development through special review procedures.

g. Control residential densities.

h. Require open space dedications.

i. Burden of proof is placed with the developer when proposing development within 100-year floodplain/SPA.

j. Encroachments into floodplain with fill may be acceptable to round out boundaries on a logical basis.
III. Community Area Street Trees, Image and Improvement Programs

The South Sacramento Community area has long suffered an image problem that is only presently being corrected. The area is flat and lacks native trees and significant vegetation. Most urban residential areas are attractive because of planting by property owners. Some commercial/industrial areas and virtually all vacant areas are devoid of any attractive, maintained growth.

The Southgate Recreation and Park District Master Plan by Barvietto, Carissimi, and Rohrer, Architects and Planners, Inc., consultants, and the Murray McComick Environmental Group includes a discussion and a plan proposal relating to this problem. Portions are included in this report because the recommendation goes beyond the Southgate District Boundary and is suggested as an action program to improve the community area's image.

Greenbelts and Bicycle Paths

A boulevard and street tree planting program is recommended as an extension and integrated part of the greenbelt element of the Recreation, Park and Open Space Master Plan for the Southgate District. The visual enhancement which can be achieved by major thoroughfare tree planting will create a distinctive and pleasant environment for driving, walking, and cycling throughout the community. Bicycle trails as well as pedestrian walks through parks, greenbelt connections and along the major streets will provide for safe and enjoyable circulation within given areas, and from one area to another. Every attempt will be made to design a system which gives optimum separation of pedestrian and bicyclist traffic from automobile traffic.

The species of trees used should be sufficiently varied to provide interest in foliage color and texture, with some flowering varieties for seasonal accent. The mature size and form of the tree varieties selected will be most important in achieving an appropriate sense of scale and aesthetic quality along boulevards, walks and paths that are to be planted. Considerable use of large scale deciduous tree varieties will provide the much needed summer shade and desirable winter sunlight. Intermingled with these should be strong accents of broadleafed evergreen and coniferous tree varieties for year-round color and body to the planting scheme.

District Image and Improvement Programs

The District possesses unique qualities such as spaciousness, close proximity to agricultural and natural landscape, and meandering water courses providing opportunity for possible development as aesthetic and recreational
amenities. Along with these advantages, the District also possesses in some areas what we have euphemistically come to term, "Urban Blight." Few communities have been fortunate enough to escape the degradation and the declining environmental quality that appears to be associated with urbanization. Much as we talk about the weather and our inability to influence its outcome, we have also apparently come to accept environmental degradation as the price of "progress," but must this necessarily be so? Must a community accept unimaginative and uninspiring land use design? Must urbanization necessarily be associated with ugliness? Must vast seas of asphalt replace natural soil and vegetation? Must children play in streets dodging vehicles to chase after a ball? Must we be deprived of beauty, an opportunity to commune with nature - an opportunity to experience tranquillity and peace?

The desire for such an environment is quite natural, but unfortunately we have come to accept mediocrity or worse in our urban environment as the best we can hope for. It is the contention of the Master Plan that this need not be; other communities have successfully controlled blight and improved their community environment. Following is an outline of suggested subjects for consideration in a program to improve urban environmental quality:

**Improvement Programs**

Whether modest or grandiose, few of the following suggestions will ever succeed unless the residents of the community are aware of the problems and concerned with their solution. Community image and urban beautification is not a critical issue to arouse the average resident; the responsibility, therefore, lies with the community and district leaders to inform and impress upon the residents that the quality of one's physical environment is not a superfluous fringe benefit, rather, that it should be an integral part of the pursuit for a better life.
A. Community Awareness Programs on Environmental Quality and Design

These may involve polls, school programs, public media coverage and support, public meetings, and formation of committees.

B. Community Action Programs

Civic improvement efforts of citizens to stimulate the improvement of private property.

C. Public Programs and Regulations

1. Provide leadership and support of public programs and regulations providing for the preservation and improvement of the environment.


3. Participate in regulatory activities affecting land use and environmental quality.

4. Support and provide incentive for the design of exemplary developments.

D. Control of Sensory Impacts

Support the adoption of controls and ordinances for the regulation of such sensory factors as: noise, visual impact, noxious fumes, etc.

Specific Recommendations Regarding Aspects of Urban Environment Directly Affecting Parks and Recreation

A. Street Tree Program

Establish a street tree planting and maintenance program following a professionally prepared District Street Tree pattern. This is especially critical along major thoroughfares, for which current county street tree programs may not be providing sufficient landscaping. Trees should be planted along public utility easements such as drainage canals, power line easements, and maintenance roads.
B. Treatment of Commercial and Industrial Areas

Commercial and Industrial areas of the district should be aesthetically treated to blend more harmoniously with their surroundings. In addition to improved landscaping of buffer areas and parking lots, commercial areas should contain mini-parks, pedestrian rest areas or park-like child care centers. Likewise, industrial areas would benefit by the provision of mini-parks for employees' lunch and coffee breaks. These special parks could be developed by cooperative arrangements among several participating stores or industrial firms.

C. Encouragement of Commercial Recreation Uses

Some types of recreation facilities are best provided by private enterprise. Traditionally, such recreation activities as bowling, miniature golf, or ice skating are privately owned and operated. This Master Plan covers only district-administered recreation facilities, but actively endorses the concept of privately-operated commercial recreation. Commercial buildings such as portions of shopping centers, which for a variety of reasons become vacant, might be the ideal location for commercial recreation ventures.

D. Clean-up of Deteriorating Neighborhoods, Buildings, and Unkempt Vacant Lots

Citizens' campaign for neighborhood improvements and clean-up should be encouraged. Public agencies and private companies, which are able, should actively assist in such efforts with manpower, equipment, and surplus material. The district should investigate the possibility of forming a youth recreation and labor force to assist in the rejuvenation of portions of their community. Many communities have formed summer youth clean-up crews to remove weeds and debris from vacant and occupied property.

Vacant or unused property may be a possible short-term source of recreational facility. The district should investigate the possibility of short-term leases or loan of unused private or public lands and improvement with recreational potential.
The specific recommendation for the South Sacramento area is that a Street Tree Planting Program be developed as a part of a countywide effort.

Funding of such a program could be one or a combination of:

A. Revenue sharing monies

B. Community Development Block Grant monies

C. Special District formation throughout specific areas such as presently exists with lighting maintenance districts, etc.

D. Donations by area residents in terms of trees with volunteer labor and equipment with park district maintenance of trees, and a special maintenance tax structure or some other funding procedure.
CHAPTER ELEVEN
PUBLIC SERVICES

I. Libraries

A. Existing Conditions

The joint City-County Library System has responsibility for the provision of library services to all of Sacramento County. The libraries which affect South Sacramento residents are described later in this section.

The Sacramento County Master Plan Element for Library Physical Development establishes optimum standards for library facilities based on several criteria: (a) optimum service radius for regional/community libraries; (b) optimum population served; and (c) optimum population per square foot of floor space. This latter standard is the one which is most critical and which is used as the basis for this analysis. The existing service radii (based on the square footage standards) for the libraries affecting South Sacramento are shown on Map 11-A.

Note: With the passage of Proposition 13 funding for services such as libraries is unclear. Future predictions and projections are subject to increasing margins of error.

Libraries serving South Sacramento are the following:

Martin Luther King Regional Branch Library

According to Sacramento City County Library standards, as quoted in the Library Master Plan, the optimum size of a regional branch library is 25,000 square feet. King Library has 15,000 square feet.

The standards also say that there should be 250 square feet for every 1000 persons served. Using the actual square footage of King (15,000 ft.²) and the 250 sq. ft./1000 standard, approximately 60,000 people can be served by this library. Map 11-A indicates the saturation service radius of King Library based on these standards.

A separate standard, also used in the Library Master Plan, indicates that a regional library should serve 100,000 to 175,000 persons. Given the size of King Library, this is neither possible nor desirable.

Also, according to the standards, a regional library should have a service radius of about 5 miles. If the maximum of 175,000 persons served by a regional library is used, the rough service radius of King Library is 6 miles. (This figure was derived from 1975 Census information, and is approximate.) If the service area of King Library is in accordance with its present size and a population of 60,000 is served, then the service radius is roughly 2 miles.

It should be noted that the library standards are approximate, flexible, and may be somewhat arbitrary. Strict adherence to them may be neither desirable nor necessary.
TABLE 11-A

KING REGIONAL LIBRARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25,000 ft.² floor space</td>
<td>15,000 ft.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 - 175,000 people served</td>
<td>60,000 served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service radius 5 miles</td>
<td>Service radius 2 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 11-B

SOUTHGATE COMMUNITY BRANCH LIBRARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12,000 ft.² floor space</td>
<td>12,000 ft.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 - 50,000 people served</td>
<td>30,000 served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service radius 2 miles</td>
<td>1-3/4 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 50,000 persons were to be served by Southgate Library, the service radius would be 2-1/2 miles. (Calculated from 1975 U.S. Census Data.)

Note: The standard for square footage for community libraries is 400 square feet for every 1000 persons.

Local Branch Libraries

No standards apparently exist for optimum floor space, persons served, or service radius for local libraries. For this report, we adopted the standard of 400 ft.²/1000 persons (identical to the corresponding community library standard) in order to have some measure of the service radii and population served by these libraries.

FRUITRIDGE

Size: 500 ft.²

Population Served: 1250

Service Radius: roughly 1/2 mile
MABEL R. GILLIS

Size: 3500 ft.²
Population Served: 8750
Service Radius: roughly 1 mile

BELLE COOLEIDGE

Size: 3944 ft.
Population Served: 9860
Service Radius: roughly 1/2 mile

OAK PARK

Size: 2332 ft.²
Population Served: 5830
Service Radius: roughly 1/2 mile

Three of the four local branches are in leased space.
The service radii of all the above libraries is indicated on
Map 11-A.

B. Trends and Projections

Given existing floor space, the optimum square footage
service radii of the King and Southgate branches will shrink
in proportion to the population increases in their respective
areas. (The service radii of the smaller branches will
remain about the same because of low population increases
expected in their areas.) The Southgate optimum radius will
shrink to approximately one mile by 1995.

C. Problem Statement

The major problem, aside from funding, as viewed by the
Planning staff, is that the population north of 47th Avenue
will become increasingly less well served as increasing
demand is placed upon the Southgate facility by new residents
in that area.
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D. Alternative Solutions

Among the possibilities for addressing the problem are:

1. Inclusion of a small facility in the proposed Fruitridge Neighborhood Center. This would have the advantage of eliminating the need for the existing Fruitridge Branch and would also be central to the area identified as in need of services within the South Sacramento plan area. Construction and operational costs could be shared between the Fruitridge Recreation and Park Area and the Library System and could be largely supplied through Community Development Block Grant monies. Map 11-A indicates the theoretical service radius of a 4000 ft.² facility at the Fruitridge site.

2. A second, more wide reaching solution would be construction of a new, full-sized (12,000 sq. ft.) facility which would eliminate the need for the current Fruitridge, Oak Park and Gillis neighborhood branches. A theoretical service radius for such a facility located near the intersection of Stockton Boulevard and 14th Avenue is shown on Map 11-A.

3. Inclusion of a new facility in the planned Oak Park Community Center on 8th Avenue near Sacramento Boulevard. This alternative, however, would be off-center to the area of potential demand and off-center to an optimum configuration for replacement of the other three branches.

4. Continuation of the status quo.

The Planning staff cannot comment on which, if any, alternative would be most desirable because of the multitude of social factors involved. The large new facility would probably be the most cost effective, based on closure of the other three. Both Oak Park and fruitridge have had very low lending rates in recent years. The library administration staff would also be amenable to the larger facility concept as it fits in well with the other new facilities around the county. Either alternative (a) or (b) would be acceptable to the Planning staff. Because of recent legislation, funding of library services is presently unclear. Any improvements to this service in the South Sacramento will probably be very limited.

II. Sewers

A. Existing Conditions

The South Sacramento area is served largely by the Central Sanitation District, (See Map 11-B), with its county central treatment facility located near the southwest corner of the Study area. Except for the problem areas discussed in
Section C, virtually all of the district is or will be served as development occurs on a logical, contiguous basis. The county central facility is a secondary treatment plant. At present it is serving a population of approximately 125,000 people with a 1977 average dry weather flow of 17 M.G.D. (million gallons/day) and peak wet weather flow of 35 M.G.D. Its nominal design capacity is for 25 M.G.D. Source: (Project Report - NortheastInterceptor System, December, 1975, and Regional County Sanitation District information.)

B. Trends

According to the 1985 projections made in the Project Report for the Sacramento Region Wastewater Management Program, the combined industrial and municipal flows during peak wet weather times would be 47 M.G.D., and during dry peak weather times, 30 M.G.D.

The apparent over-demand on the sewer system will be handled in two ways:

1. Conservation: The trend for industry to recycle wastes, due to economic, legal and environmental constraints and for homes to use less water consumptive hardware.

2. The completion of the regional treatment plant at the county central location (to be operational by 1980) which will be able to nominally handle 136 M.G.D. average seasonal dry weather flow. This new facility will provide for consolidation of existing treatment facilities throughout the Metropolitan area, thus providing better protection for the Sacramento and American Rivers, with lower operational and maintenance costs.

The new treatment facility is expected to be activated in 1980 and is expected to adequately handle the county's waste through 1990, at which time some expansion will be required.

C. Problems/Policies

There are four geographical areas of concern relative to sewage facilities in the South Sacramento area, and an identified potential land use concern with the Regional Treatment Plant.
1. Southbreeze/Eastbreeze Subdivision (south of Gerber Road, west of Elk Grove/Florin Road) This area is also served by septic tanks which are, as mentioned, unsuitable. As a major trunk line exists along Florin Road, it would be feasible and reasonable for this area to be served. The median income of this area is over $12,000 ('74 Census Figure), the majority of the people (65%) own their home with mortgage payments of $225/month or less. An assessment to establish sewer service should not be an excessive economic burden.

2. Industrial Area (north of Florin Road, east of Power Inn Road, except the Army Depot) Major trunk lines do not exist in this area. An individual or developer would incur a substantial cost to bring service into the area. Industrial development would also have to consider some type of recycling system to reduce the waste disposal into the system. As mentioned in Section B.1., economic (cost of service), legal and environmental concerns will necessitate this reduction.

3. The Agricultural/Residential Area in the southeast quadrant of the Study area. This area has numerous septic tanks on individual lots. Services will have to be extended on an incremental basis if urban development occurs, and costs may serve to inhibit development.

4. A Concern for Air Quality and Esthetics Near the Regional Sewage Treatment Plant. Although the District has purchased a considerable amount of land for buffer areas to the treatment plant, there still exists a possibility of conflict with uses in the general vicinity. Reference should be made to the Environmental Impact Report that is to be prepared for the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Facility for additional specific information. During development of this community plan this potential conflict was recognized, however, it is believed that the District itself has provided a sufficient buffer area to its operations without more land or resources being expended.
III. Solid Waste

A. Existing Conditions

Currently, solid waste disposal in South Sacramento is handled by the responsible agents indicated in Table 11-C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Type Client</th>
<th>Responsible Agent</th>
<th>Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Sacramento County Refuse Enterprise</td>
<td>Fruitridge Transfer Station/County Landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>Commercial/Residential</td>
<td>City Sanitation</td>
<td>City Landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>Commercial/Industrial</td>
<td>Sacramento Waste Disposal Company of other private permittee (any of 6)</td>
<td>SAWDCO Transfer Fruitridge Transfer County Landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>Commercial/Industrial</td>
<td>City Permittees (any of 20)</td>
<td>Fruitridge Transfer County Landfill/ L. &amp; D. Landfill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service is adequate and available on demand.

The Fruitridge transfer Station is a new, (1977) facility recently opened for ease of transfer to the county landfill. Solid waste is dumped into huge trucks for transfer. The service is available to private enterprise at a reasonable cost.

Location of the various disposal sites is indicated on Map 11-C.

B. Trends and Projections/Future Problems

Solid waste disposal will become an increasing problem in future years. Table 11-D is an excerpt from the Sacramento County Solid Waste Management Plan of 1975. It is clear that either future disposal sites will have to be acquired or that recycling and/or alternative uses will have to be considered.
DISPOSAL SITES
1. SACRAMENTO CITY DISPOSAL SITE
2. L. & B. D. LANDFILL
3. SACRAMENTO COUNTY DISPOSAL SITE
4. ELK GROVE DISPOSAL SITE
5. GRAND ISLAND DISPOSAL SITE

TRANSFER STATIONS
6. SAWDOD TRANSFER STATION
7. NORTH AREA TRANSFER STATION
8. FRUITRIDGE TRANSFER STATION (PROPOSED 1976)
9. LOCKE TRANSFER STATION (PROPOSED 1976)

DISPOSAL SITES AND TRANSFER STATION LOCATIONS

SOURCE: SACRAMENTO COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DIV.
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### Table 11-C

**EXISTING SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL SITES - ACTIVITY SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Identification</th>
<th>Site Acreage</th>
<th>Original Capacity (cu. yd.)</th>
<th>Remaining Capacity (cu. yd.)</th>
<th>Estimated Life Expectancy (Year)</th>
<th>Max. Depth of Fill (ft.)</th>
<th>Liquid Waste Restrictions</th>
<th>Paved Access Road</th>
<th>Ultimate Land Use Master Plan</th>
<th>Depth to Ground Water Table (ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sacramento County</strong></td>
<td>1. 652</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
<td>27,300,000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Sacramento</strong></td>
<td>1. 84</td>
<td>3,120,000</td>
<td>1,509,805</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Sacramento</strong></td>
<td>2. 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elk Grove (Waterman)</strong></td>
<td>1. 37</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>128,500</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Island</strong></td>
<td>1. 10</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA - Not Allowed
UNK - Unknown

**1. Total**
2. Acreage Used
3. Acreage Remaining
The problem cannot be addressed within the context of a community plan. However, the future situation could conceivably act as a future constraint to development and so is mentioned.

C. Policies

The South Sacramento plan endorses the recommended alternative in the Sacramento County Solid Waste Management Plan:

IV. Water Provision

Existing Conditions

The South Sacramento area is served by Citizens' Utilities Co., the Fruitridge Vista Water Company, Florin County and Tokay Park Water Districts and the City of Sacramento. The supply is currently from groundwater, except for the areas located within the City of Sacramento.

Areas currently not served are shown on Map 11-E. In all cases, for service line extension to occur, the initial costs must be borne by the developer who then, in effect, turns the system over to the district. In the case of Citizens' Utilities, the system is sold to the purveyor who then operates it at a profit. There is a process whereby some of the development costs are returned to the original developer as additional connections are made to the service line.

Further, this issue was carefully analyzed by LAFCO in a special report, "The South Area Water and Alternative Structures Study," and for additional information that text should be examined.

Future Problems/Trends

Data collected over the last several years demonstrates the increasing demand put on the South area's groundwater supply. Although recycling of some water and reduced consumption has tended to reduce the freshwater requirements, the recharge of the water table from precipitation, applied water (irrigation) and streamflow is not keeping up with the draw down. Overdraft has resulted in a subsequent lowering of the water table at the rate of about one and one-half feet (1-1/2) per year. This condition, including the long term use of groundwater, has been identified by the E.I.R. to be a significant impact. Recently, the Fruitridge Vista Water Company has experienced a three (3) foot annual drop of their water table.

The over-all problem of the South Sacramento area is thus twofold: 1) The constant drop in the water table, resulting in the need to utilize a surface water supply in the near future and; 2) The fragmented service by a number of purveyors.
An example of problems in the South area is the fact that a major City of Sacramento water main is located in the southern section of the Citizens' Utilities District. The residents of this area (along Elsie Ave.) have expressed the desire to have a public water supply; however, none would presently be available without annexation to the City of Sacramento. This example is similar to other areas and speaks for the need to provide a more efficient system to distribute public water (surface supply) in the urban areas. The result of this situation is inappropriate government boundary lines and piecemeal annexation.

Below is a copy of portions of the Public Works Department's Draft Recommendations to the Board of Supervisors (February 14, 1978) that relate to South Sacramento:

"2. Issue

The City of Sacramento, through the Major's testimony at the October 19 hearing and the City Manager's letter to the Board of Supervisors of January 27, 1977, has re-affirmed its willingness and intention to provide water from its entitlements to areas outside the city. There is no annexation condition attached to such water supply. The City of Sacramento has assured surface water supplies equal to 326 thousand acre feet annually but is currently using about 85 thousand acre feet annually.

The city is opposed to being included in a Countywide Water Agency and to the prospect of being subject to that agency's countywide taxing authority. They see no benefit accruing to the city from implementation of a countywide water plan. The Department of Public Works feels that a countywide water management plan will benefit the city through stabilizing and enhancing the area's economy; however, because the city itself has an abundance of water to meet all its conceivable water needs and has no groundwater overdraft problem, there is no need to include it in a water management agency.

Recommendation

The City of Sacramento should wholesale water to areas within and adjacent to its ultimate planned service area, transfer water and/or allow such water to be wheeled or diverted through its or other facilities. Negotiations should begin immediately to secure contracts with the city and any amendments of the city's rights or contracts, if any should be required, to allow the foregoing arrangements to be
made. Newly developing areas adjacent to the City of Sacramento, such as the Laguna Meadows development, should construct water transmission and distribution facilities tying into the city system. Operation and maintenance should be provided by the existing purveyor or through a County Water Maintenance District or zone of the Water Agency where no purveyor or other district or franchise exists.

The water purveyors dependent on ground water in developed and developing areas on the periphery of the City of Sacramento such as Fruitridge, Parkway Estates and Southgate should invest money otherwise used for additional supply facilities into the purchase of water from the city and construction of transmission facilities into their service areas.

In order to provide for the orderly development of water supply facilities for treated surface water through the city system or for raw water from the city's entitlement to the area outside the city limits but within the city's water rights application area, a comprehensive plan for the area must be developed. Planning for the area north and east of the city is included in the north area plan recommendations. The plan for the area south and east of the city limits must determine specific water needs, timing of water deliveries, costs and repayment schedules, and feasibility; the Countywide Water Plan found that this area, except for that portion between the most easterly city limits and Mather Field, could remain on groundwater, but groundwater quality considerations may promote surface water importation. Contracts must be executed with the city between various purveyors or overlying agencies desiring treated water in blocks of sufficient quantity to warrant expansion of the city's water treatment facilities."

The need for increased water supply is directly related to an area's population. Specific South area problems are:

A. Some existing and all future wells will have to be drilled deeper with concomitant increased costs of equipment and energy to pump the water greater lifts.

B. It is expected that lower quality water will be produced as a greater draw down occurs and deeper wells utilized. This problem will become significant to small private well operators such as motel owners, mobile home park owners, private residents in the rural areas, etc.
C. The industrial area east of the Army Depot, and the area south of Elsie Ave. have the problem of the need for long service line extensions with attendant high costs.

D. The Clayton B. Wire School area and St. Roses Cemetery area presently are not served by a public water supply. Private wells and pumps are utilized in these very low density areas. New residential developments or other uses will require annexation to the City of Sacramento for water service or the extension of service from an existing water company.

E. Conversion from groundwater to surface water requires the installation of transmission pipelines throughout a large part of an area initially served by local wells. Also, conversion from groundwater high in undesirable chemical constituents, such as characteristic of the South Sacramento Community area, can and probably will introduce serious quality problems as softer more aggressive surface water comes into contact with deposits and incrustations left by groundwater.

F. ISO ratings of 8 and 9 quickly point out the inability of existing groundwater supplies and related facilities to supply fire flows required for commercial, industrial and multiple family residential developments.

Policies

With anticipated residential, commercial, and industrial area expansion, alternatives to simply increasing the supply of domestic water should be investigated:

A. Required metering (It is recognized that this issue has been studied, further it is known that meters by themselves without a punitive and artificial water rate structure do not save water or reduce consumption; however, it is one method that must be kept in mind to control consumption.

B. Multiple-use of water, i.e., integration of water supply operations with liquid waste for recycling and reuse.

In addition, the following specific policies should be adopted:

A. Groundwater dependent systems installed in newly developing areas should be fully convertible to the use of surface sources.

B. The area near the Wire School mentioned in Problem D. above could have service extended to it by the Fruitridge Vista Water Company; however, those receiving the benefit would probably have to pay for the main extensions. City annexation could resolve the problem.
C. The area near St. Roses Cemetery mentioned in Problem D. above should be annexed to the City of Sacramento.

D. The recognized existing and projected water problems within the unincorporated South Sacramento County area may best be solved by a single governmental agency or by the City of Sacramento supplying water outside of its boundaries without the condition of annexation as described by the City Mayor on October 19, and the City Manager on January 27, 1977.

E. Rapid conversion to the use of surface sources should be encouraged. Well drilling and additional draws on the groundwater should be minimized.

F. Every effort should be made for new growth to occur in as contiguous a fashion as possible, thus better utilizing the public improvements (water, sewer, electric, etc.), that are a requirement of urban areas.

G. Water purveyors should meet required ISO fire flows before development is approved.
V. Electrical Project Study

General

This project report covers the electric power requirements for the area described in the "South Sacramento Area Community Plan", hereafter called Community Plan. This report will analyze and show the present and ultimate electrical usage, plus the present and future facilities required to meet the needs of the community.

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) provides electrical power to most of its customers through a 69,000 volt (69 kv) subtransmission system to many distribution substations. There are approximately 130 of these stations now installed in the SMUD system. These stations transform 69 kv to 12,000 volts (12kv). In addition, there is a 230 kv transmission network that is the power source for the above described system. Finally, the 12 kv system is used to serve the thousands of pole mounted and surface mounted transformers that serve the residential customers at 120/240 volts and other customers at various voltages.

The community plan area is all served at 12 kv with the exception of the small completely developed area north at Fruitridge Road. The 12 kv distribution stations and the 69 kv subtransmission lines will be discussed in detail in this report. The 230 kv transmission lines and 230 kv substations plus generation requirements will be discussed very briefly.

Demand Parameters

Using the South Sacramento Area Community Plan the load can be reasonably anticipated. The approach taken in this report will be to start with the projected ultimate development and establish an ultimate electrical system design or master plan. Then as development proceeds, this plan can be implemented on an as needed basis with proper planning to prevent capacity shortages or installation of excessive capacity.

For single family and duplex housing, the electrical demand is expected to be between seven and twelve kilowatts per unit. These loads have been chosen based on past load studies and on experience related to sizing the distribution service transformers. The variation in demand per unit is related to basically whether the houses are electrically heated or not. However, it is assumed that a high percentage of the homes will have electric air conditioning systems.

Apartments and townhouses are expected to cause an electrical demand of three to four kilowatts per dwelling unit. The demands are lower than single family houses for a number of reasons; smaller living space, common walls, perhaps different living habits of the occupants, fewer persons per dwelling, vacancies, etc. Also it is assumed that most if not all new apartments and townhouses will have electric air conditioning.

*This section was developed by the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD).
Commercial and especially industrial demands are very difficult to forecast. For example, a food canning plant's demand is very high relative to demand from warehouses. An existing industrial section in the South area was studied and a demand per acre of 43 kilowatts was noted. To allow for higher and lower demand levels, 30 and 60 kilowatts were chosen as reasonable values.

When all the individual unit demands are added together, the total measured demand is always less than the sum of the unit demands. This effect is called diversity and comes from the fact that all electrical equipment does not operate at the same time. A diversity factor of 65% has been chosen from past experience and is applied in this study.

Distribution System Design

All these variables add up to a degree of uncertainty that must be faced when designing a system to serve the ultimate load. The method that has been chosen and shown on the attached map entitled Exhibit I will allow for a range of electrical demands. The variation in demands in time or from one area to another can be accommodated by simply installing larger or smaller equipment. This method allows a high degree of flexibility and fine tuning to ensure an adequate distribution system but limiting overbuilding and excess investment. The response time to actual load growth can be as short as a year, but normally two years lead time is required to order equipment, purchase and construct station sites.

There are 13 existing substations that wholly or in part serve the community plan area. Refer to the map entitled Exhibit I. It has been determined from the results of Table III (end of section) that ultimately approximately 25 station locations will be needed. To determine the number of stations required divide "Capacity Required to Serve Projected Load" of approximately 500,000 kW by 20,000 kW per station. The new stations required are shown as triangle outlines on the attached map, Exhibit I.

Timing of substation installations can be approximated using the results of Tables I and II. These tables indicate that 2.5 new stations will be needed by 1985 and 7 new stations by 1995. However, it is more practical to purchase and develop a substation site in the area at the time that development takes place. If the capacity is not needed at the time of small area development, space should be set aside and designated for future SMUD use.

The 69 kV power lines that serve the distribution substations are normally built overhead along streets. The existing lines are shown on the map entitled Exhibit I and they are planned to remain as they are. It can be seen from this map that the proposed substations are located adjacent to these lines. At the time of total development, at least one new 69 kV line will probably be required. Its most likely route would be along the Southern Pacific Railroad from Elsie Avenue to a future planned major 230/69 kV substation south of Elk Grove.
Transmission Lines and Major Substations

As mentioned above, a major 230/69 kV substation is being planned in the early 1980's in the vicinity of Grant Line Road and the Southern Pacific Railroad. This community plan development will require ultimately half of the capacity of this station plus half the capacity of an existing major substation shown as "Pocket" on the map entitled Exhibit I.

A general transmission system plan\(^2\) has been prepared and approved by the SMUD Board of Directors. This plan anticipates construction of a new 230 kV double circuit transmission line running south from the Pocket substation to a proposed substation near Elk Grove. One possible route would be along the Western Pacific Railroad.

Generation Requirements

This community plan development in its ultimate configuration would require from 300,000 to 500,000 kilowatts of additional electric generation equipment to be built. At the present time SMUD has 649,000 kW of hydroelectric generation and 910,000 kW of nuclear generation and a 1977 peak demand of 1,354,000 kilowatts. It is apparent that the approval of this community plan will commit SMUD to a significant and sizable investment.

Environmental Impacts

The environmental effects of substations in general consist of three items—(1) noise generation; (2) visual effects; and (3) hazards due to the presence of high voltage equipment.

The major noise source is the transformer which emits a 120 Hz hum. The District is now buying transformers with a 60 dBA sound level measured six feet from the transformer. With suitable measures such as location, orientation or sound barriers, the sound level can be reduced to less than 55 dBA one foot outside the station's property line. This sound level conforms with the noise ordinance specifically Section 6.68.120 Machinery, Equipment, Fans and Air Conditioning.

The visual effects will be mitigated with suitable fencing and landscaping. The landscaping will be installed at the time of station construction if possible. The design will be such that the appearance will be pleasing and conform to the standards of the community.

The 12 kV distribution lines will be buried to the point they can be connected to existing facilities.

The appearance of the 69 kV lines will have an insignificant effect since the substations will be built near existing lines. There would be the addition of one or two poles associated with each station.
Safety is of primary importance in the design of the fencing. It will be at least eight feet (8') high as described in a paper prepared by a special fence committee. The result involves a fence that is a formidable barrier to casual intruders and still maintains the esthetics of the area.

Energy Conservation

SMUD has an aggressive energy conservation program that is outlined in a document prepared for the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission. This document analyzes the effect on energy and demand related to the various programs outlined.

The community plan recommends policy directions relating to yard area, house orientation and tree planting to minimize energy consumption. However, any energy savings as a result of these efforts are unknown as are any reductions in demand.

Flexibility will always be a distribution design policy and it is this flexibility that will allow SMUD to construct facilities to meet these expected changing load patterns.
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TABLE I

SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA
ELECTRICAL REQUIREMENTS - 1985

A) Existing Electrical System Capacity (1975)----------------------------- 157,550 kW

1. Electrical Demand for 1975 (Measured)--------------------------------- 111,100
2. Remaining Capacity minus 20% reserve---------------------------------- 14,940

Additional Planned Development (1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family and Duplex</td>
<td>32,249 kW</td>
<td>55,284 kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments and Townhouses</td>
<td>15,090</td>
<td>20,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>16,050</td>
<td>32,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 acres (30-60 kW/acre)</td>
<td>66,389</td>
<td>113,504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apply 65% diversity x .65       x .65

B) Diversified Total (New Load)------------------------------------------ 43,153

111,100

Total Projected Load (A & B)--------------------------------------------- 154,253

Apply 20% reserve x 1.20                                                 x 1.20

Capacity Required to Serve Projected Load-------------------------------- 185,104

221,854
### TABLE II

**SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA**  
**ELECTRICAL REQUIREMENTS - 1995**

A) **Existing Electrical System Capacity (1975)**  
1. Electrical Demand for 1975 (Measured)  
   \[111,100\]  
2. Remaining Capacity minus 20% reserve  
   \[14,940\]

---

### Additional Planned Development (1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family and Duplex</td>
<td>14043 units (7-12 kW/unit)</td>
<td>98,301 kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments and Townhouses</td>
<td>15394 units (3-4 kW/unit)</td>
<td>46,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>200 acres (30-60 kW/acre)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1071 acres (30-60 kW/acre)</td>
<td>32,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>182,583</strong></td>
<td><strong>306,292</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply 65% diversity</td>
<td>x .65</td>
<td>x .65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

B) **Diversified Total (New Load)**  
1.  
2. **Total Projected Load (A & B)**  
   \[229,779 \times 1.20\]  
   \[310,290 \times 1.20\]

**Capacity Required to Serve Projected Load**  
\[275,735 \times 1.20\]  
\[372,348\]
### TABLE III

**SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA**

**ELECTRICAL REQUIREMENTS - ULTIMATE**

A) Existing Electrical System Capacity (1975)----------------------------- 157,550 kW

1. Electrical Demand for 1975 (Measured)----------------------------- 111,100
2. Remaining Capacity minus 20% reserve----------------------------- 14,940

**Additional Planned Development (2020)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>LOW</strong></th>
<th><strong>HIGH</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family and Duplex</td>
<td>40351 units (7-12 kW/unit)</td>
<td>282,457 kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments and Townhouses</td>
<td>29725 units (3-4 kW/unit)</td>
<td>89,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>450 acres (30-60 kW/acre)</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>2409 acres (30-60 kW/acre)</td>
<td>72,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>457,402</strong></td>
<td><strong>774,652</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apply 65% diversity x .65

B) Diversified Total (New Load)--------------------------------------- 297,311

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>LOW</strong></th>
<th><strong>HIGH</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Projected Load (A &amp; B)</td>
<td></td>
<td>408,411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apply 20% reserve x 1.20

Capacity Required to Serve Projected Load----------------------------- 490,093

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Projected Load</td>
<td></td>
<td>614,624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacity Required to Serve Projected Load----------------------------- 737,549
### TABLE 11-D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florin**</td>
<td>$849,352</td>
<td>23,526</td>
<td>24,958</td>
<td>36.10</td>
<td>59.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitridge</td>
<td>188,024</td>
<td>10,959</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>626,357</td>
<td>16,272</td>
<td>16,272</td>
<td>.38.50</td>
<td>47.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento**</td>
<td>9,578,789</td>
<td>260,700</td>
<td>261,482</td>
<td>36.74</td>
<td>46.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 11-E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florin**</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23,526</td>
<td>24,958</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitridge</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10,959</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16,272</td>
<td>16,272</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento**</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>260,700</td>
<td>261,482</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes fire fighters, clerical help and part-time paid fireman - does not include volunteers.

**All figures are for the entire district; however, only a portion of Florin and Sacramento City Fire Districts are in the South Sacramento Plan Area.
Some fire departments have also taken on the added responsibility and expense of providing ambulance services to their districts. Florin Fire Protection District received 1,178 requests for their ambulance service in 1976/77, which surpassed 800 requests for fire fighting services. This involves not only the expense of extra equipment, but also that of training personnel to handle that type of emergency. It also, potentially at least, reduces the manpower available for responding to fire calls.

Insurance Services Office (ISO) rates the districts according to the fire hazard faced by the fire department. The districts are rated according to their performance on standards set by ISO to insure adequate station location, personnel performance and water supply. Urban areas are rated around 4 and rural areas around 9. Florin, for instance, has an ISO rating of 8 for 75% of their district. Sacramento City Fire District, on the other hand, is rated 2 for the entire district.

High ISO ratings are usually due to a lack of water supply. Water problems, for fire fighting purposes, result from a lack of commercial and residential development which would insure the installation of water mains and hydrants. This lack of facilities causes a hardship on a unit trying to fight a fire in such an area, and also causes ISO premiums to be higher for the fire district and for the homeowner in that area.

**Future Needs**

The needs for future fire protection in the South Sacramento Plan Area will be greatest in the Florin Fire District. This area has the most growth potential compared to the other three fire districts which are already heavily developed. Financing the construction of new stations can be handled fairly well through the tax override. However, the cost of maintaining and improving a fire station, whether new or old, is a problem shared by all the districts. The fixed tax rates allow for population growth, and the tax override provides for additional stations and expensive equipment; but neither allow for rises in the cost of maintaining and improving existing stations, equipment and fire fighting techniques -- the most cost-consuming part of fire protection.

Presently, fire districts are managing, though some have had to cut back on services and personnel in order to do so. In the future, however, the financial situation of fire districts could become extremely difficult unless adequate provisions are made for the rise in their cost of living expenses and the recent decrease in funds from property tax.

An additional fire station is planned for the near future in the Florin Fire Protection District, outside the South Sacramento Plan Area. Otherwise, the present number of fire stations is adequate for the immediate future with some facility expansion.
Logically speaking, the Fruitridge and Pacific Fire District areas should be incorporated into the city (thus falling into the Sacramento City Fire District), as they are part of the metropolitan area. However, past attempts at annexation have met with opposition from the people of the districts, so there is little prospect that the situation will change in the near future. A further alternative would be the consolidation of some special districts, and this could be beneficial to fire districts funding.

**Policies**

Water purveyors should meet required ISO fire flows before development is approved.

**B. Police Protection**

**Introduction**

Police protection for the South Sacramento Plan Area is shared by two separate law enforcement agencies. Sacramento City police provide protection for the incorporated portion, and the County Sheriff's Department protects the unincorporated portion of South Sacramento. Additionally, the California Highway Patrol provides traffic control. Although comprehensive police protection involves much more than patrol activities, this is the most visible aspect of law enforcement at the community level. Community attitude toward the patrolman and the quality of protection he provides helps to determine their financial and moral support of the police department. Conversely, adequate public support helps to determine the quality of police protection able to be provided to communities. Cooperation between the police departments and members of the community is not only desirable, but has been proven to be effective in reducing crime.

**Problems**

Some types of crime are associated with certain land use patterns. For instance, auto theft, burglaries (breaking and entering a building with intent to steal), and rape are associated largely with residential development. Robbery (of a person as opposed to a building) is associated primarily with commercial development — in particular, shopping centers such as Florin Center. Statistics kept by the County Sheriff's Department indicate a high incidence of these types of crime in South Sacramento.

Some features of residential areas can present a more hazardous situation for patrolmen than is necessary. Housing developments with access problems such as cul de sacs, apartment complexes with poorly lighted interior courtyards, and residential streets with little or no lighting make criminal apprehension and crime prevention very difficult.
Within the unincorporated portion of South Sacramento, information of crimes has been recorded by minor analysis zone. A review of this data shows certain areas having significantly higher crime rates by type than others of both South Sacramento and the unincorporated county as a whole. Included are burglaries, robberies, rapes and assaults. While there is little a document such as a community plan can do to reduce criminal activity, there are actions that area residents and business persons can follow in order to reduce the opportunity of the criminal to commit a crime.

Policies and Programs

Community aid, collectively in the form of neighborhood watch associations, or individually in becoming aware of crime prevention programs and procedures, can be one of the most effective ways of lowering crime statistics.
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APPENDIX - A

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE SOUTH SACRAMENTO PLAN

Preface

The following written comments have been received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Preliminary South Sacramento Area Community Plan to the time of adoption. Public hearings have been held before the Policy Planning Commission on the subject plan during April, May, June, July and August of 1978. Public hearings have been held on this Plan and EIR before the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors during September, October, November and December of 1978 and the plan was adopted December 6, 1978.

Where appropriate the responses have resulted in changes to the EIR, Community Plan and plan map. The written comments with responses to all EIR related issues are a part of this appendix. A series of letters relative only to small scale land use issues are not included, but are on record and in some cases have resulted in plan map changes of minor or no consequence.

The Preliminary South Sacramento Area Community Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report includes a summary of the EIR and the preparers estimation of the overall effect of the project. Conclusions regarding environmental effects and methods of mitigation are based on the present plan. Any significant changes from the adopted plan for a proposal should be evaluated for consistency with the conclusions of the EIR.
SACRAMENTO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

In Re Hearing On ) FINDINGS
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COMMUNITY PLAN )
MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT )

The matter of the Proposed Community Plan for the South Sacramento Area designated as a project pursuant to Section 15037 of the State EIR Guidelines and County procedures adopted pursuant to Chapter 20.01 of the Sacramento County Code, came on regularly before the Policy Planning Commission (hereinafter hearing body) on the regular meeting date thereof on April 6, 1978, and thereafter continued from time to time to August 29, 1978. Said matter then came on regularly before the Board of Supervisors (hereinafter Board) on the regular meeting date thereof on September 20, 1978 and thereafter continued from time to time to December 6, 1978.

The Board having heard the Final Master Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed South Sacramento Community Plan, makes the following findings:

1. That a draft Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) was prepared for the project which identified one or more significant effects on the environment as defined by the State EIR Guidelines.

2. That the review period and Notice of Completion as required by the State and County Guidelines and procedures was given.

3. That a noticed public hearing was held by the hearing body, and that the notice of such hearing was adequate and complete.

4. That after said hearing, and after receiving and considering the written comments and oral testimony presented, the hearing body found the draft MEIR to be adequate and complete, found that the proposed South Sacramento Area Community Plan would have a significant effect on the environment, proposed certain findings to this Board.

5. That notwithstanding the identification in the draft MEIR of the following significant effects on the environment, the hearing body recommended approval of the project:

   A. Air quality along high volume traffic corridors, major commercial area parking lots and the larger air basin of which the Sacramento Metropolitan area is a part would be adversely affected if the project is implemented. The increase is a result of more vehicle miles travelled within the project area.

   B. Traffic would significantly increase with project implementation. Some major thoroughfares are projected to be close to their rated capacity by the year 1985. The resulting traffic congestion will add to the degradation of air quality in the project area.
C. Use of limited groundwater will continue to lower the water
table throughout the South Sacramento Metropolitan Area. Provisions to
mitigate the shortfall of water supply are a number of years away. Years
of study, large public expenditures and coordination between water
purveyors of the area are required before surface water becomes a viable
option to groundwater for general use.

D. Significant potential for conflict exists between proposed
land uses as shown on the project's land use plan. Areas include
industrial/residential interfaces, and heavy commercial/residential
interfaces; additionally the more common situation of major streets and
freeway conflicts with residential uses exists in various sections of the
project.

E. Development consistent with the project will require the construc-
tion of four elementary schools and one junior high school by 1985. The
further less than significant byproduct of this need will be overcrowding
of present schools that serve the high growth area.

6. That the Board of Supervisors' approval was based on the following
reasons for which there is substantial evidence in the record:

A. Regarding the impact in 5.A. above:

The South Sacramento Plan provides several mitigation measures
that through implementation of the Plan should lessen the identified
adverse impacts, but not to a degree that would eliminate the impacts.
The mitigation measures proposed are:

(1) A 100-foot residential building setback from Highway 99
is recommended.

(2) Adoption of this Plan will also serve to strengthen the
Bikeway Plan.

(3) Plan provides for an even distribution of community
oriented services (schools, parks and neighborhood commercial)
thus reducing some trip lengths.

(4) Average commute distances are shorter than in other
communities of the County.

(5) The Plan includes several transit improvements.

(6) Increased landscaping requirements and more definitive
placement of trees and shrubs in subdivisions, via zoning ordinances
to increase wind turbulence and dispersion.

(7) Parking areas are to be "broken up" to assist in the
mixing of air.

(8) Minimum setbacks are suggested for specific roadway links
throughout the community.
In preparation of the Plan, three alternatives were explored including high density development, no plan, low density development notwithstanding the adverse impact. These alternatives and their mitigating measures are deemed infeasible and the project should be approved because:

i. the County General Plan authorizes residential development for the South Sacramento Area.

ii. the social need to control sprawl and its attendant costs for services makes the alternatives suggested inappropriate.

iii. the mitigation measures will lessen but not eliminate the adverse impact.

B. Regarding the impact described in paragraph 5.B. above: The South Sacramento Plan provides several mitigation measures that, through implementation, of the Plan, should lessen the identified adverse impact but not to a degree that would eliminate the impact. The mitigation measures proposed are:

(1) The Plan provides higher residential densities near commercial and employment centers and major intersections, and designs these developments to encourage trips without the automobile.

(2) The ongoing Transportation Study will provide several partial solutions.

(3) The widening and continued development of Franklin Blvd.

(4) Widening and improvement of Meadowview Road and its connection with Mack Road. The re-evaluation of the Power Inn Road - Elsie Avenue connection and an improved and/or alternate Mack Road - Elsie Ave. - Power Inn Freeway connection.

(5) The development of the Ex-route 148, transportation corridor as a major street from the U.S. 99 Freeway new interchange to a connection with I-5 to the west.

(6) Public transit routes and schedules will be re-evaluated to determine intra-community travel needs. One or more predominantly east-west routes should be established and include Fruitridge Road and 47th Avenue.

(7) A street improvement program will be carried out such that heavy industrial traffic flows proceed north to Highway 50, north of the community and south to Freeway 99, rather than east-west through residential-commercial areas. Specifically, this will require the widening and improvement of Power Inn Road.
(8) Concurrently with community development, a program of widening, traffic control installation and general improvement will be undertaken as is reflected on the major streets and highways plan.

(9) Where feasible, all future major rail crossings will be separated. Considering the large amount of traffic the street carries, the Florin Road crossing of the Western Pacific Railroad should also be evaluated to determine the feasibility of a grade separation in the near future.

(10) As development occurs along jurisdictional boundary streets, the City of Sacramento and County of Sacramento will cooperate and coordinate development standards with the object being a consistency of size, type of improvements and development.

In preparation of the Plan, three alternatives were explored including high density development, no plan, low density development notwithstanding the adverse impact. These alternatives and their mitigating measures are deemed infeasible and the project should be approved because:

i. the County General Plan authorizes residential development for the South Sacramento Area.

ii. the social need to control sprawl and its attendant costs for services makes the alternatives suggested inappropriate.

iii. the mitigation measures will lessen but not eliminate the adverse impact.

C. Regarding the impact described in paragraph 5.C. above: The South Sacramento Plan includes a mitigation measure that, through its implementation, should lessen the identified impact. However, the implementation of the measure is not within the jurisdiction of the County to implement without the cooperation of several private water districts. The mitigation measure proposed is:

The Plan proposes a conjunctive water use program and an emphasis upon future development of surface water delivery systems. A conjunctive water use plan would insure a safe sustained yield from groundwater sources as well as use of surface water supplies which are now underused. Such a plan will aid fire protection in that required flows could be maintained through a more centralized water distribution system as specified in the Public Services Element of the General Plan. Groundwater sources are sufficient to meet the current demand. South Sacramento users, however, must share this supply with other users in the County. Water is pumped from underground, and this situation has resulted in a one-foot per year decline of the water table for the past 10 years. Even at this rate of pumpage, it is estimated that enough water remains in the underground aquifer to supply the County's needs and, therefore, South Sacramento's needs through the year 2000.
In preparation of the Plan, three alternatives were explored including high density development, no plan, low density development notwithstanding the adverse impact. These alternatives and their mitigating measures are deemed infeasible and the project should be approved because:

i. the County General Plan authorizes residential development for the South Sacramento Area.

ii. the social need to control sprawl and its attendant costs for services makes the alternatives suggested inappropriate.

iii. the mitigation measures will lessen but not eliminate the adverse impact.

D. Regarding the impact in paragraph 5.D. above: The South Sacramento Community Plan provides several mitigation measures that, through implementation of the Plan, should lessen the identified impact but not to a degree that would eliminate the impact. The mitigation measures proposed are:

(1) Special Planning Areas.

(2) Neighborhood Preservation Areas.

(3) Policies controlling development of interface areas between specific land uses. Among the policies listed are minimum setback requirements, planting requirements, physical barriers, insulation, reduced building heights and sound suppression.

In preparation of the Plan, three alternatives were explored including high density development, no plan, low density development notwithstanding the adverse impact. These alternatives and their mitigating measures are deemed infeasible and the project should be approved because:

i. the County General Plan authorizes residential development for the South Sacramento Area.

ii. the social need to control sprawl and its attendant costs for services makes the alternatives suggested inappropriate.

iii. the mitigation measures will lessen but not eliminate the adverse impact.

E. Regarding the impact in paragraph 5.E. above: The South Sacramento Community Plan provides several mitigation measures that, through implementation of the Plan, should lessen the identified adverse impact but not to a degree that would eliminate the impact. The mitigation measures are:
(1) Adoption of County Ordinance 1187 or a change in overall funding are possibilities for funding of new elementary schools in the Reese/Kirchgater area (i.e., near the intersection of Gerber and Power Inn Roads), and in the Mack/Leimbach area (i.e., west of Valley Hi).

(2) A new junior high school for the Valley Hi area.

(3) Valley High School will be developed to its full 2550 capacity.

(4) Should the area bounded by Mack Road (extended, the Western Pacific R.R., former Route 148 and Franklin Boulevard be developed, an additional elementary facility will be needed to accommodate the additional 700+ students generated in this area.

(5) The General Plan for areas affected by these recommendations will be changed.

In preparation of the Plan, three alternatives were explored including high density development, no plan, low density development notwithstanding the adverse impact. These alternatives and their mitigating measures are deemed infeasible and the project should be approved because:

i. the County General Plan authorizes residential development for the South Sacramento Area.

ii. the social need to control sprawl and its attendant costs for services makes the alternatives suggested inappropriate.

iii. the mitigation measures will lessen but not eliminate the adverse impact.

7. That the Findings proposed by the hearing body are adequate and complete and hereby adopts such Findings based upon the record of the hearing body and the testimony presented to the Board.

8. That the final MEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the State EIR Guidelines.

9. That the Board has reviewed and considered the information contained in the final MEIR, the testimony presented at the hearings thereon, and the proposed findings, and hereby certifies the final MEIR.
On a motion by Supervisor Smoley, seconded by Supervisor Kloss, the foregoing resolution was passed and adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Sacramento, State of California, at a regular meeting thereof this 6 day of December, 1978 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: Supervisors: Melarkey, Sheedy, Smoley, Wade, Kloss

NOES: Supervisors: None

ABSENT: Supervisors: None

\[Signature\]

CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF SACRAMENTO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

(SEAL)

ATTEST: CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Response to Don Rivett, General Recreation Supervisor,  
Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento County  

Page iii - Index

Staff partially agrees, Chapter 10 renamed "Parks and Recreation, Community Aesthetics and Open Space" as shown on page 10-1 and included geology within the Environmental Element.

Page 103 - Chart— (Now page 4-8)

Staff agrees, error identified and corrected to read 11,449.

Page 160 - Neighborhood Park (Now page 10-8)

Both standards are shown on Table 10-A, B and C

Page 155 - Bikeways— (Now page 6-12)

Spelling correction is noted.

Page 168 - "The five— (Now page 10-12)

Correction noted.

Page 223 - Martin— (Now page 11-1)

Correction noted.
To: Lance Bailey, Director
Planning & Community Development Department

From: Don Rivett, General Recreation Supervisor
Department of Parks and Recreation

Subject: South Sacramento Area Community Plan

I have just finished reviewing the Preliminary South Sacramento Area Community Plan, and feel that staff and Advisory Council members are to be commended for an excellent job.

I have no suggestions for major changes, but have noticed some minor items.

Page 11 - Index
Under the heading "Recreation" are listed - Flooding, Geology, Street Trees and Community Image. These three items appear to belong under the "Environmental Element".

Page 103 - Chart of Employment by Community Area
North Central indicates total employed to be 20,430. Yet there are 21,449 people shown as employed in the Public Administration segment.

Page 160 - Neighborhood Park
Standards shown are 2 to 2.5 acres of parkland per 1,000 population. The Board of Supervisors adopted new parkland standards (5 acres per 1,000 population) in December, 1977. Should this be reflected in the Plan?

Page 155 - Bikeways - 3rd paragraph:
"Bikeway" is misspelled - "Bikeway Plan"

Page 168 - "The five main streams...."
#3 Elder Creek...East of the SPCR.... Should this be SRR?

Page 223 - Martin Luther King Regional Branch Library
3rd paragraph "a regional library should serve 1000,000 to 175,000 persons"

None of these are vital concerns, but correction may avoid confusion.
Response to Joseph P. Alessandri, Chief
Water Resources Division, Sacramento County
Department of Public Works

Page 168 (Now pages 10-12 and 13)

Paragraph 1 -
Correction noted.

Paragraph 2 -
Correction noted.

Paragraph 3 -
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reviewed planning maps relative to flood boundaries and corrections have been noted. See letter this file, June 7, 1978.

Page 171 (Now page 10-15)

Paragraph 1 -
Correction noted.

Paragraph 3 -
Correction noted.

Page 213 (Now page 7-34)

Correction noted.

Page 237 - The policy statement—— (Now pages 11-13 through 18)

Policy Statement is included in text on above pages 11-13 through 18.

Paragraph 1 -
Correction noted.

B. Fruitridge Vista——
Correction noted.
To: Lance Bailey, Director
   Planning and Community Development

From: Joseph P. Alessandri, Chief
   Water Resources Division
   Department of Public Works

Subject: South Sacramento Area Community Plan

I have the following comments concerning drainage and water supply covered in the subject plan.

Page 168

Paragraph 1 - The Planning Department can recommend appropriate zoning of flood prone areas, but the Board of Supervisors decide.

Paragraph 2 - 10 and 45 feet per mile are slopes, not elevations.

Paragraph 3 - The effect of channelization of Florin Creek on flooding in the area can be assessed. We would be happy to provide you with an assessment.

Page 171

It is unrealistic to state flatly that unchannelized streams shall be left in their natural state. There are too many factors to be considered in whether improvements are necessary or not. After the word "state" in the first line, insert "consistent with flood prevention requirements".

Page 212

Paragraph 1 - The base of fresh water is not necessarily the bottom of the Mehrten Formation. Department of Water Resources Bulletin 104-11 (page 30) states that "for the purpose of the groundwater model, the base of the Mehrten Formation would represent the base of fresh water." (Emphasis added.) This paragraph implies that all the fresh water to the base of the Mehrten is useable; this is not so. The base of fresh water was assumed to represent a TDS of 2,000 mg/l, with the 200 mg/l TDS level extending to depths of 400 to 500 feet rather than the 800 to 1900-foot level implied in the paragraph. This paragraph should be re-written to reflect more accurately the useable groundwater situation described in Bulletin 104-11.
Paragraph 3 - Groundwater recharge does not occur primarily along stream channels. Page 32 of DWR Bulletin 104-11 states that all streams other than the American, Sacramento and Colinas Rivers contribute an average annual groundwater recharge of 12,900 acre feet out of a total of 361,900 acre feet county-wide or about 3-1/2%.

Page 213

Change the first item to read: Conjunctive use of ground and surface waters with the objective of stabilizing groundwater levels should be established as the primary water management objective of all water purveyors within Sacramento County.

Page 237

The policy statement indicates a lack of understanding of the water supply situation in Sacramento County. Attached is a copy of the Public Works Department's draft recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on the Countywide Water Plan. Item 2 of the recommendations affects the South-Sacramento Area.

Paragraph 1 - Required metering has been studied extensively, most recently in connection with AB 775 (Perino), the mandatory metering bill introduced in 1977. Meters by themselves without a punitive and artificial water rate structure do not save water or reduce consumption.

B. Fruiltidge Vista is a water company not a district, and the territory cannot be annexed to the company. (Correct references also in paragraphs 1 and 3, page 236.) The water company could extend services to the areas but main extensions would probably have to be paid for by the property owners, with later reimbursement by the water company. Annexation to the City would result in treated service water being made available to the area.
Response to L. Frank Goodson, Projects Coordinator, Resources Agency, State of California

See response on page 230 (now page 11-8). The correct forum for this issue more properly belongs in the EIR developed for the Regional Treatment Plan, however, the potential for conflict is recognized by this plan and the DEIR.

Presently a draft Environmental Impact Report is being prepared titled "Sewage Sludge Management Program" with completion set for Winter 78-79. This document will contain an analysis of the potential for odor related problems in and near the treatment plant.
Memorandum

To: Mr. L. Frank Goodson
Projects Coordinator
Resources Agency
Resources Building, 13th Floor

County of Sacramento
827 Seventh Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Central Valley Region
3201 S Street, Sacramento, California 95816
Phone: 445-0270

Subject: Review of Notice of Intent: SCH 78013105 - Deir-South Sacramento Area Community Plan

The area of study is adjacent to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Facilities currently under construction. Emphasis should be given to the air quality and esthetics sections of the proposed EIR. The people responsible for reviewing the EIR and lay people should clearly understand the significance of locating next to a major sewage treatment facility. The EIR should address possible impacts of the Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant on adjacent developments and mitigating measures.

Richard P. Rose
Acting Chief
Delta Watershed
Response to George C. Weddell, Chief, Engineering Division,
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
February 16, 1978 and June 7, 1978

a. Page 168 ---- (Now pages 10-11 and 12)
   Correction noted.

b. Page 169 ---- (Now page 10-13)
   Correction noted.

c. Page 169 ---- (Now page 10-13)
   Correction noted.

d. Page 170 - Flood Maps (Now page 10-14)
   County submitted zone maps to Corps for correction. These
   flood lines are to be used relative to zoning. See June 7th
   letter.
Mr. Lance Bailey
Director
Advanced Planning Section
Planning and Community Development
Department
County of Sacramento
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. Bailey:

This is in response to your 20 January 1978 letter requesting comments on the Preliminary South Sacramento Area Community Plan (revised to January 1978).

Our specific comments are as follows:

a. Page 168 - Present Trends - 2nd sentence: Although the Morrison Creek Stream Group feasibility study completed by the Corps of Engineers in 1972 did recommend a plan which included increasing the hydraulic capacity of portions of some streams in the Basin, our letter to Sacramento County dated 10 January 1977 indicated that reevaluation of the plan is in order. However, the Corps of Engineers did not recommend in the 1976 Flood Insurance Study that the area be channelized to accommodate the Standard Project Flood. No recommendations are contained in the Flood Insurance Study.

b. Page 169 - Restrictive Legislation: To be complete, the paragraph should discuss Federal Legislation concerning flood insurance as well as State and local legislation.

c. Page 169 - Programs and Policies - para 2(b): As established by the Federal Insurance Administration, a more specific minimum requirement is that first habitable floor elevation must be at or above the 100-year flood level. The County could require a higher elevation than the 100-year flood elevation but not lower.

d. Page 170: The flood plain map shown does not agree with the Corps of Engineers Flood Insurance Study completed for this area.
SPKED-W  
Mr. Lance Bailey  

16 February 1978

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Preliminary South Sacramento Area Community Plan.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE C. WEBBELL  
Chief, Engineering Division

CF: Mr. Alcides Freitas  
Environmental Coordinator  
County of Sacramento  
827 7th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814
Mr. Brant Clark  
County of Sacramento  
Planning and Community Development Dept.  
717 K Street, Room 203  
Sacramento, California  95814  

Dear Mr. Clark:  

We have completed our review of the land use zone maps for the South Sacramento Community Plan inclosed with your 1 June letter.  

We limited our review to the areas with specific zone designations on the maps and we assumed that the (F) symbol identified areas subject to 100-year flooding. We are returning your maps (Inclosure 1) with areas shaded in red where our interpretation of the flood plains are different.  

If you have any questions, please call Mr. Tom Christensen, (916)440-3268.  

Sincerely yours,  

[Signature]  

GEORGE C. WEDDELL  
Chief, Engineering Division  

1 Incl  
As stated  

7 June 1978
March 1, 1978

See attached letter to Mr. Lockett for full staff response.

Changes have been made to the text of the Air Quality Section beginning on page 180 (now page 7-1).

An addition has been made on pages 3-13, 14 and 15 relating to the population issue on a county-wide basis. Some confusion is evident in Mr. Goodson's letter between 1995 population and holding capacity population for these noted community plans. As an example, the South Natomas plan projects a 1995 population of 32,900 persons and an ultimate (No Time Frame) of about 62,000.

On May 23, 1978, county staff met with Mr. Nevis of ARB staff with the purpose in mind of resolving ARB's concerns. The result was a text revision and update and the proposal to include a roll-back model for CO analysis at a typical street intersection and to include in the text an analysis of how South Sacramento fits into SRAPC's regional oxidant analysis. These items will be incorporated into the final EIR.
July 24, 1978

William C. Lockett, Chief
Planning Division
California Air Resources Board
1131 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Lockett:

My staff and I truly appreciate the critical review contained in your memorandum, dated March 1, 1978, on the South Sacramento Area Community Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report. It is our intention to work with you in every way possible to do whatever is necessary to adequately predict and, to the extent possible, mitigate future air quality impacts upon the South Sacramento community.

Concerning the comments contained in the memorandum on the overall future population of the area, we agree with the need to coordinate population projections among our various community areas. Attached is a countywide projection summary prepared by the County Planning Department on a community by community basis which shows how we believe South Sacramento's growth will fit in with the overall County's growth as constrained by the State Department of Finance's projections. Our projections for South Sacramento are based upon our own intimate knowledge of the County's sub-regional growth trends. We are open to any detailed criticisms you might have on these projections but would have to know the assumptions upon which you might base them. We realize that individual projections made in other plans by other jurisdiction (e.g., the City of Sacramento) may differ.

Concerning the land use proposals, we fail to see any significant differences between the South Sacramento plan and SRAPC's draft land use policy. The State Office of Planning and Research has remarked that the plan seems in line with the Urban Strategy regarding contiguous growth and infilling. Also, remember that this particular plan is more of a "fine tuning" of already well-established land use patterns than it is a plan for development of a virgin area.

Your concern over the implementation of the plan is a complex one. While we too are concerned over the future carbon monoxide emissions in the area,
we are not sure whether the plan, taken alone, can realistically address the problem. In our opinion, it is extremely doubtful that no plan (i.e., merely allowing existing zoning patterns to prevail) or any other realistic alternative plan would result in an improved air quality picture, whereas it is extremely probable that the proposed plan, with its emphasis on higher density along transit routes, proposed setbacks from line sources of pollutants, and emphasis on infilling and revitalization of areas close in to existing job centers would eventually improve the situation from what would have occurred without it. Proliferation of people and automobiles in this area is, more or less, inevitable. Stringent growth control in this area, close to major job centers, would probably just force growth further out elsewhere. Without drastic action initiated by the State, we feel that we are doing the best we can, given existing political and economic conditions.

Concerning the use of the methodology contained in the draft Land Use/Oxidant Precursors Emission Study, we had hoped that we had included sufficient caveats in the text to inform the reader that we were using a somewhat untested methodology, the results of which were subject to questioning, as are, in our opinion, all air quality forecasting methodologies published to date. The comments concerning the need to establish land use/emission functions for the specific area we feel are invalid and is not within the ability of this project budget to develop. Our understanding has been that the whole purpose of the Land Use/Oxidant Precursors Emission Study was to produce coefficients which could be used anywhere. The ones used here would be particularly valid, since they were developed for the Sacramento area and used in the Sacramento area. The comments on the use of 1974 functions for 1995 reflect a lack of full review of the technique used since the technological corrections to 1995 were appropriately applied for motor vehicle emissions after the projections were made using the 1974 functions (see p. 189). No assumptions were made concerning technological changes in the characteristics of non-motor vehicle emissions because no rationale could be found for doing so.

Several points of clarification and changes have been made throughout the analysis to improve its readability based upon your suggestions. We have added, at the suggestion of Mr. Nevis of your staff, a simple rollback model for prediction of oxidant as well as an analysis of a probable localized carbon monoxide situation.

Finally, concerning your comment on the need for consistency among city, county, and APCD methodologies, this would be greatly assisted by clear direction from ARB on the methodology to use in analyzing future plans of this nature.

Again, I would like to stress that air quality was a prime consideration throughout the design of this plan, especially from its "infill" and "selected high density" perspectives. The use of an alternative air quality forecasting methodology was viewed in part as an experiment. The effort made exceeds in many ways the efforts made on other plans we have reviewed. We hope it will be accepted in that light.
If I may be of further assistance or provide any further information on this plan, please let me know at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Brant Clark
Associate Planner

BC: as

Attachment
# TABLE 3-H

SACRAMENTO COUNTY POPULATION PROJECTIONS*  
(1975 to 1995) AND ANNUAL GROWTH RATE BY COMMUNITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community Area</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1995(s)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1995(a)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>North Natomas</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rio Linda-Elverta</td>
<td>12,434</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>North Central Area</td>
<td>51,800</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>74,450</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Citrus Heights</td>
<td>55,520</td>
<td>96,386</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>94,300</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Orangevale</td>
<td>18,474</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Polson Area</td>
<td>9,221</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>South Natomas</td>
<td>9,002</td>
<td>26,060</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>North Sacramento</td>
<td>41,710</td>
<td>50,299</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>41,700</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arden-Arcade</td>
<td>90,651</td>
<td>99,355</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>99,250</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td>41,489</td>
<td>57,801</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>49,650</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fair Oaks</td>
<td>17,817</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>30,750</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>57,661</td>
<td>87,949</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>94,300</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>29,125</td>
<td>31,066</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>32,750</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ind. Pk.-Pkt-Mdvw.</td>
<td>85,893</td>
<td>111,230</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>109,200</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>East Sacramento</td>
<td>77,916</td>
<td>83,937</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>78,400</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>South Sacramento**</td>
<td>58,023</td>
<td>86,421**</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>96,300**</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Vineyard</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Laguna Creek</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>9,895</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>7,969</td>
<td>18,632</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rural Area</td>
<td>12,061</td>
<td>14,539</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>14,900</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>5,387</td>
<td>8,553</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8,450</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COUNTY TOTAL 686,498 944,197 1.6 944,250 1.6

(s) = SRAPC 7/76  
(a) = Adjusted: County Planning 6177  
90 = Average annual compound growth rate  
*Based on State Department of Finance D-100 Projections.  
**Does not include Data Area F
Memorandum

1) L. Frank Goodson
Projects Coordinator
Resources Agency

2) Alcides Freitas
Sacramento County Environmental
Impact Section
827-7th Street, Room 301C
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: Air Resources Board

Date: March 1, 1978
Subject: South Sacramento Area
Community Plan and
Draft Environmental Impact
Report (DEIR)
SCH No. 78013105

We have reviewed the draft environmental impact report (DEIR) for the South Sacramento Area Community Plan. The plan comprises approximately 29 square miles with about 60 percent being the unincorporated area of Sacramento County. The remaining 40 percent is located in the incorporated area of the City of Sacramento.

We are concerned with the magnitude of this and other plans for the Sacramento area. To date, five major plans have either been proposed or adopted which, if implemented as anticipated, would provide for a population increase of 230,000 by 1995. These plans are South Natomas accommodating an increase of 62,000 in population; Meadowview, 60,000; Laguna Creek, 21,000; South Pocket, 45,000; and now South Sacramento, 42,000. The December 1977 Department of Finance projections, based on E-150, indicate a total increase of 240,000 people by 1995 for the entire county. It appears these five plans will provide for all but 10,000 of the anticipated increase through 1995. We question the validity of this as there are other areas in the county which are anticipating growth during this planning period. Therefore, we urge the City and County of Sacramento to reevaluate the need to accommodate this large population increase in the South Sacramento area at this time because the proposed plan seems contrary to the draft SRAPC Land Use policy.

In addition, we are concerned about the implementation of the plan as it will result in an increase of emissions in the Sacramento area when an overall decrease in existing emissions of about 50 percent is necessary if state and national ambient air quality standards are to be met. Review of the DEIR indicates the carbon monoxide (CO) standard will continue to be exceeded by this date unless mitigation measures are adopted which are not currently a part of the project. Congress mandated sanctions for regions which do not comply with the planning provisions of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977 (Section 176). If an adequate air quality plan is not submitted, or reasonable progress (as determined by the Environmental Protection Agency) is not being made, no new major industrial sources of pollution may be permitted in the region and highway funds and EPA grants, are likely to be withheld. The Amendments have placed rather stringent requirements on state and local government which can be met only through prompt, cooperative action by all levels of government.
The DEIR incorporates a methodology for calculating emission which appears inaccurate. The use of the methodology contained in the Draft Land Use of Oxidant Precursors Emissions Study (California Air Resources Board, 1976) seems inappropriate. The land use functions developed for the Emissions Study were for a portion of Sacramento larger than the study area and reflect particular spatial relationships. Land use emission functions need to be developed for the study area. Also, it is inappropriate to use 1974 functions for 1995 calculations. The 1974 functions do not account for changes between 1974 and 1995 such as emission control technologies or regulations, transportation patterns, or land uses.

In addition, several portions of the air quality analysis are confusing. Table IX-5 on Page 188, indicates several situations of land use, but does not explain the distinctions.

We recommend the consistent use of either kilograms and/or tons as indicators of measurement. Table IX-7, Page 192, beginning with "Total in Kilograms" needs explanation as it is not apparent how these calculations and numbers relate to the preceding tables.

The DEIR needs to contain the calculations used to obtain the CO emissions estimate of 32 tons per day for 1995 and 48 tons per day for 1975 noted on Page 193. We are uncertain about how these figures were derived. We recognize there are a number of methodologies available to calculate air pollutant emissions and concentrations resulting from the implementation of a plan or project. However, we suggest for the sake of consistency, that the staffs of the city and county, together with the air pollution control district staff agree on a methodology to use for the analysis of community plans. Different methodologies are used for different plans and can be confusing to the public and decision-makers. Also, we believe the use of an agreed upon methodology would make it easier to compare the analysis of community plans.

The analysis for CO mitigation measures was presented well. We support the suggested setbacks and of mitigation measures not incorporated as part of the plan. This will increase the possibility for the Sacramento Air Quality Maintenance Area to attain the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

William C. Lockett, Chief
Planning Division

cc: J. Meyer, SRAPC
G. Glissmeyer, Sacramento County APCD
EPA
Response to Keith L. Roberts, Chief
Florin Fire Protection District
March 3, 1978

1. District size was based on planimetering a County Fire District Map and it placed your area at 69.6 square miles. Without an engineered computation this department will continue to use the nearly 70 square mile figure. The LAFCO Sphere of Influence book said 68 square miles for your district.

2. Population figures are based on the 1975 Census using minor zone information and projecting to the specified year the correct estimated population, 1976-77, is 24,958 persons and the text has been changed to reflect that figure.

3. Some text changes have been made as a result of these comments. See pages 239 thru 243 (now pages 11-27 through 11-31).
Mr. Brant Clark  
Sacramento Planning Department  
717 K Street, Room 203  
Sacramento, California 95814  

Dear Mr. Clark:  

In reference to the SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA COMMUNITY PLAN AND DRAFT EIR dated January 24, 1978, I would like to bring a few things to your attention for possible clarification.  

1. Under fire protection, the report states that our fire district has an area of 70 square miles. I have always been under the assumption that our area consisted of 64 square miles. Which of us is right, and how did you arrive at your figures?  

2. Same question about population. Your report states 70,000 - ours is merely an estimate, but we figure closer to 50,000. I am not disputing your figures. We are probably the ones who are wrong, but I'd like to change our records if that's the case.  

3. There are what I consider numerous biased statements in the report concerning fire protection. If I didn't know better, I would think it was prepared by a city employee. Every time the Sacramento Fire Department is mentioned, it is with a superior tone or attitude. Whenever a fire district is mentioned, it is played down as something inferior. We admit that Sacramento has more fire stations and men, but the statement that they have great resources from which to draw and not so with the other fire districts is false. Every fire district in this state has the same resources from which to draw regardless of size, because we are all tied to a common mutual aid agreement. Did you know that last year Florin assisted the Sacramento Fire Department on 68 emergencies, and that they assisted us on 13?  

The report also gives the impression that we have not or cannot update our equipment. Are you aware that all the fire districts purchased new pumper last year and our district purchased three; and that we have a common alarm center that dispatches four different fire districts as if they were one? Did you know that Sacramento also has considerably low density land without adequate water supply for fire protection?
Another statement I take exception to is that funding determines quantity and quality of man power. Quantity I will accept, but quality has never been second rate in the history of this department. We have an outstanding training program that is equal to any in the state.

I could go on, but won't drag this out. I'll merely say that if you're standing in our shoes and reading this report, it appears biased.

I would be happy to discuss this report with you at any time, and if you can be any help to us on items 1 and 2, I would appreciate it.

Sincerely,

Keith L. Roberts, Chief

KLR/as

cc: South Sacramento Community Area
Planning Advisory Council
Response to E. F. Galligan, Deputy District Director,
Transportation Planning, State of California
March 3, 1978

Pages 152, 156 — (Now pages 6-10 through 6-17)

Information only.

On Page 202 of — (Now page 7-24)

It should be noted that these low noise standards are for lands
zoned for residential purposes and do not apply to all lands
county wide,

We note the — (Chapter 1, Implementation)

This paragraph has been changed to recognize the concern for
improvements to be placed near or on rights-of-way.

On Pages 156 --- (Now page 6-15)

The description to be utilized is former Route 148 alignment.
Street type proposed is an arterial.
Memorandum

To: Mr. Mike Evanhoe  
Business and Transportation Agency  
1120 N Street, Room 2101  
Sacramento, California  95814

From: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - ATSS 457-4543  
District 3, P.O. Box 911, Marysville, CA 95901

Date: March 3, 1978

File: 03-Sac-99  
Preliminary South Sacramento Community Plan  
SCH 78013105

Subject: We have reviewed the Preliminary (January 1978) South Sacramento Area Community Plan.

Pages 152, 156, and 158 of the report mention the Mack Road-State Highway 99 Interchange as one area of concern for traffic circulation in the South Sacramento area. This project has been tentatively programmed for F.Y. 1983-84 utilizing Federal-Aid Urban funds. This scheduling is dependent upon a number of variables, including availability of FAU funding.

On Page 202 of the report under the heading "Exterior Noise Standards," we note a 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. standard of 55 dBA and a 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. standard of 50 dBA. These standards appear unusually low to us, especially in view of the interior noise standards of the same magnitude (items (2) and (3) at the top of Page 203).

We note the statements made on Page 206 regarding the 100-foot-residential-building setback from State Route 99 and the recommendation that a noise attenuation barrier be provided. Where sound barrier walls are proposed, Caltrans would be interested in reviewing those near the Route 99 freeway. When walls, footings, or any other work is proposed on State highway right of way, an encroachment permit must be obtained from the Department of Transportation. We would encourage developers to establish contact with the District Office in Marysville to discuss sound attenuation with District officials, whether or not the sound attenuation facilities are proposed on State right of way.

On Pages 156, 157, and 158, the report refers to Route 148. We suggest that the authors seek another designation for this
corridor since it has been unadopted and is no longer State Route 148. It is unlikely that there will be any State construction in this corridor during the life of this plan.

LEO J. TROMBATORE
District Director of Transportation

E. F. Galligan
Deputy District Director
Transportation Planning

Attach.
Response to Office of Planning and Research,  
State of California  

For population questions, please review material relevant to Air Resources Board response and pages 3-13, 14 and 15 of Plan Report.

For land use related questions, it must be understood that the plan for South Sacramento is based on existing uses in an area largely committed to urban use. It considers city and county General Plans and other prior planning actions. There is not a great deal of flexibility in planning options for such an area and it is staff's belief that the most reasonable land use plan was proposed. A reasonable amount of background is needed to understand a technical report and plan such as this and there are many implied concepts or ideas that relate to other sections of the report. Each land use proposal cannot be explained in written form without an involved and detailed accounting. To explain: Public hearings are a major portion of the process of community planning. The public hearings result in a detailed discussion of issues related to land use within the context of the community or even entire County General Plan. As a result, the final product is the result of a preliminary plan, plan report, responses from agencies and individuals and public testimony.
In the broadest sense, the South Sacramento Area Community Plan is in conformance with California’s Urban Strategy*. It generally adheres to the three priorities of the Urban Strategy: to preserve and enhance existing urban areas (i.e., "in-fill"); and when necessary to locate outside the existing urban area, to do so contiguously. In adhering to the Strategy, the Plan includes the following objectives:

- maintaining the identity of existing residential neighborhoods;
- developing land use policies that maintain existing business areas, and encouraging their improvement;
- promoting culturally-oriented activities within the community;
- encouraging preservation and enhancement of the natural and human environment;
- preventing leapfrog or strip commercial development;
- providing policies and programs which deal with human problems, needs, aspirations and the welfare of the community;
- and providing for adequate domestic, recreational, public service and industrial water supply system within the community area.

The only concern regarding the Community Plan centers around its assumptions regarding future population growth and land use development. In projecting population growth, the Plan assumes an annual growth rate between 1975 and 1985 of 2.3% (from 62,700 to 78,900 or 16,000 total). It assumes a greater growth rate between 1985 and 1995 of 2.8% (from 78,900 to 104,300 or 25,000 total). It is unclear on what basis these projections were made. There is no metropolitan or regional context established within which these projections were presented. It is unclear whether these rates are relatively high or low compared to the region as a whole or to other developing areas within the region. Is this a reasonable share of growth or not? The Plan should be more explicit in this regard. A regional perspective regarding growth should be developed in conjunction with the Sacramento Regional Area Planning Commission.

The issue of population growth leads directly to a second issue: that is, whether the new urban development that is called for in the Plan and that encroaches upon presently non-urban lands is necessary or justified. The State's Urban Strategy acknowledges and provides for contiguous urban development, but only as necessary. The South Sacramento Community Plan presents its proposed residential and industrial growth in isolation from similar growth proposed elsewhere in the Sacramento metropolitan area. It is unclear for example whether there is truly a need for heavy industrial development in the northeast corner of the Planning area, on land that is currently vacant. It is unclear whether Sacramento's housing needs can be met other than on unoccupied lands in the southern portion of the planning area. Sacramento's community plans would be enhanced considerably if a metropolitan-wide perspective were presented within each plan; and the relationship between that plan the the broader needs, resources, and opportunities of the region as a whole were explained.

It should be clarified that the above comments do not disagree with the Plan's population projections or with its proposed new development on the fringe of already developed areas. The comments do maintain that the underlying assumptions and justification are not presented—and so a reasoned conclusion about the appropriateness of these proposals cannot be made.

Page 160, Paragraph 2 (Now page 10-1)
Paragraph rewritten.

Page 160, Paragraph 3 (Now page 10-1)
New standard shown both on page 160 and on Table VIII.

Page 161 (Now page 10-2)
Map changed to reflect comments of both this district and the Recreation and Parks Department of the City of Sacramento.

Page 162, Bikeways and Trails Map (Now page 10-3)
Map reviewed. Changes were made to also reflect comment received from the City of Sacramento.

Page 163, Paragraph 3 —— (Now page 10-4)
Paragraph rewritten.

Page 163, Problem Areas —— (Now page 10-5)
Paragraph changed.

Page 164, Paragraph A5 (Now page 10-6, paragraph 1 e)
Paragraph changed.

Page 165, Paragraph C3 (Now page 10-11, paragraph 3 b)
Paragraph changed.

Page 165, Paragraph C4 (Now page 10-11, paragraph 3 c)
Paragraph rewritten.

Page 165, Paragraph C5 (Now page 10-11, paragraph 3 d)
Paragraph reworded.

Page 167, Table VIII-1c —— (Now page 10-9, Table 10-C)
Table redone, incorporating Attachment A information.

Page 178 (Now page 10-21)
Sentence changed to reflect the need of additional maintenance funding source.

Page 236, Item 1 (Now page 11-13)
Paragraph reworded.

Page 236, Item 2, Paragraph 5 (Now pages 11-13 through 18)
Sentence added to paragraph.
March 24, 1978

Mr. Lance Bailey, Director
Planning Department
County of Sacramento
827 Seventh Street, Room 327
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: COMMENTS ON THE PRELIMINARY SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA COMMUNITY PLAN

Dear Mr. Bailey:

The Board of Directors of the Southgate Recreation and Park District has reviewed the Preliminary South Sacramento Area Community Plan. The Board is extremely pleased with the quality of the document and appreciates the efforts of your staff and the South Sacramento Planning Advisory Committee in developing this much needed document. It is the District's opinion that this plan will be the ruler required to facilitate proper growth in the South Sacramento Area. The District, therefore, lends whatever support necessary to ensure that both the quality of the document is maintained and the timeline for completion is achieved.

The Board of Directors recommends the following changes be made to the Preliminary South Sacramento Area Community Plan:

Section 8 Park & Recreation, Conservation & Open Space

Page 160, Paragraph 2:

It is the District's opinion that school facilities are a primary element of open space and recreation facilities. The District, therefore, suggests that this paragraph be rewritten indicating that school facilities should definitely be considered as sources of open space when reviewing park acreage needs within defined communities or neighborhoods.

Page 160, Paragraph 3, Neighborhood Parks:

The Sacramento County Board of Supervisors has adopted a standard of 5 acres per 1,000 population as part of the new Land Dedication Ordinance. The standard of 2.5 acres per 1,000 population shown on page 160 is inconsistent with this new standard.
Page 161:
As agreed upon by your agency, the Southgate Recreation and Park District Ten Year Master Plan Update should be substituted for the old plan which is indicated on this map. Your department has received the approved Updated Park and Recreation Master Plan from this District. Page 161 identifies four proposed park sites which have already been purchased by the District. These are as follows:

Park Site #6 – Bowling Green Park. The District currently has title to 6.79 acres at this location.

Park Site #7 – Nicholas Community Park. The District currently has title to 9.54 acres at this location.

Park Site #14 – Trailhead Community Park. The District currently has title to 13.35 acres at this location.

Park Site #15 – Rutter Community Park. The District currently has title to 6.76 acres at this location.

Page 162, Bikeways & Trails Map:
It is the District's recommendation that the Bikeways & Trails Map be reviewed and updated based upon changing conditions in the South Area. The District would recommend that the County adopt a policy requiring a 30' dedication along all streams within the County. This would provide an instrument to implement future pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle trails as identified within the South Sacramento Area Community Plan and the Sacramento City-County Bikeway Master Plan.

Page 163, Paragraph C, Southgate Recreation and Park District:
It is the District's recommendation that this paragraph be rewritten as follows:

"The Southgate Recreation and Park District consists of approximately 14.5 square miles and encompasses much of the younger growing area of the community. The major portion of the District's land area is either undeveloped or sparsely developed with low density agricultural use. The 1975 population of the District was 25,990 with a projected 1985 population of 33,100. In 1978 the District provided thirteen park sites consisting of 74.25 acres of land. Trends and projections are more fully summarized in Table VIII - IC."

Page 163, Problem Areas – Parks, Item C:
The words Bowling Green and Nicholas should be scratched from this paragraph. The District has recently purchased Bowling Green Park site and has a community park known as Nicholas Community Park.

Page 164, Paragraph A5:
The words "State Park Bond Issue monies" should be replaced by "County, State, and Federal grants." State Park Bond Issue monies are only a single use and are not projected to be available in future years.
The District's Master Plan Update recommends a 40-60 acre District Park at Trailhead Park site. This sentence should be reworded as follows: "Trailhead Park should be expanded to a district size park as funding becomes available."

The District is in disagreement with this entire paragraph. It is the District's opinion that the District should not co-develop neighborhood park sites located outside its jurisdiction. Neighborhood park sites would only serve the immediate area and, therefore, the Camellia School site would serve few District residents. The District suggests that the sentence should be reworded to indicate that the District is willing to jointly develop the proposed reservoir community park site. It is the District's opinion that the reservoir community park site, because of its size, would be multi-functional and thereby serve District residents. Additionally, it is located close to the District boundaries and most definitely is within the sphere of influence of the District.

This paragraph should be reworded as follows: "Development of the community school park near Rutter Junior High School should proceed on schedule. The District currently has seven acres that is contiguous to Rutter Junior High School. Joint master planning and development of both the school and park site would meet the needs of residents in the immediate area."

The District would recommend substituting the attached chart labeled Attachment A. This chart is from the District Master Plan Update and identifies neighborhood planning areas as designated within the Master Plan. By utilizing this chart, a more accurate comparison between the South Sacramento Area Community Plan and the District's Ten Year Master Plan Update could be accomplished.

The District is in favor of a street tree planting program within the South Sacramento Area community. This street tree program would enhance the aesthetic qualities of the community. It is the District's opinion, however, that Item D on page 178 is unacceptable. The District's tax rate capabilities are limited by law and, to maintain a street tree program as outlined on map VIII-4, would require an additional funding source. The District would recommend that a separate tax be developed for the implementation and maintenance of the street tree program. The actual day-to-day maintenance of this program could be accomplished by the District if existing revenue was augmented by this separate tax.

Chapter 11 - Public Utilities

The District recommends that the South Area Water and Alternative Structures Study, which was completed by LAFCO, be mentioned in the text within paragraph 1 or 2 of page 236. This study is significant in terms of the alternative governmental structures that could be provided in the South Area to eliminate existing water problems.
Page 236, Item 2, Paragraph 5:

In the text description of water related problems in the South Area, the focal point should center around the piecemeal annexation of unincorporated territory to the City of Sacramento due to the problems of water availability. The piecemeal approach to annexation that has occurred and will continue to occur in the South Area is forcing inappropriate government boundary lines and further reducing a common sense approach to providing governmental services to the public.

Thank you in advance for your consideration on these items.

Sincerely yours,

FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

ROBERT P. THOMAS
GENERAL MANAGER

RFT:ir

Enclosure

Copy to South Area Planning Advisory Council
NEIGHBORHOODS DEFINED

The principle factor used in defining neighborhoods in the Master Plan Update refers to a residential area whose geographic center is not more than one-half (1/2) mile safe walking distance from the outer periphery. Generally, one can refer to a neighborhood as corresponding to the residential area containing an elementary school.

POPULATION PROJECTIONS AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

A population analysis and forecast was an essential ingredient of the Master Plan Update. It renders a reliable guide to the probable numbers of future residents in any given area of the Park District.

Data was gathered from the Sacramento County Planning Department, i.e., projected 1985 population figures and information inferred by new housing development trends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>845000</td>
<td>1. Bowling Green</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>(-) .5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation: To jointly develop the Fern Bacon/Bowling Green School Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>849001</td>
<td>2. Parkway</td>
<td>4,803</td>
<td>20.5*</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>(+) 9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation: Park acreage sufficient for area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>747000</td>
<td>3. Nicholas</td>
<td>6,554</td>
<td>13.25*</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>(-) 1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation: That the triangle area adjacent to the pedestrian overcross not be developed into a park.
- That acreage be acquired adjacent to Nicholas Park to serve both neighborhood and community park needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>750020</td>
<td>5. Central District Library Area</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>16.5*</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>(+) 11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation: Acquire additional acreage to enlarge Trailhead Park into a District park site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74010</td>
<td>6. Kennedy Larchmont/Lindale</td>
<td>3,951</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>(-) 4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation: Kennedy 4.5 acre deficit, can be alleviated by:
- A joint development and operation of Reese Elementary School grounds.
- Expansion of the Rutter Junior High School joint lease agreement.

Committee Recommendation: 750000 7. Reese/Rutter Lindale | 5,336                      | 22*                    | 12.0                                                     | (+) 10.0                           |
- Acquire property adjacent to Reese Elementary School, fronting Palmer House Drive.

### Property Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,795</td>
<td>4.5* 10.5 (-) 6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Committee Recommendation:** That the Florin/Florin East deficit be alleviated by acquisition of:
- A 5-7 acre park site south of existing Kara Tract development.
- A 4-6 acre site near French and Gerber.
- A 4-6 acre site on Florin Road in the northeast corner of the proposed Florin Sunrise subdivision. (This has been initiated.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,227</td>
<td>2 14 (-) 12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Committee Recommendation:** Kirchgater/Union House Creek deficit of 12 acres alleviated by:
- Acquisition of a 6 acre site northeast corner of Cottonwood subdivision.
- Leasing and joint development and operation of Kirchgater School and acquisition of additional acres at Kirchgater School.
- Acquisition of additional neighborhood park sites.

---

**Breakdown of Acreage**

| (2) Parkway - Crofoot Park | (7) Reese/Rutter -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal Park</td>
<td>Rutter School 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florin Creek</td>
<td>Rutter Park 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Reese School 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(5) Central Area - Trailhead Park</th>
<th>(8) Florin, Florin East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trailhead Park 14.0</td>
<td>Florin Civic Center Park 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylor Sports Field 2.5</td>
<td>Florin School 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3) Nicholas - Sky Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sky Park 3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(4) North Parkway - Nicholas Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Park 10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 13.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to James C. Ray, Traffic Engineer
Sacramento County Department of Public Works

Page 27: (Now page 1-13)
Corrections noted.

Page 36: (Now pages 1-22, 23)
Corrections noted.

Page 37 #11: (Now page 1-23)
Corrections noted.

Page 142: (Now page 6-1)
Corrections noted.

Page 148: (Now page 6-6)
Corrections noted.

Page 150: (Now page 6-8)
Paragraphs rewritten

Page 152: — (Now page 6-10)
Corrections noted.

Page 153: (Now page 6-11)
Previous corrections cover this question.

Page 154: (Now pages 6-11 and 12)
Corrections noted.

Page 155: (Now pages 6-12 and 13)
Corrections noted.

Page 156: (Now pages 6-13 and 15)
Comments only - no response needed.

Letter of February 3, 1978

Map was changed and various other text changes were made plus input to proposed tentative subdivision in the area.

page A-38

SAT-2 A-12
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Inter-Department Correspondence

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
County of Sacramento

To: Lance Bailey, Director, Planning Department

From: James C. Ray, Traffic Engineer, Highways & Bridges Division

Subject: ELSIE AVENUE CIRCULATION PLAN

It is recommended that Power Inn Road be extended from Elsie Avenue southerly as an arterial street to intersect with the future 148/Calvine Road extension east of Highway 99. This proposal is shown on the South Sacramento Community Plan.

The present Master Circulation Plan shows Cottonwood and Elsie connecting east of Power Inn Road in a long radius curve. With the proposal for extending Power Inn Road it would not be necessary to have this long radius curve, but to have the two streets intersect at right angles. Considerable work must be done to further detail the exact alignment of Power Inn Road, Cottonwood and Calvine.

With the proposed General Plan amendment to create higher density in this area, it appears as if Elsie should remain as an 84 foot street. As of this writing exact details of how to accomplish the widening are not known. It would be our recommendation that the details of Elsie Avenue be worked out with any specific subdivision development that takes place and that the alignment of Power Inn Road, Cottonwood and Calvine be worked out over the next 6 to 8 month period.

It does not appear necessary that Cottonwood be an 84 foot street, but could be reduced to a 66 foot street with appropriate intersection widening. This is based on the assumption that no industrial development will take place south of Elsie. If industrial development takes place south of Elsie then Cottonwood should remain an 84 foot street.

It should be noted that this division will require a longer property line radius at the southwest corner of Elsie and Cottonwood - exact radius to be determined at the time the subdivision is submitted.

JCR/js
cc: Lee Kies
Roger Tointon
R. Kallett
Glenn Williams
To: Brant Clark, Planning Department

From: James C. Ray, Traffic Engineer

Subject: COMMENTS ON THE SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA COMMUNITY PLAN

Page 27: No sidewalks, curb, gutter and street lights have been installed or will be installed in the 1977-78 fiscal year. It may happen later. Construction of noise barrier walls should take place on private property and not on freeway rights of way.

Page 36: There is no specific guideline on where the driveways should be located so as to minimize impact on residential uses. This is not specific enough. At the present time general guidelines are that residential streets with less than 100 vehicles per hour are no problem and the properly designed collector residential streets with 200 to 300 vehicles per hour are no problem.

Page 37 #11: It is the policy of this Division that bus bays be provided only on 84' streets. Bus bays on other kinds of streets are not always necessary. What is more important is a place for shelters to be installed. This matter should be addressed.

Page 142: I recommend that Item 2 be changed because the movement of goods is important. I would suggest that it be worded: "The transportation element of this plan is focused on the movement of people. The movement of goods is also of concern but is not specifically addressed in this plan."

Page 148: The assumption that one acre of commercial development can be expected to generate more than 60 times the amount of traffic of a residential development is incorrect. It is possible that a MacDonald's restaurant might generate this much, but the typical commercial development would generate between 150 to 500 trips per acre (although the measurement by acre is a very poor method of determining trip generation). A residential development generates 40 to 100 trips per acre. The major design concern in developing a transportation network is in the peak hour flow; therefore, the home to work trip is the most critical factor. Normally, employment is the most important factor in determining trips in commercial development, although parking spaces and retail floor area, or floor area, is also a very effective method.
Page 150 (in the Circulation Element): The third paragraph describes service levels. The numbers quoted are totally in error. The analysis, of course, indicates that links do not fall below level of service "C" except during rush hour periods. That is the name of the game - measuring the level of service during the rush hour. If the projected increases, even if they are erroneous, are in the appropriate order of magnitude there is no question in my mind that major streets in the South Sacramento Community will become congested. Unfortunately, the final paragraph is a very poor analysis of the resulting condition of increased traffic flow. At the present time we have service capacity problems on both 47th Avenue in the vicinity of Franklin Boulevard, and Florin Road in the vicinity of Franklin Boulevard. These are home to work trips. There are also many congested periods during typical shopping hours.

Page 152, Item 3 in the partial answers: In my opinion this is a false premise since some industrial traffic may be affected by the development of Power Inn Road and it is absolutely essential to connect Power Inn Road southerly beyond Elsie. However, this will not relieve Florin and Gerber Roads because it will only handle the projected increase. Regarding Item 5, there is no possible way that future traffic will utilize local neighborhood streets as a solution to the total problem.

Page 153: The final paragraph does summarize a more realistic picture, but it is in conflict with the preceding pages.

Page 154: The 4th paragraph is very confusing since home to work trips are the highest trip desire. It may be that improving public transit will help other than home to work trips. It is not clear in this explanation.

Page 155, 3rd Paragraph: Intuition is no replacement for fact unless no facts are available. Since bicycle use is not on the increase for other than recreational trips, it is my opinion that in no way in the next 17 or 18 years will the bicycle be a major part of the transportation system in Sacramento County because in the last 4 years where great efforts have been made to provide bicycle facilities, bicycle traffic has not increased significantly by normal measure for pure transportation purposes.

Page 156, Item 3: We will indeed identify major improvements necessary in the Transportation Study. Almost none of the improvements are reflected on the Major Street and Highway Plan shown on Page 157 with the possible exception of Route 148 Expressway and the Power Inn southerly extension. All of the problems in the existing area will need a revision of the Major Street and Highway Plan and vastly improved transit service, especially 47th Avenue between Franklin and Sacramento Boulevard, Florin Road in the vicinity of Franklin Boulevard, and the 148 Corridor.
Response to Rayman Sturdevant, Supervisor,
Solid Waste and Land Use, Sacramento County Department
of Community Health
April 3, 1978

Water Hygiene and Management

Consideration of concerns added to pages 212, 213 (now pages 7-33 and 34).

Air Pollution Control District

Air Quality section has been rewritten in coordination with Air Resources Board. Until the Air Quality Maintenance and Non-Attainment Area Plan is adopted local plans can do little to regulate VMT.

Community Noise Section

Noise contour map has been revised.
To: Alcides Freitas  
Environmental Coordinator

From: Rayman Sturdevant, Supervisor  
Solid Waste and Land Use

Subject: SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA COMMUNITY PLAN AND DRAFT EIR

Personnel of the Department of Community Health have reviewed the South Sacramento Area Community Plan and Draft EIR and have commented as follows:

Water Hygiene and Management

More consideration should be given to the effect of continued land development on ground water depletion in this area that has been historically over drafted. The EIR projects a ground water elevation of 65-75 feet below sea level by 1995. However, as of December of 1977 we have already recorded static water levels as low at 75 feet below sea level.

Therefore, we suggest that any new subdivisions in this area should be planned to take advantage of surface water supplies.

Air Pollution Control District

The Sacramento County Air Pollution Control District has reviewed the subject document. Our comments on this document will consist of general observations regarding the adequacy of the plan as it applies to the general air quality of the Sacramento Area and the effects of future air quality planning in the form of non-attainment area planning and air quality maintenance planning on the proposed project.

1. The South Sacramento Community Plan recognizes that the adoption of the plan will lead to an increase in the emission of air pollutants and may, therefore, prove to be inconsistent with the goals and general land use planning recommendations of the forthcoming Air Quality Maintenance and Non-attainment Area Plans. These plans are currently being developed and will recommend air pollution control direction for the Sacramento area including potential air pollution control by land use planning.
2. The Air Quality Maintenance and Non-attainment Area Plans are scheduled to be completed in their initial form by January 1, 1979. These plans will develop strategies for the control and reduction of pollutants generated by sources of air pollution within the Sacramento area, including the effects on the atmosphere as a result of planning for developments of this nature. These air pollution control plans are still in the development stage, but after approval by the legislative bodies, will more likely impact substantially on the air pollution generated by projects of this nature.

3. The draft EIR recognizes that a substantial increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) will result if the plan is implemented. This increase in VMT would increase and concentrate air pollutants in the plan area, without achieving corresponding decreases in similar air pollutants from other sources.

4. The air quality in the Sacramento area is such that National Ambient Air Quality Standards are exceeded; the adoption of this plan, without sufficient mitigating measures, would contribute more pollutants to an air mass which already exceeds the above-mentioned standards.

Until the National Ambient Air Quality Standards are met within the Sacramento area, any planning efforts will be affected by the policies and directions of the yet to be approved Air Quality Maintenance and Non-attainment Area Plans. It is premature, at this time, to predict specific direction and policy these plans will take, however, there is no doubt that the plans, when approved, will impact on land use planning decisions because these decisions will have a profound effect on the air quality in the Sacramento area.

Future approval of projects or plans of this nature will have to take into account the specific directions of the above-mentioned air quality control plans. Since the overall goal of the Air Pollution Control District is to attain the Nation Ambient Air Quality Standards; and as long as the standards continue to be exceeded, planning directions will be affected by air pollution control needs.

Community Noise Section

Mather AFB has furnished us with a revised version of the noise contours for their base. This change should be reflected in the Noise Impact Map IX-4 on page 204. A portion of the revised contour map is attached. (Rev. date, December 8, 1977).

RS/rdb

Attachment
Response to Don H. Nance, Director,
Sacramento County Parks and Recreation
April 14, 1978.

1. Flood Prone —

    Connection noted, pages 34 and 165 (now pages 1-19 and 20
    and page 10-11).

2. Water Supply

    Other agency comments to the Water Supply and the Ground Water
    sections are oriented towards the increased use of surface
    water through the City of Sacramento's existing water systems.
    While the recommendation is useful to the community interest,
    the program has yet to be implemented. The plan presently
    speaks to these issues and supports the concept.
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO
Inter-Department Correspondence

Date: 4/14/78

To: Al Freitas, Environmental Coordinator
Environmental Impact Section

From: Don H. Nance
Director of Parks & Recreation

Subject: South Sacramento Area Community Plan and Draft EIR (Control No. CP-78-001)

We have reviewed the South Sacramento Area Community Plan and Draft EIR. We find the document to be comprehensive and well written and endorse the plan, but wish to direct additional comments toward the following specific issues:

1. Flood Prone Areas Along Streams

We recommend that the trailways referred to in the Floodways and Floodplains Section (Pgs. 34 and 165) also be planned to accommodate equestrian use where appropriate.

2. Water Supply

We also support Plan 2 of the CH2M Hill Sacramento Countywide Water Plan (Pg. 213) which is the "Safe Yield" or "Stabilized Water Level" alternative. However, we believe that these objectives can be attained without involving major diversions of surface water from the upstream end of the American River Parkway via Folsom South Canal. We recommend that the South Sacramento Area water purveyors negotiate with the City of Sacramento to utilize a portion of their water rights, which could be withdrawn at either the American River Water Treatment Plant or the Sacramento River Water Treatment Plant. Since both of these plants are located downstream of most of the popular rafting, canoeing, kayaking, and swimming locations within the Parkway, the higher flows through these areas would maximize public benefit derived from the surface water.

Following optimal use for public recreation in the American River Parkway, the water would then be available for diversion to urban/industrial use in the Sacramento area, and the remainder would be available for Delta water quality enhancement or export via CVP to southern California.

In discussing this issue with a representative of the Sacramento City Water and Sewer Division, we were informed that:
a. Good potential exists for providing surface water to a majority of the South Sacramento Area from either City Treatment Plant.

b. The majority of the South Sacramento Area lies within the City's "Ultimate Water Rights Application Area" to be served under its approved surface water permits. It is also possible that the State Water Resources Control Board would allow minor adjustments to the City's "Ultimate Water Rights Application Area" boundary in order to include a slightly larger portion of the South Sacramento Area.

c. The City would also benefit from such an arrangement since it would help to perfect their existing water rights and thereby reduce any possibility that those rights could be decreased.
Response to a series of letters from the City of Sacramento Planning Department, last date April 27, 1978.

Note: The specific letters from various departments of the City of Sacramento are not made a part of this appendix, but all requested text and map corrections have been made.

Comments from the City of Sacramento are in two forms. They are General Comments to the Environmental Impact Report that are very broad in scope and can only be responded to in a general, broad, brush fashion because of their complex, interrelated nature, and Specific Comments on a page by page basis that can be spoken to in a direct fashion.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment 1. This general comment is addressed in its specific implication below. However, it is appropriate to respond to the City Staff's criticism of a plan prepared with their assistance and ongoing review with the query: Where were you when this document was being prepared and the background research was being done?

   a. What are the cumulative air quality impacts of growth outside the study area upon South Sacramento?

Response: "Outside the study area" is sufficiently ill defined as to leave the preparers herein stumped as to the point of beginning. See pp 180-195 (now 7-1 through 7-24) of the Environmental Element (revised since the previous draft) for a full discussion of air quality impacts.

   b. What are the traffic level impacts and the costs of road improvements to be incurred as the result of developments outside the South Sacramento community?

Response b1: Traffic Levels - The cumulative impact of traffic related outside growth is projected and shown on Figure VII-2 (now Map 6-B) of the plan. Growth assumptions for traffic flows include the concept of growth outside of the study area. The EIR has identified traffic increase as a significant impact. Magnitude identification for Franklin Blvd. and Bruceville Road based on future growth in the Laguna community is very difficult to project. There is absolutely no trend presently in the Laguna community for urban growth. There are some development problems yet to be resolved in the area.
which makes projecting traffic increases difficult. Projections can be made that estimate the increase of average daily traffic based on full development of the Laguna area. An increase at full development (probably beyond 1990) along Franklin Blvd. south of former Route 148 may be 25,000 vehicles per day. For Bruceville Road south of former Route 148 may be 14,000 vehicles per day. These assumptions include the concept of the yet to be built arterial street following the route of former State Route 148 between Highway 99 and Interstate 5 being in place.

Response b2: Fiscal Impacts - The approach taken in this report has been to estimate levels of traffic expected from development of a specific community and to assume improvements will occur in line with existing policy regarding widths, standards and payment of costs. If this is a major problem, then during the early stages of preparation of this plan (a joint city-county effort), it would have been appropriate to raise this issue, develop specific objectives and quantify costs. At this juncture a major commitment of staff and funds is required to amend existing policies and quantify costs by mutual or individual effort. The plan and EIR will be amended to include the following objective and program:

Objective: To quantify the costs of street improvements improvements and to amend current city and county policies as needed to provide for improvements to the local street system.

Program: Appoint a joint task force of city/county appointees to quantify costs of street improvements and to suggest amendment of current jurisdictional policies to provide projected street improvements in the South Sacramento community.

c. What is the cumulative impact of growth of the South Sacramento community with respect to other adopted community plans in the region?

Response: Again, the question is very vague and as a result difficult to answer. The anticipated growth rate of South Sacramento has been developed in conjunction with the Sacramento Regional Area Planning Commission in an effort to allocate the county's expected growth to the various communities within the county. Obviously if the anticipated growth does not occur, then the projections contained in the report (traffic, commercial, employment, etc.) will fall short and the growth will
occur in another location. It is hoped that implementation of the policies and programs contained in the plan will make the projections a self-fulfilling prophecy due to the removal of the generally acknowledged poor image of the South Sacramento community.

Comment 2. The current draft has been greatly revised to reflect the successful format and approach taken in the Rancho Cordova Community Plan. The criticisms have been addressed and changes made.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Specific
Comment 1. Page 20. Alternatives to the proposed action.

Response: The text of this subsection was expanded to include an increased density alternative (see page EIR-7).

Specific
Comment 2. The EIR should discuss the impacts of alternative uses within the Regional County Sanitation District buffer area south of Union House Creek, west of Franklin Blvd.

Response: Some discussion of the Regional Sewage Treatment Plant location was added to the text. The question of uses within this buffer area is addressed by the plan. Permanent agricultural is shown on the preliminary Laguna Community Plan for lands in the unincorporated area. The county purchased these lands for the purpose of providing a buffer area. The question of impacts of the now under construction treatment plant are beyond the purview of this report. EIR documents have been prepared relative to this major governmental project.

Specific

The plan document has been changed to have only one fiscal impact section. This impact section is purposely developed in a very broad brush fashion. Any other approach in light of the available funding was not possible. The uncertainties of post Proposition 13 leave impossible a defensible fiscal evaluation. In cases where multiple jurisdiction occurs, it is extremely difficult to develop a consistent implementation method based on policies only. In the unincorporated county area services are provided by special districts which have proven to be suspicious of proposals to consolidate services or any modification of the status quo. Planning for future urban growth is the name of the game. However, actually doing it under present circumstances of unsure funding, conflicting economic interests and differing visions of the future realistically becomes very short term detailed planning on a project by project basis and long range planning in very general terms.
Specific Comment 4. **Any discussion of** (See Map 6-C)

The text has been changed to reflect these concerns.

Specific Comment 5. **Page 171, Policy 4. Flooding** (Now page 10-15)

The text has been changed to reflect this concern.

Specific Comment 6. **Page 213, Policy 1. Groundwater** (Now page 7-34)

The text has been changed relative to this policy.
April 27, 1978

Sacramento County Policy Planning Commission
County of Sacramento
827 - Seventh Street
Sacramento, Ca  95814

Honorable Members in Session:

Subject: City Planning Commission Report on the Preliminary South Sacramento Community Plan and Draft EIR (M-132).

At its April 25, 1978 meeting, the Sacramento City Council adopted the attached City Planning Commission recommendation regarding the environmental information incorporated in the Preliminary South Sacramento Community Plan and Draft EIR. The City of Sacramento therefore recommends that the factors in the staff report be considered in your deliberations on the matter. Please contact Toke Masuda or me should you have any questions.

Your Commission should know that the City appreciates the cooperation the County Planning Department has been giving in the preparation of this complex plan and EIR.

Respectfully submitted,

George Smith
Associate Planner
GS:1

Attachment
cc: Brant Clark
South Sacramento Advisory Council
April 20, 1978

City Council
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Preliminary South Sacramento Community Plan and Draft EIR (M-132)

SUMMARY

The Preliminary South Sacramento Community Plan and Draft EIR is a combination plan and EIR that incorporates most of the necessary environmental information. However, it is believed that the Preliminary Plan and EIR is deficient in its discussion of the cumulative impact of growth and development outside the study area upon South Sacramento's air quality and local circulation system; in its discussion of the relationship of the South Sacramento Plan to other plans; and in its identification of impacts and mitigation measures. The Planning Commission forwarded its comments to the County Policy Planning Commission for the County's first public hearing on the Preliminary Plan and Draft EIR on April 6, 1978. Another public hearing is scheduled for May 30, 1978. The Commission recommends approval of this report, and it should be forwarded to the County with any additional comments the Council may deem to be appropriate.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please consult the attached amended staff report for further details on general and specific areas of environmental concerns.

VOTE OF COMMISSION

The Planning Commission, by a vote of seven ayes, one absent, one vacancy, approved the attached amended staff report on March 30, 1978.
RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council approve this report and forward it to the County Policy Planning Commission with any other comments the Council may deem to be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Tokuo Masuda
Principal Planner

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED:

Walter J. Slee, City Manager

Attachment

M-132

April 25, 1978
Districts 5, 6, 7, 8
March 30, 1978

Planning Commission
Sacramento, California

Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Environmental Information Within the Preliminary South Sacramento Community Plan and Draft EIR (M-132)

SUMMARY

The Preliminary Plan and Draft EIR incorporates most necessary environmental information but is deficient in discussing the cumulative impact of growth and development outside the study area upon South Sacramento's air quality and local circulation system; in discussing the relationship of the South Sacramento Plan to other plans; and in identifying impacts and mitigation measures. Staff recommends approval of this report and transmittal to the City Council.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

City staff has reviewed the environmental information incorporated in the Preliminary South Sacramento Community Plan and Draft EIR. The Planning Department's comments appear below, while other City-department comments are attached to the end of this report.

The Planning Department believes that most of the necessary environmental information is incorporated in the Plan and EIR, which is comprehensive and broad in scope. Staff believes, however, that the Draft EIR is deficient in the following significant areas.

General Comments

1. The EIR should address the cumulative impact of growth and development outside the study area upon South Sacramento's air quality (pp. 180-202) and proposed local circulation system, including fiscal impacts of improvement to both City and County street systems (Sections VII and XV). For example, the document does not address the primary or secondary effects of traffic generated by potential agri-industrial uses in the area south of Sheldon Road; future development of the Laguna community; or existing and future development of the Meadowview community. The EIR also should address the cumulative impact of growth of the South Sacramento community with respect to other adopted community plans in the region such as Elk Grove, Laguna, and South Pocket.

2. The EIR should clearly identify plan impacts and mitigation measures. Information in Section II dealing with EIR requirements (pages 11-12) is incomplete and, in some cases, inaccurate. Information in the Summary on mitigation measures (pages 18-19) does not list the proposed mitigation measures; preferably, the mitigation measures should be identified with the impacts they mitigate. The text also does not identify those impacts that are potentially significant and
those impacts that are less than significant, as does the Summary. Further discussion of impacts should include a more detailed discussion of mitigation measures.

Specific Comments

1. Page 20. Alternatives to the Proposed Action. The EIR should present an increased density alternative.

2. The EIR should discuss the impacts of alternative uses within the Regional County Sanitation District buffer area south of Union House Creek, west of Franklin Boulevard.

3. Page 259 ff. Fiscal Impacts. The EIR should contain only one, comprehensive fiscal impact section. The present document contains two fiscal impact sections. Areas deserving special attention include the construction of street improvements and the conversion of ground water to surface water, including the provision of water distribution and transmission facilities to accommodate the planned urban growth.

4. Any discussion of Bruceville Road and Center Parkway south of former Route 148 should provide for the fact that the City has not yet determined the exact configurations. In addition, any discussion regarding the interchange of U.S. 99 and the proposed transportation corridor along former Route 148 should include information to the effect that the City, County and State currently are studying financing alternatives.

5. Page 171, Policy 4. Flooding. The EIR should address the alternative of managing the boundaries of the Laguna Creek flood plain in order to have clear and accurate subdivision lines in adjacent development.

6. Page 213, Policy 1. Groundwater. The EIR should address the feasibility of this recommended policy and its impacts if implemented (adoption of the CH2M Hill plan).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The lead agency principle in preparing EIR's provides that not more than one EIR shall be prepared in connection with the same underlying activity and that the EIR shall be prepared by the lead agency. It is, therefore, necessary that the South Sacramento Community Plan Environmental Impact Report adequately cover as many environmental considerations as possible at this time in order to reduce the need for EIR's on future individual projects within the plan area.

The Planning Department recommends that the City Planning Commission approve this staff report and forward it along with other comments the Commission desires to make to the County and the City Council.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Tokuo Masuda
Principal Planner

Tm:CS:km
Attachments
Response to a letter from James Bemis, Electrical Engineer, Sacramento Municipal Utility District

This text has been incorporated into the plan text. See pages 238a, b, c, etc. (now pages 11-19 through 11-26).
May 5, 1978

Mr. Brant Clark  
Advance Planning  
717 K Street - Room 203  
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Brant:

Enclosed is an Electrical Project Study and marked-up map for the SMUD facilities required for the South Sacramento Area Community. This study can be considered as comments on the Draft EIR, and should be included in the Public Utilities section of the Community Plan.

We plan to use this project study as a basis for property acquisition and EIR negative declaration preparation.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James Bemis  
Electrical Engineer

Enclosures
Response to Letter from Environmental Council of Sacramento
September 6, 1978 - page A-59.2

This letter is mostly complementary, the few issues mentioned have been discussed in the text.

Response to Letter from James C. Ray
County Public Works
September 18, 1978 - page A-59.3

The map on page 6-14 has been corrected.

Response to Letter from George C. Weddell
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
October 4, 1978 - page A-59.4

The corrections have been made to pages 10-12 and 10-14.

Response to Letters from Robert Thomas
Southgate Recreation and Park District
October 17 and November 21, 1978

The requested changes have been made to page 10.2

Response to Letters from City of Sacramento
Dated November 15, 1978 - page A-59.7

The two issues discussed by this letter relative to development of drainage improvements and street improvements have been referred to within the Plan text and environmental document. The normal County method of incremental development of these improvements on a project by project basis and from an overall view for consistency with an adopted plan will no doubt be followed for these areas. There is no question that City-County coordination and participation will be needed for these projects.
ENVIROMENTAL COUNCIL OF SACRAMENTO
909 12th Street
Sacramento, California 95814

September 6, 1978

Board of Supervisors
Sacramento County
700 H Street
Sacramento, Ca. 95814

RE: SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA COMMUNITY PLAN

Members of the Board:

The Environmental Council of Sacramento thanks you for the opportunity to review this document. Having attended all the hearings, we realize that there are few problem areas still unresolved. We do desire, however, to comment on the following:

With regard to domestic and commercial water supply, ECOS feels that the basic policy should be shifted from the current use of ground water - which constitutes virtually all of the South Sacramento area water - to surface water. We agree with the Planning Department recommendation that future subdivisions have water service systems that can convert from ground water to surface water when surface water becomes available.

While the plan speaks of additional and alternative transportation means, ECOS feels additional emphasis should be given to the coordination of public transit and park and ride lots. Cooperation between CalTrans, the County and Regional Transit could result in county or county/CalTrans sponsored park and ride lots for bus riders and car poolers.

ECOS recommends that additional bikeways be provided for, particularly those connecting residential areas and neighborhood shopping areas. New subdivisions and apartment complexes should be designed to provide for easy bicycle and pedestrian access to shopping and public services.
ECOS very strongly feels that the overlap with the Laguna Creek area be built by filling in and developing out from existing facilities. Leapfrog development should not be permitted in this or any other area.

ECOS feels that the South Sacramento Area Planning Advisory Council, the Planning Department staff and the Policy Planning Commission deserve recognition for their work on the South Sacramento Area Community Plan. They have listened long and hard and responded appropriately to concerns as they were expressed.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Karolyn W. Simon, President
Environmental Council of Sacramento
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Inter-Department Correspondence

Date: September 18, 1978

To: Brant Clark, Planning Department

From: James C. Ray, Traffic Engineer

Subject: SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA COMMUNITY PLAN

I have very briefly reviewed the South Sacramento Area Community Plan dated September, 1977, revised to August, 1978. The circulation plan shown on Page 6-14 meets with our present planning criteria. We will include the South Sacramento Area in the County Transportation Plan and will seek your input at the appropriate time.

As per our phone conversation, it should be noted that the alignment of Sheldon Road on the Laguna Creek Plan is the recommended alignment rather than that shown on Page 6-14.

JCR/js
Mr. Brant Clark  
Advanced Planning Section  
Planning and Community Development Department  
County of Sacramento  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Clark:

This is in response to your 8 September 1978 letter requesting comments on the third draft of the South Sacramento Area Community Plan (revised to August 1978). Our comments are as follows:

a. Page 10-12, Present Trends. - We appreciate your clarification of this paragraph, as requested in our 16 February 1978 letter. However, some ambiguity still remains. The fourth sentence "At the present time, only part of the project has been completed..." is unclear; "project" could refer to the Corps Flood Insurance Study (FIS), discussed in the paragraph, or to the Morrison Creek Stream Group Project, which was authorized by Congress in 1976 for advance engineering and design studies. Regardless of which reference is intended, neither is correct. The Corps FIS is complete, and the flood insurance rate maps will become effective on 15 March 1979. Advance planning studies on the Morrison Creek Project are needed to determine if construction should proceed but have not been initiated, since Congress has not appropriated the additional planning funds.

b. Page 10-14. - Because of the scale and clarity of the map, it is not possible to determine if the map agrees with the Corps Flood Insurance Study map completed for this area. As you know, by letter dated 7 June 1978 we transmitted to you a delineation of the 100-year flood plain in this area.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Community Plan.

Sincerely yours,

George C. Weddell  
Chief, Engineering Division
October 17, 1978

Board of Supervisors  
County of Sacramento  
700 H Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: THIRD DRAFT OF SOUTH SACRAMENTO AREA COMMUNITY PLAN

Dear Chairman Kloss and Members in Session:

The Board of Directors of the Southgate Recreation and Park District have reviewed the third draft of the South Sacramento Area Community Plan. The Board is extremely pleased with the document and recognizes the many hours of work that have gone into its development. The Board further applauds the process which has allowed continuous public notice and input.

All but one of the District's recommendations on the preliminary plan have been incorporated within the third draft. The District's Ten Year Master Plan reflects a proposed community park located in the southeast portion of the District. To assure that the District's Master Plan is in concert with the final South Sacramento Area Community Plan, the District requests this amendment be added to page 10-2 of the plan.

Thank you in advance for your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,

FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

[Signature]

ROBERT P. THOMAS  
GENERAL MANAGER

RPT:ir

Copy to Brant Clark, County Planning Department
November 21, 1978

Mr. Brant Clark, Planner
County of Sacramento
827- 7th Street, Room 327
Sacramento, Ca  95814

Dear Mr. Clark:

This letter is in regard to the recreation element of the proposed South Sacramento Area Community Plan. Specifically, there are two parks that are not correctly shown on page 10-2 of the South Sacramento Area Community Plan.

Park #14, Trailhead Community Park, should be located further north of existing placement on map 10-A. The placement of this park should straddle Orange Avenue as the District currently has title to land directly southwest of the corner of 66th Avenue and Florin Mall Drive, and title of land directly south of Orange Avenue. The District is currently in the process of purchasing additional land north of Orange Avenue. This park, also, is proposed to be a district-wide park rather than the Community Park identified.

The District, also, has a community park in its Ten-Year Master Plan located directly north of Calvine Road, west of Short Road, south of the transportation corridor, and east of US99. I have attached a copy of Map 10-A of the South Sacramento Area Community Plan and have marked in red the general location for this Community Park.

With these changes, the recreation element of the South Sacramento Area Community Plan will more accurately reflect the District's Ten-Year Master Plan. I thank you in advance for your assistance on this matter and, should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. THOMAS
General Manager
RFT/rd

enclosure
November 15, 1978

Board of Supervisors
County of Sacramento
Suite 2450, County Administration Building
700 H Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Honorable Members in Session:

At its regularly scheduled meeting of November 14, 1978, the Sacramento City Council approved the attached staff report concerning the effects of proposed urbanization of properties adjacent to Laguna Creek upon the South Sacramento Community. Enclosed are six copies of the approved report. (The Preliminary South Sacramento Community Plan, M-132.)

Sincerely,

Lorraine Magana
City Clerk

LM:HO'
Encl.
cc: Lance Bailey
Item No. 51
City Council  
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Preliminary South Sacramento Plan (M-132)

SUMMARY

The Sacramento County Board of Supervisors is completing public hearings on the preliminary South Sacramento Community Plan. The Planning Commission recommends transmitting this report to the Board of Supervisors advising the Board of the City's concerns regarding the effects of the proposed urbanization of the adjacent Laguna Community upon the South Sacramento Community. Effects include the need for adequate storm drainage facilities in the Laguna Creek floodplain and the timely development of major streets south of Mack Road, especially the east-west major street in the former Route 148 alignment.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please consult the attached staff report for a detailed discussion of this matter.

VOTE OF COMMISSION

The City Planning Commission, at its November 8, 1978 meeting, voted 6 ayes and 3 absences to recommend favorable action by the City Council on the attached staff report.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council approve the transmitting of the City's comments to the County Board of Supervisors.

Respectfully submitted,

Ethan Browning, Jr.,
Planning Director

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED:

Walter J. Sipe, City Manager
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November 14, 1978
District No. 8

page A-59.7
City Planning Commission  
Sacramento, California

Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Preliminary South Sacramento Community Plan (M-132)

SUMMARY

The Sacramento County Board of Supervisors are completing their public hearings on the preliminary South Sacramento Community Plan. It is recommended that the City advise the Board of the City's concerns regarding the effects of the proposed urbanization of the adjacent Laguna Community upon the South Sacramento Community. These effects include the necessity for development of adequate storm drainage facilities in the Laguna Creek flood plain, and the timely development of major streets south of Mack Road, especially the east-west major street in the former Route 148 alignment. The staff recommends approval of this report and its transmittal to the City Council.

BACKGROUND

The County Board of Supervisors will conduct its fourth public hearing on the preliminary South Sacramento Community Plan on November 15, 1978. The City Planning Department anticipates a workshop on the plan for the incorporated portion of the South Sacramento Community in January, 1979.

The Planning staff commends the County Planning Department and the South Sacramento Area Community Planning Advisory Council for the preparation of this Community Plan. However, it is recommended that the following comments be transmitted to the County regarding effects of proposed adjacent urban developments upon this plan:

1. The proposed urbanization of properties (in both the incorporated and unincorporated areas) adjacent to Laguna Creek would increase stormwater discharges into Laguna Creek. This would enlarge the flood-prone areas designated by the Corps of Engineers unless channel improvements are constructed to handle the increased stormwater runoffs. The City and County should be assured of the construction of adequate storm drainage facilities prior to the approval of any new development discharging into Laguna Creek.

2. The staff concurs with the plan's evaluation that there may be severe traffic congestion within this community due to urbanization of the southerly portion of this community. It is recommended that the City and County work with the State Department of Transportation regarding the funding for development of these major improvements.
RECOMMENDATION

The staff recommends that (1) the Planning Commission approve this report; and (2) recommend that the City Council transmit the City's comments to the County Board of Supervisors.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Tokuo Masuda
Principal Planner
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November 9, 1978
APPENDIX - B

GLOSSARY OF EXISTING FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Local Programs

The following programs are funded by Community Development Block Grant funds and can only be used in designated target areas in South Sacramento. Most are for fiscal year 77-78 with no assurance of continuance through another year.

The Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency currently administers the following four programs:

Housing Opportunities Program for the Elderly (H.O.P.E.) - Program provides grants up to $1,500 to lower income elderly homeowners for emergency home repairs on single family housing units.

County Loan Program - Provides 4-1/2% loans for home repairs with a maximum loan amount of $5,000 to lower income homeowners of single family dwelling units.

Unmet Shelter Program - Provides maximum grants of $750 for home repairs, and grants up to $250 for home appliances to families on AFDC.

Home Management and Counseling - Provides homes ownership counseling for lower income persons in consumer education and default situations.

Other C.D. funded housing programs in the community are administered by various non-profit organizations and county agencies.

St. Paul's Center - Volunteer Home Repair Service - Home repair service for lower income elderly homeowners on single family homes.

Legal Aid Society - Housing Maintenance and Education Project (H.O.M.E.) Provides legal assistance and self-help housing services for lower income tenants and homeowners.

Sacramento Area Mental Health Association, Self-Reliance Center Rehabilitation Program - rehabilitation of housing for lower income persons where the labor is provided by persons who have mental handicaps or disabilities.

1This glossary is not inclusive of all housing assistance programs administered by Federal, State or Sacramento County.
State Filipino American Coordinating Conference Housing Opportunities Center - provides repair and rehabilitation of homes primarily for lower income elderly and handicapped homeowners.

Fruitridge Neighborhood Center Housing Insulation and Rehabilitation - provides services to lower income owner-occupants of single family homes for housing rehabilitation and installation of insulation.

The majority of housing programs currently available provide home repair, rehabilitation and counseling services to lower income owner-occupants of single family homes. The renter is primarily provided services by the Legal Aid Society.

NOTE: Currently, under California Civil Code, a tenant/renter may make or authorize repairs once a year. However, these repairs must not exceed one month's rent. The tenant, for his own protection, should request in writing, that the landlord make the needed repairs, and give the landlord "reasonable time" (approximately 30 days) to comply. If there is no response after this time, the tenant can have repairs made, deduct the amount from his rent, and submit the balance of the rent along with a written explanation to the landlord.

However, according to the California Civil Code 1942.5 referred to as Retaliatory Eviction, the landlord has the legal right to evict the tenant 60 days after that tenant has made repairs. The only alternative to provide protection from evictions for renters would be a revision of the California Civil Law in this respect.

HUD Programs

Section 8 - Owners, either private or public, may rent existing, rehabilitated or new units directly to lower income tenants. Owners receive a Contract Rent, normally not exceeding a HUD-determined Fair Market Rent for the area, paid in two parts. The rent (together with an allowance for utilities if not included in the rent) paid by the tenant is equal to 15% to 25% of the family income, depending on a variety of circumstances. The difference between the tenant rent payment and the total Contract Rent is paid for through a government subsidy called the Housing Assistance Payments Program. For rehabilitated and new units, owners are chosen by the HUD field office from those submitting a proposal in response to a HUD advertisement.

Section 232 - A direct low interest rate HUD loan to non-profit sponsors for the production of elderly and handicapped housing projects. Program changes and new regulations provide for the merger of 202 permanent financing with Section 8 housing assistance payments.

Section 235 Revised) - A below market interest rate homeownership program which has been considerably revised to concentrate on moderate income families. To be eligible for assistance payments, a family must have an adjusted family income which does not exceed 80% of the median income for the area with appropriate adjustments for smaller or larger families. As of September 1976, the revised Sec. 235 income limit for a family of four living in Sacramento County was $13,900. Housing insured and subsidized under the program may be new or substantially rehabilitated, single family, townhouse, or condominiums.
Section 221 (d) (2) - A mortgage insurance program which enables a family to purchase a home with a 3% cash investment at an interest rate of other FHA insured loans. The benefit of this program is that the 3% cash investment makes homeownership attainable by low-moderate income people who usually cannot afford a 10-20% down payment as with conventional loans.

Section 312 - Rehabilitation loan program to provide 3% loans to eligible homeowners. To be used in conjunction with existing renewal and code enforcement efforts in specific target areas, and as support to CDBG rehabilitation efforts.

Other HUD Programs - There is an abundance of other HUD programs, such as special Section 8 assistance for HUD insured projects, low-rent conventional public housing funds for modernization of existing public housing projects and mortgage insurance programs, to name a few. The most commonly used have been cited here. However, for additional information, contact the Sacramento FHA Insuring Office.

Farmers Home Administration Programs - (Part of the Department of Agriculture, FmHA administers programs for use primarily in rural areas.)

Section 502 - Provides low interest loans to rural low income families for the purchase and/or repair of single family owner-occupied housing and also provides construction financing to eligible sponsors.

Section 504 - A loan and grant program for rural lower income families for substantial repairs up to $5,000.

Section 514 - A loan program to nonprofit sponsors of new housing for farm workers.

Section 515 - A rural rental housing program providing loans to buy, build, or improve apartment-style housing for the elderly and lower income persons. Can be coupled with a special set aside of Section 8 rental assistance and interest credits to further subsidize rent levels.

Section 524 - A rural loan program for site development of subdivision lots to eligible sponsors which would, in turn, sell them to lower income buyers.

State Administered Programs

Neighborhood Preservation Program - The California Housing Finance Agency can make available, on its own or in combination with private lending institutions and other governmental agencies, a broad range of residential financing mechanisms, including rehabilitation loans in the form of home improvement loans and a variety of first trust deed
loans; a bond insurance program facilitating use of Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation bonds where appropriate, and direct loans for multi-family rentals. The CHFA can make direct loans on rental property of three or more units using the Federal Section 8 subsidy program. In addition, CHFA can provide the funds for and/or insure loans by private lenders for one to four unit, owner-occupied dwellings. These loans may be unsecured or second trust deed remodeling loans, or first deed purchase or refinance and remodel loans.

Direct Funding Program - The CHFA is authorized to make construction and permanent loans of up to 95 percent of the total development cost to a profit-motivated mortgagor, and 100 percent for non-profit mortgagor. The CHFA can provide this financing at a lower interest rate than conventional lenders, thereby reducing project mortgage payments and reducing unit rental costs. Used in conjunction with the Section 8 program, the Direct Lending Program is a viable resource for financing the construction of low and moderate income housing in the county. It has been recently interpreted by the California State Supreme Court that projects funded by this program are subject to referendum as presented in Article XXXIV of the State Constitution. For some communities, this will mean a lengthy delay for submitting applications for project financing. However, the County of Sacramento is currently authorized to construct up to 1,000 low income housing units under a referendum overwhelmingly passed by the voters in November 1975.
Problem:

The Housing Element of the South Sacramento Area Plan identifies as a problem the poor distribution of housing available to lower income persons. In fact, specific metropolitan areas have concentrations of housing for lower income persons, the result of which is a compounding of social problems within these neighborhoods. These problems include impactation of schools, lack of housing opportunity, lack of opportunity for housing locations near employment and potential for increased usage of automobiles.

Goals and Policies:

The adopted General Plan of the County of Sacramento states as goals:

GOAL 6. TO PROVIDE ALL RESIDENTS WITH OPPORTUNITIES FOR A WIDE RANGE OF CULTURAL, SOCIAL, EDUCATIONAL, HEALTH AND COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES IN PACE WITH SACRAMENTO'S STATUS AS A MAJOR METROPOLITAN AREA

GOAL 8. TO HELP PROVIDE SAFE AND ADEQUATE HOUSING FOR ALL CITIZENS WITH AN OPPORTUNITY FOR CHOICE AMONG ALTERNATIVE LIVING ENVIRONMENTS

Program:

The following proposal could be developed into a local ordinance to implement an inclusionary housing program:

1. All residential developments of new construction of five units or more must provide:

   A - At least 15 percent of its dwelling units in a price range affordable by moderate income households, and;

   B - In construction of housing structures containing five or more units which will eventually be offered for rent, at least ten percent of the units must be affordable by low income households and at least 10 percent affordable by moderate income households.

The intent of this proposal is not to subsidize any units (although subsidies may be used). The profit potential on any given project should remain the same, or increase. The intent is to increase housing mix and disburse housing opportunities on a wide range throughout the area. It is recognized that low income families as defined in this proposal cannot feasibly participate in a home purchase program.

2. The requirement may be satisfied by the use of the following methods, singly or in concert:

   A. Use of federal, state, or local government low and moderate income housing programs.
B - Reductions in square footage and/or amenities to be provided in the designated units and/or inclusion of scattered duplexes or townhouses;

C - Density Bonuses: An incentive method of density bonuses for producing low and moderate-income housing when the housing is included within the development. A greater density bonus would be earned by building the required units in a high income development, and a lesser bonus for inclusion within middle income priced developments. The density bonus should not exceed 15 percent. Appendices 1-A through C should be referred to for application of the bonus procedure. The density bonus should be directly tied to the number of moderate or low cost units built in each phase. The developer would not receive permission to go ahead on the next phase until those in the previous phase were completed. The units granted as a density bonus should be itemized to the particular phase receiving the bonus. In developments that have only one time phase then the full number of low and moderate income housing should be applied in the first phase;

D - Providing the required number of units elsewhere within the same community as determined by the Planning Director. Each developer shall submit proposals indicating how his development will provide the required low and moderate income housing units. If after due consideration of all possible methods, the provision of housing at sales prices or rentals that can be afforded by low and moderate income households is not feasible within the project and this is verified by the Planning Director, he shall require that the developer submit proposals on how he may provide the necessary number of units elsewhere in the community at locations acceptable. However, construction of the required units must proceed in advance of or simultaneously with the base units. No bonus would be granted when this method is used;

E - The acceptance of any other public or private assistance possible for low and moderate income housing in the development;

F - For those developers willing to exceed the minimum requirements significantly (i.e. 30 percent or more), the jurisdiction would suspend any plan change, subdivision, Environmental Impact Review, building permit, and other construction related fees payable;

G - For those developers willing to exceed the minimum requirements, expedited scheduling before Reviewing Commissions will be given.

3. No building permit shall be issued, land use zone changed or subdivision approved for any housing development until approval of the Planning Director has been obtained and agreement reached that such development will comply with the requirements of this ordinance.
4. In making sales of the designated units the developer of a sales development shall convey title of the property to the buyers as a fee simple determinable so that so long as the property is owned and occupied by the qualified family as the term is defined in this ordinance the buyers have full title to the property, regardless of their future income status. In the event of default, the mortgagor could sell the property at market value to any prospective buyer.

5. The sales price of a designated unit at initial sale shall be subject to the prior approval of the Planning Director, and shall reflect the requirement that a low or moderate income household should not be required to pay more than 30 percent of its income for housing purchases.

Initial purchasers will be screened by the Director of the Housing and Redevelopment Agency for compliance with the income limitations. If qualified buyers cannot be located within three months after final building inspection, the units shall be released for sale on the open market. However, the resale restrictions outlined in Section 6 shall apply in any case.

6. The sales price upon resale shall be subject to the prior approval of the Housing and Redevelopment Agency Director who shall determine a maximum price that would result in monthly payments that are no greater than 30% of 80% (after family size adjustment) of the then current median income, plus the cost of any substantial major improvements made to the property. The Housing and Redevelopment Agency Director shall have first refusal rights on purchase of the property in the event of resale. Should this agency decline to purchase the property it would then act as the reviewing body for eligibility of the new purchaser who would be required to meet the income limitations described in Section 11. The requirement would also be binding on the estate of the original qualified purchaser. A legal heir who inherits the property would be allowed to occupy it even if he or she does not meet the qualifications. However, said heir would be bound by the resale restrictions in the event that he or she chooses to sell.

A clause would be included in both the Grant Deed and Deed of Trust that sale of the property is subject to price limitations and approval by the Director of the Housing and Redevelopment Agency. Full disclosure of this limitation will be required by the seller at the time of initial or resale.

7. The rent schedules for designated rental units at initial occupancy shall be subject to the review of the Housing and Redevelopment Agency Director for compliance with the price formula upon which requirements were based or upon which any density bonus was granted. Rents in designated units shall reflect the requirement that a low or moderate income household shall not be required to pay more than 30 percent of its income for housing purposes. Any changes in the rent schedule for the designated rental units shall be subject to the prior approval of the Agency Director, who shall determine the rental level which reflects the cost of maintenance, the competitive rate of return for similar investments, and changes in property taxes and other costs of doing business.
Renters will be screened by the Director of the Housing and Redevelopment Agency for compliance with the income limitations. If eligible renters cannot be located within one month after the unit becomes vacant, the unit shall be released for rent on the open market, however, the restrictions shall apply to subsequent renters. The Director of the Housing and Redevelopment Agency shall be notified as soon as a rental unit mandated by this ordinance becomes vacant and he shall maintain a referral list of prospective renters. The Director shall require a yearly statement of fact from the owner-manager of the rental units that the required number of units is still being occupied or offered for rent to low and moderate income households.

8. Low and moderate income units required by this ordinance shall:
   a. Be reasonably disbursed throughout the development;
   b. Generally reflect the average number of bedrooms per dwelling unit for the development as a whole; and
   c. Be designed to harmonize with other residential structures and units in the development.

9. An applicant aggrieved by a determination or requirement of the Planning Director or Housing and Redevelopment Agency Director in regard to this ordinance may appeal to the appropriate body or the Housing and Redevelopment Commission, whichever is applicable, who will act upon it in 60 days. The appeal shall set forth specifically wherein the action of the Director(s) fails to conform to the provisions of this ordinance, or wherein his requirements are improper. Such appeal shall be filed in the public office of the respective commission with an information copy to be filed with Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. Thereupon, the appeal and the Director(s) file thereof shall be transmitted to the respective commission. The Board of Supervisors, by resolution, may reverse or modify any determination or requirement of the commission. The failure of the Board of Supervisors to vote upon an appeal within 60 days after transmittal shall be deemed a denial of the appeal. If an appeal be denied, the action of the commission shall thereupon become final and conclusive.

10. The Directors shall make an annual public report directed to the Board of Supervisors, reporting on implementation of the ordinance and the efficiency of the ordinance in providing low and moderate income housing. Additionally, at that time an estimated update of new sales, rental and income figures will be made.

Owner occupied units shall be examined additionally on a five year basis for additional adjustments to sales price and alignment with prevailing definitions of "Moderate" income.

11. For the purposes of this ordinance the following terms shall be defined in the following manner:
BASE UNIT - Any unit in the original development proposal effected by this ordinance which would be permitted before the granting of any bonus or imposition of any of the requirements of this ordinance.

DESIGNATED UNIT - Units required to be provided by this ordinance.

BONUS UNIT - Units permitted over and above normal density restrictions as an incentive for compliance with this ordinance.

LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLD - A household which meets the current eligibility standards for low income households in the county as such standards shall be set from time to time by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This definition basically refers to 50% of median county income for a family after adjustments for size.

MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLD - A household which meets the current eligibility standard for moderate income households established for the county from time to time by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This definition basically refers to 80% of median county income for a family after adjustments for size.

12. This ordinance shall become effective 45 days after the approval by the appropriate authority.
APPENDIX 1-A

Sales Unit Density Bonus Formula, When Requirement is Met Within the Original Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderate Priced Units Included</th>
<th>Bonus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Additional Conventional Unit in High Income Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/4 Additional Conventional Unit in Upper Middle Income Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2 Additional Conventional Unit in Middle Income Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1977* Market Price of Base Units</th>
<th># Units Possible Under Land Use Zone Plan</th>
<th># Moderate Priced Units Mandated</th>
<th># Bonus Units at Market Price</th>
<th>Total Units (1 + 3)</th>
<th>Total Units at Market Price (4 - 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. High $65,000 or more</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Upper Middle $50,000 - $64,999</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Middle $30,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Moderate $30,000 or less</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NOT ENCOURAGED IN SACRAMENTO COUNTY BECAUSE OF GOAL FOR REGIONAL DISPERSION OF ALL HOUSING COST RANGES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To be adjusted yearly in proportion to HUD Median Income for county or city.
APPENDIX 1-B

Rental Unit Density Bonus Formula, When Requirement is Met Within the Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Income Rental Units Included</th>
<th>Additional Conventional Unit in High Income Rental Development</th>
<th>3/4 Additional Conventional Unit in Middle Income Rental Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderate Income Rental Units</th>
<th>Additional Conventional Unit in High Income Rental Development</th>
<th>1/2 Additional Conventional Unit in Middle Income Rental Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1977 Approximate Monthly Market Rental Costs* Average Unit in Complex</th>
<th>1 Units Under Current Zoning</th>
<th>2 Required Moderate Income Units</th>
<th>3 Required Low Income Units</th>
<th>4 Bonus</th>
<th>5 Total Units (1+4)</th>
<th>6 Total # Market Units 5-(2+3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1 High $350+</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2 High $350+</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1 Middle $250-349</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2 Middle $250-349</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Moderate $150-249</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No Requirement, No Bonus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Low $150 or less</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Not Encouraged Because of Goal for Regional Dispersion of All Housing Cost Ranges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To be updated yearly

**Examples of inclusion of more than the required number of low income units

***Example of minimum number of low income units, with the remainder of the requirement met by moderate income units
EXAMPLES OF ORDINANCE APPLICATION

Situation - Developer desires to develop 100 acres into single family units. The land use zone is RD-5. Normally, he would be allowed a maximum of 500 units. However, his usual development pattern calls for 3.5 units/acre, a pattern which he feels integral to the success of his development. He submits a map requesting 350 units.

Application of Ordinance - No bonus asked, none given. Fifty-two (52) of the 350 units would have to be sold for a moderate income price.

Situation - Developer desires to develop 100 acres of residential sales units but has no definite preference concerning development pattern. The land use zone is RD-5. He would like to maximize use of the property. Normally he would be allowed a maximum of 500 units.

Application of Ordinance - If the maximum number of units under the plan (i.e. 500) were asked for, 75 of them would have to be moderate income. A maximum bonus of 75 units would be offered (i.e. 15% of the total). The developer anticipates that one-half of his units will be in the upper middle range and that one-half will be in the middle income range. His bonus would be computed as follows:

1) for the upper middle/moderate mix;
   250 upper middle income units x .15 = 37 x .75 = 28 bonus units
2) for the middle/moderate mix;
   250 middle income units x .15 = 37 x .50 = 18 bonus units

His final project would be allowed 546 units of which 75 must be moderate priced units. The other 471 would be split between upper middle and middle income units. These could be placed on the property in any reasonable combination of single family, duplex or townhouse.

Situation - The developer wishes to develop 5 acres of RD-20 property into rental units. He predicts rents in the middle income range (60%) and the high income range (40%). His maximum allowable density would be 100 units under the restrictions of the land use zone.

Application of Ordinance - The required number of low income units would be 10. The required number of moderate income units would be 5. His allowable bonus would be:

1) for the middle/low mix;
   60 middle income units x .10 = 6 x .75 = 5
2) for the middle/moderate mix;
   60 middle income units x .10 = 6 x .50 = 3
3) for the high/low mix
   40 high income units x .10 = 4 x 1 = 4
APPENDIX - C

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Decibels

"Decibel" abbreviated "dB", is a term having several definitions, all referring to a logarithmic ratio of two quantities. For our purposes in measuring sound, the definition is:

\[
\text{SPL (Sound Pressure Level) in dB} = 10 \log \frac{P}{P_0^2} = 20 \log \frac{P}{P_0}
\]

where \( P \) = sound pressure in question

and \( P_0 \) = reference sound pressure, by convention .0002 dynes/cm²

The level chosen for \( P_0 \) is generally considered to be the softest sound perceivable by a healthy young ear. The human ear can detect sounds with pressure level differences of magnitudes exceeding \( 10^{12} \), so that the numbers would become very unwieldy unless logarithms were used.

The decibel notation provides a reasonable approximation of the response to sound intensity of the human ear, but must be modified to provide for the ear's frequency response characteristics. Many different modifications exist, but the most common, and one which does one of the best jobs at moderate sound levels, is the "A" weighting. A decibel reading on a meter using the "A" scale is abbreviated "dBA". This scale compensates fairly well for the lower sensitivity at high and low frequencies of the human ear. Unfortunately, decibels only take care of part of the sound description problem. All sounds obviously have duration as well as intensity, but the dB notation does not provide for this time distribution. A number of systems have been developed to remedy the situation.

CNEL

CNEL, or Community Noise Equivalent Level, is a system used largely by civilian airports in California. It takes into account the time of day when a noise event occurs. Events in the evening, 7:00 PM to 10:00 PM, are considered 3 times as obnoxious as daytime events, 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM. Night-time (10:00 PM to 7:00 AM) events are considered 10 times as obnoxious as daytime events.

CNEL is a calculated quantity which cannot be measured with a meter. Meter readings over a 24 hour period must be fed into an equation which yields a single number. Meter readings must be made on the "A" scale.
\[
\text{CNEL} = 10 \log \frac{1}{24} \left[ (NL_d) + 3 (NL_e) = 10 (NL_n) \right]
\]

Where
- \(NL_d\) = weighted peak sound level for each daytime hour
- \(NL_e\) = weighted peak sound level for each evening hour
- \(NL_n\) = weighted peak sound level for each nighttime hour

CNEL usually requires considerable sophistication and a computer to calculate with any accuracy. Equipment has been developed which, once installed and calibrated, performs the necessary calculations automatically and gives readouts in CNEL.

\[ L_{dn} \]

\(L_{dn}\) or "Average Noise Level" or "Day-Night Noise Level" is essentially the same as CNEL except that the evening term is eliminated and noise events during this period are weighted the same as daytime events. This system is gradually finding increased usage and appears destined to be the descriptor of choice, at least for the short run. As with CNEL, equipment exists to measure and calculate noise levels in \(L_{dn}\) automatically. Depending on the situation, \(L_{dn}\) levels will usually be essentially the same or slightly lower than CNEL.
APPENDIX - D

GENERALIZED FISCAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The purpose of this section is to give a very general idea of costs attributed to implementing this community plan. The time horizon that will be considered is to 1985 when the plan area population is expected to be nearly 79,000 persons. This will be an increase of about 16,000 persons from the 1975 population. The key factor to be considered is the relationship between services provided and the revenues needed to support those services. The services are to people for such things as schools, parks, fire protection, etc.

A significant problem when considering fiscal impacts in the South Sacramento area is jurisdictional. About 40% of the land area is located within the City of Sacramento which provides all services throughout its area. The balance of the community is Unincorporated County of Sacramento area and services are provided either out of the general fund such as the Sheriff's Department or by special taxing district such as Southgate Recreation and Park District.

Revenues accrue to both the city and county in a similar fashion. In the case of the county, the largest proportion of county revenues are transfer payments from the state and federal governments (52%), next is property tax (29%), then local sales tax (8%), and the balance is from other revenue sources such as fines, licenses, and charges for services.

With current trends in property tax adjustment this section is presented as a general guide. Specific methods for future funding is unknown.

Assessed Value* and Per Capita Assessed Valuation of Portions of Plan Area:

1) Southgate Recreation and Park District
   $49,030,389  18,223 people  $2691/persons

2) Fruitridge Recreation and Park District
   $33,788,017  14,200 people  $2379/persons

3) Pacific Fire District
   $53,741,477  16,272 people  $3303/persons

4) Fruitridge Fire District
   $14,098,324  11,000 people  $1282/persons

Schools

Estimated costs** for new schools:

   4 elementary schools  $ 6,000,000
   1 junior high school  4,000,000
                       $10,000,000

*Prior to passage of State Proposition 13 during June 1978.
**"Laguna Creek Area Study;" W.M.R.T.
These costs will be for both the City School District (1 elementary) and Elk Grove Unified School District (3 elementary and 1 junior high school). No estimates are made for existing plant expansion based on increased school enrollment. Because of the complexity of school financing no attempt has been made to assign school costs based on future needs. Additionally, parts of the Elk Grove Unified School District are located within the City of Sacramento thus compounding the problem of rational analysis.

Parks and Recreation

Once again there is a complexity of jurisdictions. The area has three districts to evaluate. For the purpose of discussion let's examine needs and potential costs from a community area viewpoint. The analysis by planning staff indicates a need of about 69 acres of neighborhood and small community parks by 1985. This need has been identified as 12 sites. Costs would be in three categories: land acquisition, facilities development, and annual maintenance. Land can be acquired by purchase, and dedication because of residential development. Recent experience has indicated a cost from $10,000 to $20,000 per acre for park land and an average of $15,000 per acre may be appropriate. Based on county requirements about 30 acres, either in funds or land might be expected to be available because of new development in this period. Thus 39 acres at $15,000 per acre would still be needed, amounting to $585,000. Improvement costs can be estimated at $7,000 per acre for high use parks thus amounting to $483,000 for the 69 acres. Yearly maintenance can range up to $1,500 per acre depending on improvements and use. At a $1,000 a year average the maintenance per year of all new parks exclusive of those presently developed would be about $69,000 per year not including building maintenance. It can easily be seen that over a 10 year period if all parks are purchased/dedicated, improved and maintained, the cost to the area may be $1,413,000.

The revenues to meet these costs would come from each area's property tax and in some cases Community Development Block Grant Monies. Because each district/city area varies in its ability to finance projects, it is impossible to determine fully if this program for park acquisition and improvement can be accomplished by 1985. However, based on past experience, it is reasonable to expect that most of it can.

Sheriff and City Police Services

This service is provided from tax revenue in both jurisdictions. The normal situation is that as population and identified needs increase, the responsible political body provides the appropriate funding. The tax revenue plus any grants or special funding, would provide this service. There will be a fiscal impact, however, it is incremental and over a long period of time.

Water:

As development occurs, the provision of water supplies is included as part of the package sold to the consumer. User fees for connection and water are levied by the water purveyor. Costs of water production and distribution will increase and the private consumer will pay these costs. No fiscal impact is expected because of the plan.
Drainage:

Property assessments are used to finance these capital improvements. Local drainage improvements are included in the development package sold to the residential housing consumer. Maintenance of drainage improvements is financed by property tax. There are no negative fiscal impacts associated from this plan assuming Laguna Creek is left in its present state and new development occurs outside of the floodplain. (See "Laguna Creek Area Study," W.M.R.T.). However, it is possible that assessment districts for drainage could be developed and the cost of these improvements would be paid by the property owner.

Wastewater:

Once again in the development of residential areas, the cost of these facilities is part of the package the residential purchaser pays for. Treatment of wastewater will be at the Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant that has been financed by Grants and Bonds. The user pays a fee to the district for service.

Solid Waste:

This service is provided to homes and business in both city and county and is financed by a self-supporting user fee.

Library Service:

As described by the plan, a new facility would be appropriate in the Fruitridge area. Furthermore, some or all construction costs may be financed through the use of Community Development Block Grant Monies. If this occurs then costs of operation would be the major fiscal impact. As described in the "Laguna Creek Area Study," those costs could be about $85,000 a year and would be financed by property for the city-county library system. This impact would be no more than expected to adequately serve a portion of the metropolitan area that is presently underserved. Funding for such a project is, at the moment, highly questionable.