

MINUTE ITEM

This Calendar Item No. 24
was approved as Minute Item
No. 24 by the State Lands
Commission by a vote of 2
to 0 at its 1/31/85
meeting.

MINUTE ITEM

24

01/31/85
W 23451
Kiley
Gorfain

SACRAMENTO RIVER CARRYING CAPACITY STUDY

During consideration of Calendar Item 24, the resolution in
Calendar Item 24 was approved as presented by a vote of 2-0,
with 1 abstention by Commission-Alternate Ordway.

Attachment: Calendar Item 24.

CALENDAR PAGE

MINUTE PAGE

350

CALENDER ITEM

A 4, 1, 10

24 †

01/31/85

W 23451

S 1, 5, 6

Kiley

Gorfain

SACRAMENTO RIVER CARRYING CAPACITY STUDY

On July 12, 1984, the State Lands Commission imposed a moratorium on marina development along the Sacramento River within Sacramento County and directed staff to undertake a comprehensive study of the cumulative effects of existing and proposed marina development on the River's carrying capacity.

The moratorium was enacted as a result of the recent proliferation of new marina and marina expansion proposals, and a growing concern over competing river use conflicts and the potential adverse effects which could result from piecemeal development.

Pursuant to Commission direction, staff has prepared a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Study. The RFP includes a study outline (see Attachment A) prepared in consultation with other public agencies and prospective consultants who have expressed an interest in participating in the Study. The Study is expected to take 4-6 months and cost up to \$125,000.

Staff is in the process of soliciting additional funds for the Study from the City and County of Sacramento and from Yolo County. If such funds from local jurisdictions are not available, the Commission would have to proceed on its own and, based on the total amount of state funds available, may have to modify the scope of the Study as presently described in the proposed RFP. If such modifications are substantial, the Executive Officer may deem it necessary to re-submit the Study outline to the Commission for further approval.

Pursuant to the Commission's delegation of authority and the State CEQA guidelines (14 Cal. Adm. Code 15061), staff has determined that this activity is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as a

CALENDAR PAGE	120
INDEX PAGE	351

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 24 (CONT'D)

categorically exempt project. The project is exempt because it is a planning study for possible future action not approved, adopted or funded by the Commission (14 Cal. Adm. Code 15262).

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE COMMISSION:

1. FIND THAT THE PROPOSED ACTION IS EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF CEQA PURSUANT TO 14 CAL. ADM. CODE 15061, BECAUSE IT INVOLVES A FEASIBILITY OR PLANNING STUDY FOR POSSIBLE FUTURE ACTION WHICH THE COMMISSION HAS NOT APPROVED, ADOPTED, OR FUNDED (PRC 21101 AND 14 CAL. ADM. CODE 15262).
2. AUTHORIZE STAFF TO SEND OUT THE RFP TO PROSPECTIVE CONTRACTORS.
3. AUTHORIZE STAFF TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE CONDUCT OF THE SACRAMENTO RIVER CARRYING CAPACITY STUDY TO THE LOWEST QUALIFIED BIDDER.

ATTACHMENT A

1.3.

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED

The study should consider, but need not be limited to an examination of:

A. Competing Uses of the River

- 1) Boating facilities (e.g., marinas, launching ramps, fueling docks, sanitary facilities)
- 2) Water skiing
- 3) Fishing
- 4) Cruising
- 5) Picknicking
- 6) Swimming
- 7) Sightseeing
- 8) Nature walking
- 9) Commercial development (Old Sacramento)
- 10) Industrial
- 11) Cruise/excursions
- 12) Special events (e.g., July 4th - Water Festival)

B. River Congestion

- 1) Definition of acceptable and unacceptable congestion
- 2) Estimation of congestion attributable to sources within the study area

(NON-SUBSTANTIVE REVISION 03/11/85)

CALENDAR PAGE	120.2
MINUTE PAGE	353

- 3) Estimation of congestion attributable to sources outside the study area
- 4) Relationship of defined congestion levels for the study area to other comparable areas of the U.S.
- 5) Evaluation of methods and effects of regulation in mitigation of congestion levels
- 6) Description of joint regulatory measures used elsewhere in the development of waterway use controls

C. Air Pollution and Noise Pollution

- 1) Effects of increased river use by competing users
- 2) Effects of new construction in and along the river front

D. Water Quality

- 1) Effect of marina development on the River's water quality
- 2) Water quality effects of marina and other boating activities on competing water uses

E. Aesthetic Environment

F. Effect on Existing Levee System resulting from:

- 1) Wave wash caused by boating activity
- 2) Access and parking requirements

(NON-SUBSTANTIVE REVISION 03/11/85)

- 3) Estimation of congestion attributable to sources outside the study area
- 4) Relationship of defined congestion levels for the study area to other comparable areas of the U.S.
- 5) Evaluation of methods and effects of regulation in mitigation of congestion levels
- 6) Description of joint regulatory measures used elsewhere in the development of waterway use controls

C. Air Pollution and Noise Pollution

- 1) Effects of increased river use by competing users
- 2) Effects of new construction in and along the river front

D. Water Quality

- 1) Effect of marina development on the River's water quality
- 2) Water quality effects of marina and other boating activities on competing water uses

E. Aesthetic Environment

F. Effect on Existing Levee System resulting from:

- 1) Wave wash caused by boating activity
- 2) Access and parking requirements

ATTACHMENT A

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED

1.3.

The study should consider, but need not be limited to an examination of:

A. Competing Uses of the River

- 1) Boating facilities (e.g., marinas, launching ramps, fueling docks, sanitary facilities)
- 2) Water skiing
- 3) Fishing
- 4) Cruising
- 5) Picknicking
- 6) Swimming
- 7) Sightseeing
- 8) Nature walking
- 9) Commercial development (Old Sacramento)
- 10) Industrial
- 11) Cruise/excursions
- 12) Special events (e.g., July 4th - Water Festival)

B. River Congestion

- 1) Definition of acceptable and unacceptable congestion
- 2) Estimation of congestion attributable to sources within the study area

G. Riparian Habitat

- 1) Rip-rap effect on riparian vegetation
- 2) Destruction of habitat from new facilities
- 3) Rare and endangered species
- 4) Habitat enhancement

H. Fisheries Habitat

- 1) Effect on habitat by new marina facilities
- 2) Effect of increased boating activity on sensitive habitats

I. Local and Regional Plans and Land Use

- 1) Consistency of marina development with planning efforts of affected local jurisdictions in the study region
- 2) Consistency of proposed marina development with land uses adjacent to the river

J. Archaeological Impacts

- 1) Survey of existing information on significant resources from the American River to Miller Park

K. Evaluation of the Consequences of Not Allowing Additional Marina Development