

Appendix E: Data Development

Appendix E: Data Development

Data Collection and Summary of Baseline Materials

At the initiation of the project, the City of Sacramento provided electronic files containing approximately 55 layers of data. Additionally the City provided for the consultant team various hard copy reports including draft and final versions of the 2003 NBHCP, the Metro Air Park Specific Plan, prior economic studies and various agricultural related reports. Electronic files were comprised mostly of data from various sources, including Sacramento County, Natomas Basin Habitat Conservancy, U.S Fish & Wildlife Service and the Department of Fish and Game. Much of these layers served as a base layer for analysis, including the County of Sacramento's hydrology layers and as augmented through subsequent review of the various reports. Other important data from this electronic package included Sacramento County's land parcels and the associated value of each parcel based on the land transaction thus providing a snapshot of land ownership in the Natomas Basin. Also provided were layers identifying Williamson Act contract status for each parcel.

From the Natomas Basin Conservancy, the consultant team obtained the delineation of their acquisition and management areas for both Sutter and Sacramento County areas. This was an evolving data set since the Conservancy is still active in acquiring required habitat mitigation for the NBHCP. This information became part of the baseline data and is a part of all subsequent analyses maps.

From Sutter County (via the City of Sacramento) information was received regarding Measure M, a referendum approved by the voters of Sutter County to amend the County General Plan, rezone and therefore develop the southeastern most part of Sutter County bordering Sacramento County. Also received from Sutter County were land use layers, parcel data and 2006 crop production data.

From the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the most recent soil survey data for Sacramento County was obtained, and from the Department of Conservation, the latest Farmland Monitoring and Mapping Program (FMMP) data -- which is a State of California classification of important farmland -- was acquired. Crop characteristics were furnished by the Agricultural Commission's Office and detailed ownership and land transactional information was furnished by the County Assessor's office.

From the Natomas Basin Conservancy, data pertaining to current conservancy land holdings were obtained. This was actually an iterative process since the Conservancy is still actively engaged in implementing the acquisition and development of the mitigated lands for the NBHCP. From Sacramento International Airport Management group, the planning team received numerous layers of valuable information depicting both current and future operations conditions. As noted above, the airport has plans for future expansion including extending at least one of the runways to accommodate larger aircraft, as well as building a third runway to the west of the two current runways. Based on that expansion scenario, a new noise contour and safety model was generated and provided to the planning team to support the inventory and analysis tasks.

Appendix E: Data Development

Additional Data Requests to City, County and Others:

Airport Buffer:

1. We requested the metadata regarding the “new noise contours” file.
2. There appears to be conflicting data between the noise contours and the locations of the projected approach surfaces at the ends of the run ways. *A visible offset suggests that one of the two datasets has the wrong alignment.*
3. We request better vegetation data within the airport management sphere –i.e. *we request a database of tall trees that are potential nesting or roost habitat to birds if the data exists. (We hope to define not only the required buffer lands of the airport operations but how these lands overlap with other open space elements like habitat supporting open space or recreation open space.)*
4. Airport airside security limits and general security boundaries.

Flood Control/ Hydrology

1. We requested the electronic (CAD or other?) drawings of all SAFCA proposed flood-related improvements including levee setbacks. *If we can't get the electronic versions then accurate maps will be fine. It appears that there are many iterations to this information so the latest and most probable scenarios should be best.*
2. We have several drafts of the Natomas area FEMA flood insurance zones. We requested the latest with accompanying metadata.
3. We checked to see if LIDAR imagery was available for the whole Basin but found there was only partial coverage *From it we can develop a detailed elevation model of the area and it will help accurately depict low-lying areas, flood potential and flood mechanics.*
4. We also requested historic maps or depictions of the Natomas area would be very informative. *This will be useful in determining what conditions were prior to major human interventions such as the development of the levee system.*

Habitat/Biological

1. Although we had the latest sightings data from the CA NDDB we wanted to develop the best habitat models in terms of Swainson's hawk and Giant garter snake habitat preferences. We discussed with Jim Estep and received generic veg-cover criteria for Swainson's hawk related to agricultural crops associated agriculture.
2. WE received current crop data for Sacramento County to augment and reinforce other habitat related information already in hand especially for species dependent on specific forage types or particular crops.
3. We requested but did not locate a dataset for the large or important trees in Natomas.
4. We pursued More evaluative data of the characteristics of the Natomas waterways. *We may not be able to do better than US EPA's threatened waterways data but this will be useful in completing an assessment of habitat potential for these features*
5. We received the Biological Effectiveness Monitoring for the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan Area 2005 Annual Survey Results (April 2006) by Jones & Stokes. This is by far the most recent and comprehensive biological dataset but it is also still missing key coverage areas and we are bound by confidentiality not to display specific site-related findings from this study.

Appendix E:

Data Development

Existing parks, OS and Trail Connections

1. We requested existing regional trails, bike lanes and routes. (City, County and/or SACOG?)
2. WE requested any info regarding the bike and trails master plans (City, County and/or SACOG)
3. Specifically we looked for data for the path of the new Ueda Parkway along Steelhead Creek from Elkhorn Blvd to the American River, and other parkways and bikeways that are planned. We also looked for Info regarding proposed or existing connections to Dry Creek Parkway.
4. Other regional trail or linkage type proposals and projects *i.e. Ueda Parkway is complete between W. El Camino to just north of Main in Natomas. It's a connection to the future Dry Creek Parkway, another major trail that will make a 70 mile loop when Ueda Parkway, Dry Creek Parkway are completed and connected to the American River Trail System.*

Important Farmland, Agricultural Resources and the Williamson Act

1. We obtained detailed crop data from the Sacramento County Agricultural Commission. for lands within Sacramento County regarding what crops are being produced where. *We also obtained this for Sutter County.*
2. Current crop info including value per acre of crops. *The Important Farmland designation based on soils is a start but we would also like to see what the most valuable agriculture in this area is in terms of value of crops produced on a yield per acre basis.*
3. We also acquired Williamson Act parcel info for Sacramento and Sutter County.

Community Separator

1. We investigated the intent of the community separators so we could develop a rationale for the separator in terms of location and the optimum width or shape.
2. We assumed that the Highway 99 corridor the primary vantage where a community separator should be considered. This study did not consider views from the I-5 bridge over the Sacramento River coming into the County , views along the Garden Highway, the I-80 bridge over the Sacramento River nor or the Power Line Road corridor.