

**SACRAMENTO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION**  
**1112 "I" Street, Suite 100**  
**Sacramento, California 95814**  
**(916) 874-6458**

September 19, 2007

TO: Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission

FROM: Peter Brundage, Executive Officer

RE: **Greenbriar Proposal: 1) City of Sacramento Sphere of Influence Amendment 2) Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Sphere of Influence Amendment 3) County Sanitation District #1 Sphere of Influence Amendment (12-05)**  
CEQA: Environmental Impact Report  
(State Clearinghouse # 2005062144)

CONTACT: Don Lockhart (916) 874-2937

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Adopt Resolution No. LAFC 1345; A Resolution of the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Sphere of Influence Amendments for the City of Sacramento, the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, and County Sanitation District #1. (State Clearinghouse # 2005062144) (LAFC 12-05)
2. Adopt Resolution No. LAFC 1346; A Resolution of the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission Adopting Findings of Fact and A Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Sphere of Influence Amendments for the City of Sacramento, the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, and County Sanitation District #1. (LAFC 12-05)
3. Adopt Resolution No. LAFC 1347; A Resolution of the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Sphere of Influence Amendments for the City of Sacramento, the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, and County Sanitation District #1. (LAFC 12-05)
4. Adopt Resolution No. LAFC 1348; A Resolution of the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission 1) Making Written Determinations for the Municipal Services Review; and 2) Approving the Sphere of Influence

Amendments for the City of Sacramento, the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, and County Sanitation District #1. (LAFC 12-05)

[The Municipal Services Review (MSR) (alternatively called a Master Services Element) was prepared and submitted by the City in July 2007.]

**MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION THIS EVENING**

The matters before your Commission this evening consists entirely of the Municipal Services Review, the Final Environmental Impact Report and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, and the related Sphere of Influence Amendments for the City of Sacramento, the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District and the County Sanitation District # 1.

If your Commission acts in the affirmative on the preceding items, the various related land use entitlements and reorganization will be considered by the City of Sacramento City Council and your Commission at a later date. No physical development of the site may occur without annexation to the City of Sacramento.

**Project Proponents:**

City of Sacramento Scot Mende, New Growth & Infill Manager Planning Department 915 I Street, 3rd floor Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 808-4756	River West Development Bret Hogge 7700 College Town Dr. # 215 Sacramento, CA 95826 (916) 379-0955	North Natomas 575 Investors, LLC Brian Vail 7700 College Town Dr. # 101 Sacramento, CA 95826 (916) 379-0955
---	---	---

This Sphere of Influence Amendment request was initiated by a Resolution of the City Council, in response to a landowner application.

**BOUNDARY OF THE PROJECT AREA**

The territory proposed to be included in this Sphere of Influence Amendment is the result of an application received by the City of Sacramento (“City”) for the development of approximately 577 acres at the northwest quadrant of the intersection of State Routes 70/99 and Interstate 5, hereinafter referred to as the Greenbriar Proposal. The proposed development site is located in the unincorporated portion of Sacramento County, adjacent to and west of the City of Sacramento, outside the City of Sacramento’s (City) existing Sphere of Influence (SOI). (DEIR, p. 3-1.) It is located outside the Sacramento County General Plan Urban Services Boundary as well as the Urban Policy Area. [See Tab B]

On the south and east, the site abuts the City of Sacramento city limits. There are rice fields to the north. I-5 and new mixed-use development lies to the south (within the City

of Sacramento). SR 70/99 and a new residential community currently under development within the City's North Natomas Community lie to the east. Metro Air Park, under development, abuts the proposal site on the west. Slightly further west, and adjacent to Metro Air Park, is the Sacramento International Airport, an area first developed and opened for operation in 1967.

### **SUMMARY OF PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposed project is an application to the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission by the City of Sacramento to expand the City's Sphere of Influence, as well to expand the Sphere of Influence of both the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District and County Sanitation District #1. On November 4, 2005, the City submitted an application to the Commission for an amendment of its Sphere of Influence ("Application") and resulting amendments to the Sphere of Influence of the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District ("SRCSD") and County Sanitation District #1 ("CSD#1") (collectively the "Greenbriar Proposal.") The Application includes additional development entitlements subject to approval by other public agencies, including Prezoning, General Plan Amendments, Master Tentative Parcel Map, Tentative Subdivision Map, Planned Unit Development, and Development Agreement. The Application also includes a Request for Reorganization (Annexation and Detachments) to be considered by your Commission at a later date, should the SOI Amendments and other certain development entitlements be approved.

The project site is located west of the City of Sacramento's North Natomas community within the Natomas Basin. The project site consists of approximately 577 acres of fallow agricultural land (at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the project was circulated) bounded by Interstate 5 (I-5) to the south, State Routes 70 and 99 (SR 70/99) to the east, Elkhorn Boulevard to the north, and Lone Tree Canal to the west. The project site is immediately adjacent and west of the City's North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP) area and the City's jurisdictional boundary and sphere of influence (SOI). The recently approved Metro Air Park Special Planning Area (SPA) is located adjacent and west of the project site. An industrial business park is planned for development within this area, under the jurisdiction of the County of Sacramento. [Tab B]

The Greenbriar proposal is a mixed-use development project that includes:

- (1) 3,473 low, medium, and high density residential units,
- (2) 48.4 acres (net) of commercial development,
- (3) 10-acre (net) elementary school site,
- (4) 48.4 acres (net) of neighborhood parks, and
- (5) 39-acre (net) lake/detention basin that encircles the central portion of the project site.
- (6) 16.5 dwelling units/net acre (individual densities for each residential category (248.2) divided by the number of categories(15)

Based on the average household size from the U.S. Census 2000, the project would generate additional population of 8,926 persons (2.57 average household size x 3,473 households in project.)

The proposal also includes the construction of a new east-west roadway, Meister Way, through the center of the site. A new (unfunded) light rail station and rail alignment is proposed to be constructed by Sacramento Regional Transit (RT) along this roadway near the center of the site. The rail alignment would connect the project site to the Metro Airpark development and Sacramento International Airport to the west and the North Natomas Community to the east across SR 70/99 via a new proposed overpass at SR 70/99. Higher density (than other parts of the project), mixed-use development (residential and retail/office land uses on same parcel) is proposed along Meister Way near the proposed light rail station. The project also includes a linear open space/buffer area that extends along the western boundary of the site, adjacent to Lone Tree Canal, proposed to protect potentially sensitive biological habitat.

### **History of City of Sacramento Sphere of Influence**

A Sphere of Influence is defined as the probable physical boundary and service area of a local agency. Land use regulation and service delivery within a Sphere of Influence remains the responsibility of Sacramento County and affected special districts until such time as the area, or any portion thereof, is annexed to an incorporated city. Currently, the City of Sacramento contains approximately 99 square miles with a population of approximately 450,000 residents. The City of Sacramento's Sphere of Influence was adopted October 21, 1981, almost twenty-five years ago. Since that time, there have been relatively few adjustments to the City's Sphere of Influence. There have been relatively few annexations. The Cosumnes River College SOI/ Annexation was completed in 1990. Northgate Market Place Reorganization was completed in 1991. In 1995, the Commission amended the City's Sphere of Influence in a clean-up to include all the territory already within the City's corporate boundary and the territory known as the Natomas Panhandle to be included within the City's Sphere of Influence. Since 1985, there have been 12 annexations, containing approximately 797 acres of land, to the City of Sacramento. The majority, as well as the largest areas of annexation, occurred prior to the 1970's.

These past Sphere Amendments in terms of a ninety-five square mile city are considered to be relatively minor. A majority of the development (build out) during this period occurred in south Sacramento, South and North Natomas as well as the unincorporated area and the City of Folsom. Since 2000, the City and County of Sacramento have developed principles and policies related to the City of Sacramento SOI in the Natomas area, called the Natomas Joint Vision.

The proposed SOI Study Area is composed of a number of different sub-areas. Except for the Natomas Joint Vision Study Area, the sub-areas are composed of relatively small parcels that are already located in relatively close proximity to new development and infrastructure. Therefore, these sub-areas could develop sooner than originally anticipated. Thus, there will be continual pressure to process Sphere of Influence

Amendments based on current build out projections within the current City limits. In addition to that, there will likely be continual pressure to process Sphere of Influence Amendments even if the Natomas Joint Vision SOI study proceeds in a timely fashion.

**CITY OF SACRAMENTO SPHERE OF INFLUENCE POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE GREENBRIAR PROJECT**

The City of Sacramento states the following reasons in support of the Greenbriar proposal:

- The City of Sacramento seeks to direct orderly growth and to provide an adequate level of service to the residents of the community.
- The City of Sacramento seeks to encourage urban development within the City limits and discourage urban development in the unincorporated area.
- The Sphere of Influence shall include those parcels adjacent to the City limit whose development could have significant visual, traffic, service and environmental impacts on the City of Sacramento so that the City may influence the ultimate development of those parcels.
- The Sphere of Influence Amendment boundary shall include those areas that can be annexed to the City of Sacramento within the next 5 to 15 year period to meet its projected growth trends and development patterns.

Further, the City asserts that municipal services may be extended to the Greenbriar property, such that current City residents will not be adversely impacted. The City believes that these services can be provided without impact to current residents.

The City also provides the following policy rationale:

**1. City policy rationale for inclusion of Greenbriar site into the SOI.**

Assuming the current rate of development absorption and vacant land inventory, both Citywide and within the existing SOI, sufficient holding capacity does not exist within the City to accommodate projected growth. Including Greenbriar in the SOI will help the City accommodate projected growth.

According to the City's General Plan technical background reports, as of September 2005, there were approximately 14,000 acres of low and medium density parcels of vacant land available. However, the actual number is likely less than this total, because a substantial quantity of land has been developed subsequently in the North Natomas area, where the majority of this land is concentrated. For example, projects considered in a cumulative context include the Westborough, Cambay West, Natomas Crossing, Natomas Town Center, Natomas Creek Project and the Panhandle Project (595 acres with 3,075 dwelling units). All of these projects are located in the North Natomas area.

Several new projects are currently being developed in the south Sacramento area. M&H Realty and SunCal Companies and Dunmore Homes have submitted an application to develop one of the last remaining large blocks of land in the City, the 925-acre Delta Shores site. Vacant industrial sites at the 240-acre downtown Sacramento railyards (up to 10,000 dwelling units) and 72 acre Curtis Park railyards (540 dwelling units and 188,941 square feet of retail/commercial) are being actively pursued for development, with applications submitted and the environmental review process begun on both. As this shows, the North Natomas area continues to be actively developed, and other large, vacant, or undeveloped parcels are being actively pursued.

The City believes that, as a result of the lack of available vacant land within its boundaries, the City will need to look to sites outside the SOI in order to accommodate projected growth. The information provided by the General Plan Update Technical Background Reports and the ongoing City Infill Strategy support this conclusion, as discussed below.

**a. General Plan Update Technical Background Reports**

The Technical Background report for the City of Sacramento General Plan Update shows the following:

Current (2005) population:	450,000
Proposed General Plan Holding Capacity (2030):	564,000
Anticipated City population (2030):	650,000

Over the next 25 years, the City is expected to grow by 200,000 people. However, the current General Plan, including the current sphere-of-influence, would only accommodate an additional estimated 114,000 people. Additional land would be needed if the City intends to accommodate the 86,000 people above the General Plan's holding capacity that are anticipated to live in the City.

In its July 6, 2007 report, the City's economic consultants, Economic Planning Systems (EPS) estimated that, given the General Plan update area's urban form and land use parameters, the City has theoretical vacant and redevelopment capacity for 111,000 additional housing units.

However, while the vacant site potential and reuse potential is theoretically a sizable number, EPS believes that the market and site constraints of these potential development areas will not deliver anywhere near the 100,000 dwelling units needed. In other words, these sites are generally low potential (with rates of absorption by 2030 of less than 30% of theoretical development capacity). Therefore, in order to meet growth targets, the City needs to utilize the new growth sites, including the Greenbriar project site.

## **b. City Infill Strategy**

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) adopted the Sacramento Regional Transportation and Land Use Study Preferred Blueprint Scenario (Blueprint) in December 2004. The Blueprint's preferred land use scenario identifies the Greenbriar site for high density mixed residential and single family small lot land uses. Existing North Natomas development to the east across SR 70/99 is designated for single-family large lot and single-family small lot, and the area south of I-5 for single-family large lot, single-family small lot, public, and medium-density mixed-use center or corridor land uses. Undeveloped areas to the north are designated for medium-density and high-density mixed residential land uses with the area to the west designated for industrial land uses.

The City of Sacramento has discretion to determine how it would implement the Blueprint's Smart Growth Principles in its long-term planning. For areas considered as Urban Reserve (i.e., areas designated for future urban growth beyond a 20-year planning horizon), the City determined that future growth within the Natomas Area in accordance with SACOG's Blueprint Smart Growth Principles could result in the development of up to approximately 44,400 housing units, approximately 4 million square feet of commercial space, and 14,600 jobs.

Generally, with the exception of the "pipeline" projects (e.g., Greenbriar, Panhandle, Curtis Park Village, Railyards, etc.), the General Plan anticipates less than 30% of theoretical development capacity for the infill sites. The infill sites constitute only about half of the anticipated growth allocations. Therefore, in order to meet growth targets, the City needs to utilize the new growth sites, including the Greenbriar project site.

All of the Blueprint's principles have been applied in the design of the proposed Greenbriar project. The project incorporates diverse housing types (i.e., low density, medium density, high density residential), development would be compact (i.e., maximize use of the urban footprint by providing medium and high density residential land uses on more than half of the site), the area of public open space is greater than required by city regulations (project provides 48.4 acres versus City requirement of 48.2 acres), and mixed uses (i.e., residential and commercial land uses on one parcel) would be accommodated on the site. In addition, the project would provide a variety of transit opportunities including walking and bicycling, and by planning for a future Downtown-Natomas-Airport light rail extension and station at the project site.

## **2. Infrastructure needs or deficiencies currently noted within the North Natomas Community Plan area.**

The North Natomas Financing Plan underfunds identified infrastructure needs by about \$70 million. This deficiency is the result of construction costs and standards escalating faster than the adjustment of fees. These deficiencies include library, fire, police, transit and roadway facilities.

The North Natomas Financing Plan funded the land acquisition for the North Natomas Regional Park; however, identified deficiencies are the payment of Habitat Conservation Plan Fees and capital improvements for the Regional Park. Greenbriar will contribute approximately \$3.35 million to help fund this amount.

The Greenbriar project would include phased expansion and extension of public utility infrastructure from adjacent areas (e.g., NNCP area) to the project site. Infrastructure plans would specify the size and locations of pipelines necessary to convey potable water, wastewater (including pump and lift stations if necessary), and storm water drainage to and from the project site. In addition, locations for placing electrical infrastructure and natural gas lines would also be identified on the plans.

The main water supply for the project site would be a 30-inch transmission line that would be extended from South Bayou Road (south of the project site) under I-5 (via a jack and bore construction method) to Elkhorn Boulevard. Additional reliability and redundancy in the water distribution system would be provided through a 24-inch transmission line that would be constructed from Natomas Boulevard and Elkhorn Boulevard (east of the project site) to the intersection of Lone Tree Road and Elkhorn Boulevard where it would connect to on-site distribution facilities. The proposed water distribution system would consist of a grid of 8-inch and 12-inch distribution mains throughout areas designated for residential land uses. An 18-inch transmission main would run under Meister Way from the western edge of the project site to the east; it would then run north between two parcels designated for high density residential land uses (near the eastern boundary), east along the boundary of the site, and would terminate at a 24-inch transmission main located in Elkhorn Boulevard. Three groundwater wells would be constructed on-site; one to periodically maintain flow in Lone Tree Canal; and two to maintain (if needed) flows within the on-site lake detention basin.

The project also includes the construction of a gravity flow and force main wastewater collection system. Approximately one-quarter of the site would be served by a gravity flow system that would connect to the existing 33-inch North Natomas interceptor located at the terminus of Greg Thatch Circle (immediately east of the project site). The remaining portions of the project site would be served by gravity flow to a centrally located lift station. Flows from the lift station would be conveyed by a 16-inch sewer force main that would ultimately connect to the 33-inch North Natomas Interceptor along the northwestern boundary of the property.

### **3. Growth and population projections for the affected area**

The South Natomas Community Plan has essentially reached its buildout of 18,000 dwelling units. The North Natomas area has approximately 18,000 dwelling units toward buildout of approximately 32,000 dwelling units. The first residential building permit was issued in 1999 for North Natomas; in excess of 2000 dwelling units have been constructed annually; at this rate, buildout of the current Sphere of Influence in Natomas would be expected in approximately 2013.



#### **4. Financing constraints, opportunities and implications to address existing infrastructure demand**

Greenbriar will contribute to the North Natomas Financing Plan to help fund several categories of infrastructure and public facilities. As discussed above, the project will provide \$3.35 million for the planned North Natomas Regional Park. In addition, the project will provide \$1.78 million for library facilities, a \$1.52 million contribution for the construction of fire facilities, and \$2.4 million for police facilities, which includes a \$1.5 million 880-MegaHertz radio transmission tower.

The project also includes dedication of a corridor that could accommodate a future transit stop and light rail alignment for the Downtown-Natomas-Airport light rail extension, located near the center of the project site along the proposed Meister Way roadway. The light rail station would provide public transportation access to downtown Sacramento, Sacramento International Airport and Metro Air Park. The transit station is currently estimated at \$2.4 million. RT will also be provided with the right-of-way over the project site at no cost.

Finally, the Greenbriar project will provide \$1.65 million for the improvements to the Elkhorn interchange.

#### **Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District**

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) provides conveyance, treatment and disposal service to the contributing agencies: the City of Folsom, the City of Sacramento, and County Sanitation District 1 is responsible for the remainder. CSD#1 operates and maintains collection systems in the Cities of Elk Grove, Citrus Heights, Rancho Cordova, and the unincorporated areas of Sacramento County. The study area of the 1993-1994 Sacramento Sewerage Expansion Study (SSES) included property within the Urban Services Boundary (as described in the 1993 Sacramento County General Plan), plus the Folsom SOI Area. In addition to these areas, the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Interceptor System Master Plan 2000 (Master Plan 2000) includes interceptor conveyance capacity for the City of West Sacramento. Master Plan 2000 considers the impacts of providing service to other areas, including a portion of Placer County, Northern Territories, East County Area and South Elk Grove. (Black & Veatch, Sacramento Regional Sanitation District Interceptor Master Plan, January 2000, pp ES-1 and ES-2.) The Municipal Services Review includes an Appendix C that outlines the service areas described in Master Plan 2000.

#### **County Sanitation District #1**

County Sanitation District #1 (CSD#1) provides wastewater collection and conveyance to the Cities of Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, unincorporated areas of Sacramento County, and portions of the City of Folsom and the City of Sacramento. CSD-1 is the largest of the contributing agencies of the Sacramento Regional County

Sanitation District. Wastewater from CSD#1 is discharged into an SRCSD interceptor system and treated at SRCSD's Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The main collection system includes 2,700 miles of sewer pipeline ranging in size from 4 to 75 inches in diameter. Collection system pipelines are categorized based on size, function, and hydraulic capacity. Collectors are pipes that receive flows directly from homes and businesses and are generally 10 inches in diameter or smaller. Trunk sewers are pipelines that function as conveyance facilities to an SRCSD system and generally are 12 inches in diameter and larger.

The Greenbriar Proposal will be required to annex into the CSD-1 and SRCSD service boundaries to receive sanitary sewer service. Sufficient capacity within the SRCSD interceptor system and CSD#1 trunk facility has been confirmed to accommodate the Greenbriar service demand without adversely impacting current service levels.

### **SUMMARY OF LAFCO SPHERE OF INFLUENCE ANALYSIS**

#### **General Sphere of Influence Requirements**

1. Municipal Service Review
1. Environmental Documentation.
2. City and County "meet and confer" negotiation period regarding the Sphere of Influence boundaries, development standards, and zoning requirements for the areas within the proposed Sphere of Influence. LAFCo is required to give "great weight" if agreement is reached between the City of Sacramento and the County of Sacramento. The two entities have completed their required meet and confer process, and have come to agreement on various matters. However, the means and definition of "Open Space Preservation" remains a topic of discussion.

#### **Sphere of Influence Review Requirements per Government Code**

In determining the Sphere of Influence of each local agency, the Commission shall consider and prepare a written statement of its determinations with respect of each of the following:

1. The present and planned uses in the area, including agricultural and open space lands.
2. The present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area.
3. The present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services that the agency (or agencies) provides or is authorized to provide.
4. The existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the Commission determines that they are relevant to the agency.

In conducting a Sphere of Influence Review, the Commission shall comprehensively review all of the agencies that provide the identified service or services in the identified area. Factors to be considered in the review of a proposal shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following:

- (a) Population, population density; land area and land use; per capita assessed valuation; topography, natural boundaries, and drainage basins; proximity to other populated areas; the likelihood of significant growth in the area, and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas, during the next 10 years.
- (b) Need for organized community services; the present cost and adequacy of governmental services and controls in the area; probable future needs for those services and controls; probable effect of the proposed incorporation, formation, annexation, or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the area and adjacent areas.  
  
"Services," as used in this subdivision, refers to governmental services whether or not the services are services which would be provided by local agencies subject to this division, and includes the public facilities necessary to provide those services.
- (c) The effect of the proposed action and of alternative actions, on adjacent areas, on mutual social and economic interests, and on the local governmental structure of the county.
- (d) The conformity of both the proposal and its anticipated effects with both the adopted commission policies on providing planned, orderly, efficient patterns of urban development, and the policies and priorities set forth in Section 56377.
- (e) The effect of the proposal on maintaining the physical and economic integrity of agricultural lands, as defined by Section 56016.
- (f) The definiteness and certainty of the boundaries of the territory, the nonconformance of proposed boundaries with lines of assessment or ownership, the creation of islands or corridors of unincorporated territory, and other similar matters affecting the proposed boundaries.
- (g) Consistency with city or county general and specific plans.
- (h) The Sphere of Influence of any local agency which may be applicable to the proposal being reviewed.
- (i) The comments of any affected local agency.

- (j) The ability of the newly formed or receiving entity to provide the services which are the subject of the application to the area, including the sufficiency of revenues for those services following the proposed boundary change.
- (k) Timely availability of water supplies adequate for projected needs as specified in Section 65352.5.
- (l) The extent to which the proposal will assist the receiving entity in achieving its fair share of the regional housing needs as determined by the appropriate council of governments.
- (m) Any information or comments from the landowner or owners.
- (n) Any information relating to existing land use designations.

The Commission shall consider the request and receive any oral or written testimony. The Commission may approve or disapprove, with or without amendment, wholly, partially, or conditionally, the request.

**MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW-GENERAL GUIDELINES**

*Please note, the Municipal Services Review was previously distributed August 27, 2007.*

**Municipal Service Review Requirements**

In order to prepare the Sphere of Influence Amendments for the Greenbriar Property, the Commission shall conduct a service review of the municipal services provided in the affected territory. The Commission shall include in the area designated for service review the county, the region, the sub-region, or any other geographic area as is appropriate for an analysis of the service or services to be reviewed and shall prepare a written statement of its determination with respect to each of the following:

1. Infrastructure needs or deficiencies.
2. Growth and population projections for the affected area.
3. Financing constraints and opportunities.
4. Cost avoidance opportunities.
5. Opportunities for rate restructuring.
6. Opportunities for shared facilities.
7. Government structure options, including advantages and disadvantages of consolidations or reorganization of service providers.
8. Evaluation of management efficiencies.
9. Local accountability and governance.

### **The Purpose and Intent of the Municipal Service Review**

The MSR is the instrument required to provide information and data to ensure that the Commission has access to all necessary information in a timely manner to make sound conclusions and determinations with respect to municipal services.

Determinations have been included for each of the service items addressed in the Municipal Services Review. The information included in the MSR supports the general determinations stated in the “Determinations” of each section. Since the Greenbriar project site is not part of the current City SOI or County of Sacramento Urban Services Boundary, some agencies have not foreseen the accelerated growth in the Sacramento area and have not considered service extension alternatives and infrastructure needs beyond the current Sphere of Influence (i.e., City of Sacramento, CSD-1, and SRCSD). Annexation to the City of Sacramento, CSD-1, and SRCSD will proceed after the SOI Amendment of Reorganization is approved by LAFCo.

Generally, including Greenbriar within the Sphere of Influence of the City of Sacramento, CSD-1, and SRCSD will improve government structure options. Future residents will share common municipal services currently provided to the City lands within the North Natomas Community Plan Area, which lies directly east and south of the site. This will result in a uniform expansion of residential land use and allow the residents of Greenbriar to benefit from similar levels of service, governmental structure and vision within the City of Sacramento and North Natomas Area.

The inclusion of the Greenbriar project site into the SOI has included extensive planning and engineering efforts on the part of the applicant Project Team, City of Sacramento, and LAFCo. Based upon the information contained herein, the extension of service to this project area through the City of Sacramento will provide a well-planned and logical expansion of services currently provided to the existing residents within the City. Similarly, by providing for comprehensive service planning to the project area, the service levels to the existing City will not be negatively affected, and in some cases will be improved through future funding and construction of various proposed infrastructure improvements. In the event of approval of annexation, the project will participate in funding a fair share fee, user fees, and assessments to support the increased Greenbriar service area with the SOI Amendment.

The City of Sacramento has made an effort to proactively plan to provide for future growth. The current General Plan is in the process of being updated. The determinations in the MSR quantify the ability of the City, CSD-1, and SRCSD to provide for planning for services and financing to meet the needs of the Greenbriar project through inclusion into the SOI. The MSR determines that there is adequate government structure to provide services and accommodate successful growth.

The City of Sacramento General Plan, CSD-1 Master Plan, and SRCSD Interceptor Master Plan have been established to include growth in the current SOI. The City has

governed the adjacent North Natomas required infrastructure, Finance Plan and public services to successfully accommodate the planned growth in that area. The Greenbriar project has not been included in these urban development plans but will be considered with the proposed SOI Amendment.

### **Summary of Services and Service Providers**

The City of Sacramento is a full service city by Charter. The project applicants have demonstrated the need for the full range of municipal services in order to develop their property. The City of Sacramento has the demonstrated means and capacity to provide public or municipal services as efficiently, effectively, and competitively as the County and special districts.

The City has police protection, fire protection – including hazardous material, emergency medical service and advanced life support capabilities, public works (water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, flood control, solid waste disposal – including curb-side recycling and green waste pick-up, animal care services), parks, public libraries, land use planning, building permit services, and other miscellaneous services needed to support urbanization. Over the past number of years, some of these services have combined in order to address regional needs. Joint Powers Agreements (JPA) have been created agencies to provide sanitary sewer service (SRCSD and CSD#1,) libraries, flood control (SAFCA), and emergency response communication. Generally, these mergers have resulted in improved service levels to meet the needs of a fast growing community. However, several areas or government functions, remain separate and autonomous and continue to be provided by the City, the County and various special districts.

Reclamation District 1000 will continue to provide storm water conveyance, in coordination with the City of Sacramento Department of Utilities.

The provision of services is analyzed and discussed extensively in both the MSR and the EIR.

### **Commission Duties and Responsibilities under Cortese Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000**

The Commission shall have all of the ... powers and duties ... to review and approve or disapprove, with or without amendment, wholly, partially, or conditionally, proposals for changes of organization or reorganization, consistent with written policies, procedures, and guidelines adopted by the Commission .... A Commission shall not impose any conditions that would directly regulate land use density or intensity, property development, or subdivision requirements. When the development purposes are not made known to the annexing city, the annexation shall be reviewed on the basis of the adopted plans and policies of the annexing city or county. A Commission shall require, as a condition to annexation, that a city prezone the territory to be annexed. However, the Commission shall not specify how, or in what manner, the territory shall be zoned. The decision of the Commission shall be based upon the General Plan and pre-zoning of the City of Sacramento in effect at the time of the decision. [Government Code Section 56375(a).]

In addition, LAFCo is to review proposals and consider discouragement of urban sprawl, the preservation of open space and prime agricultural land and the encouragement of orderly formation and development of local governmental agencies. [Government Code 56001 and 56668.]

### **LAFCO STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES RE SPHERES OF INFLUENCE**

The proposed Sphere of Influence Amendment for the City of Sacramento is consistent with Sacramento LAFCo Policies, Standards and Procedures. Government Code Section 56425(a) specifies "In order to carry out its purposes and responsibilities for planning and shaping the logical and orderly development and coordination of local government agencies so as to advantageously provide for the present and future needs of the county and its communities, the Commission shall develop and determine the Sphere of Influence of each local agency within the county."

### **Findings**

The proposed Sphere of Influence Amendments for the Greenbriar Property is consistent with the purpose and responsibility of the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission to plan and shape the logical and orderly development, together with coordination of local agencies, in order to provide for the present and future needs of the County of Sacramento and its communities.

#### **A. Present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open space:**

A city is a political subdivision under the State of California. The power and authority of a city is derived from the State Constitution and State law. The affected territory includes agricultural and open space land uses and vacant land consisting of approximately 577 acres. The Sphere of Influence Amendment (SOIA) area would provide territory needed by the City of Sacramento to provide for the future expansion needs and maintain logical and orderly patterns of development.

Surrounding land uses include agricultural land uses to the north and south, new residential development in the incorporated North Natomas community to the east and south, and the approved Metro Air Park development project to the west. The Metro Air Park development consists of proposed commercial, hotel, and recreational (i.e., golf course) land uses. The City of Sacramento North Natomas Community Plan ("NNCP") area is located adjacent to the eastern and southern boundary of the SOI Amended Area. Future development in the North Natomas area includes residential and commercial land uses. Regional access to the project site is provided from State Route 70/99 and Interstate-5. Local access to the project site is provided by Elkhorn Boulevard.

The City's Application for the Greenbriar Property includes not only an amendment to the Spheres of Influence of the City, SRCSD, and CSD-1, but also a General Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Master Tentative Parcel Map, Tentative Subdivision Map, Planned Unit Development, and Development Agreement. The approval of the development elements of the Greenbriar Project is within the jurisdiction of the City and hearings will only proceed if LAFCo approves the proposed SOI Amendments. The development application also includes a proposed reorganization, which includes an annexation and detachments that would be considered at a later time, provided LAFCo approves the SOI Amendment and the City approves the development entitlements.

**B. The present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area:**

The SOI is a plan for the future probable physical boundaries and service area for the City of Sacramento. The Commission has the authority to determine the SOI for each local entity. (The County of Sacramento does not have a SOI.) The purpose of the SOI is to provide for the present and future needs of the community. The SOI may be subject to terms and conditions imposed by LAFCo to ensure the orderly development and planned growth tempered by the need to preserve open space and agricultural land.

The SOI amendment will not require the immediate need for additional public facilities or services. In fact, it would be premature to develop infrastructure for an area that has not been approved for annexation. The purpose of the SOI analysis and Final Environmental Impact Report is to identify the probable impacts that may occur based on the assumptions associated with the land use scenario analyzed for the SOI territory.

**C. The present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services which the agency provides or is authorized to provide:**

The City of Sacramento, SRCSD and CSD#1 have the present capacity to provide municipal services within the respective service areas. Approval of the SOI territory will facilitate and encourage that the City plan for expansion of necessary services prior to any annexation proposal. Upon annexation, the City of Sacramento will be required to provide domestic water, storm water and drainage, solid waste collection and disposal, fire protection and emergency medical services, police protection, parks and recreation, library services, and roads and public transportation. Wastewater collection and treatment would be provided by CSD#1 and SRCSD.

Approval of the SOI Amendment will not change the current service providers. At this time minimal services are provided to this area because of its rural character.



**D. The existence of any social or economic communities of interest:**

Territory within the proposed SOI area is located outside of Sacramento County's Urban Service Boundary line (i.e., the ultimate boundary for the delivery of municipal services provided by the County and Special Districts). The City of Sacramento does not have an urban growth boundary beyond its existing corporate boundaries. The City of Sacramento has requested the SOI to establish an urban growth boundary to accommodate anticipated future growth. Given policies of both jurisdictions, the City of Sacramento is the most logical provider of municipal services to the SOI area if the area should be annexed to a city. The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 promotes the view that urban development should occur within municipal boundaries, i.e., that municipal services are more efficiently provided by a single municipal provider, rather than a myriad of single purpose providers.

The proposed Greenbriar Property Sphere of Influence Amendments conform to the following LAFCo Policies, Standards and Procedures.

1. The proposed SOI territory does not overlap the Sphere of Influence of any other city.
2. The MSR for the proposed SOI identifies types and adequacy of municipal services to be provided.
3. The MSR for the proposed SOI identifies existing land uses and reasonable projection of land uses that may occur.
4. The MSR for the proposed SOI identifies existing and proposed facilities.
5. The proposed SOI is consistent with the policies of the General Plan of the City of Sacramento, and the Master Plans of SRCSD and CSD#1 respectively.
6. The SOI does not split neighborhoods or divide an existing identifiable community, commercial district, or other area having a social or economic identity.
7. The proposed SOI does not create islands, corridors or peninsulas or distort existing boundaries.
8. The proposed SOI does not exclusively contain revenue-producing properties.
9. The proposed SOI does not split parcels or create an area difficult to serve.

10. The proposed SOI is orderly and is not "leap frog" development in relation to existing development.
11. The proposed SOI does not pose a threat to public health and safety.
12. Projected population growth and development patterns for the City of Sacramento are occurring in the adjacent North Natomas Community towards the south and east and toward the proposed Sphere of Influence area. Currently, this is the most logical direction in which the City of Sacramento can grow.
13. The proposed SOI territory has targeted and selected property that, although currently prime agricultural fallow lands, including approximately 329 acres of prime agricultural land, is in the logical path of urban development and adjacent to developed land, which promotes orderly growth and discourages sprawl.

Moreover, Government Code Section 56377 requires that the Commission:

In reviewing and approving or disapproving proposals which could reasonably be expected to induce, facilitate, or lead to the conversion of existing open-space uses, the commission shall consider all of the following policies and priorities:

- (a) Development or use of land for other than open-space uses shall be guided away from existing prime agricultural lands in open-space use toward areas containing non-prime agricultural lands, unless that action would not promote the planned, orderly, efficient development of an area.
- (b) Development of existing vacant or non prime agricultural lands for urban uses within the existing jurisdiction of a local agency or within the sphere of influence of a local agency should be encouraged before any proposal is approved which would allow for a lead to the development of existing open-space lands for non-open space uses which are outside the existing jurisdiction of the local agency or outside of the existing Sphere of Influence of the local agency.

The Greenbriar Property Sphere of Influence Amendments proposal meets these conditions.

## **CEOA DISCUSSION**

### **Background**

On November 1, 2005, the City and LAFCo entered into a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") by which the two entities agreed to process a single EIR to evaluate the environmental consequences of the SOI Amendment, Reorganization, and related development entitlements. LAFCo is the lead agency for the Environmental

Impact Report for the Sphere of Influence Amendments. The City of Sacramento is the lead agency for the Environmental Impact Report for the related land use entitlements, including rezoning, and reorganization.

### ***CEQA Timeline***

- A Notice of Preparation for a Draft Environmental Impact Report (“Draft EIR”) was prepared and released for public comment on July 28, 2005, and a Recirculated Notice of Preparation was released for public comments on August 16, 2005.
- A Draft EIR was prepared and circulated for public review and comment between July 19, 2006, and September 5, 2006.
- Based upon comments received, certain revisions were made to the Draft EIR and a Recirculated Draft EIR was released for public comment on November 14, 2006, through January 2, 2007.
- Based upon comments received, a Second Recirculated Draft EIR was prepared and published on April 10, 2007, and the public comment period ran until May 25, 2007.
- The Commission received public comments on the Amended SOI and the Draft EIR on August 2, 2006, and August 30, 2006, and received written comments on the Draft and Recirculated EIRs from individuals and organizations.
- The Final Environmental Impact Report (“Final EIR”) that incorporated the Draft EIR and Recirculated EIRs by reference and provided responses to public comments was prepared and distributed to the public on August 15, 2007.

### **FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

The City of Sacramento (City) and Sacramento Local Area Formation Commission (LAFCo), as co-lead agencies, have prepared this document to be part of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Greenbriar Development Project. It contains a list of persons, organizations, and public agencies submitting comments; the comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR), and Second RDEIR; and responses to significant environmental points raised in those comments, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15000 et seq.). In accordance with Section 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Final EIR consists of the following documents:

- ▶ Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Greenbriar Development Project, (including Appendices A through P), dated July 18, 2006;

- ▶ Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Greenbriar Development Project, dated November 14, 2006;
- ▶ Second Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Greenbriar Development Project, dated April 10, 2007; and
- ▶ Comments, Responses to Comments on the DEIR, RDEIR, and Second RDEIR, and revisions to those reports contained in this document.

***Summary of LAFCo Issues of Interest and Level of Impact***

As a co-lead agency for the project, LAFCo is responsible for considering the proposed City of Sacramento Sphere of Influence Amendment (SOIA) for the project site and the SOIA for Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) and CSD#1. LAFCo is also the responsible agency for consideration of the reorganization (annexation to the City of Sacramento, SRCSD, CSD#1 and related detachments) proposed for the project site.

The Cortese-Knox Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act (Act) of 2000 (Government Code section 56000, et seq.) charges LAFCo with ensuring the timely and orderly formation of local government agencies and boundaries, preserving prime agricultural and open space resources, and discouraging urban sprawl. Pursuant to the Act, LAFCo is responsible for reviewing logical and timely changes in local government boundaries, including reorganizations such as the proposed Greenbriar SOIA and Annexation. On November 1, 2005, the City and LAFCo entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) by which the two entities agreed to have a single EIR prepared to evaluate the environmental consequences of the proposed development. Under this MOU, the City and LAFCo established themselves as Co-Lead Agencies for the EIR and defined their respective roles and responsibilities relating to the oversight and management of the EIR to ensure that it would adequately address the environmental issues to be reviewed by both LAFCo and the City.

Under the Act, an essential tool for ensuring orderly growth is the annexation of land within an adopted SOI. The SOI is a policy tool used to provide guidance for consideration of annexation proposals and is intended to encourage efficient provision of municipal services and discourage duplication of service delivery. Land must be within a city’s SOI to be annexed. The project site is located adjacent to the City of Sacramento’s SOI on the south and east and the project applicant is requesting an amendment of the City’s SOI to incorporate the project site. The SOI expansion and annexation request would be considered by LAFCo in a 2-step process: first, consideration of the SOIA; second, if the SOIA is approved, consideration of reorganization for the project.

As a co-lead agency under CEQA, LAFCo must ensure that the environmental document prepared for the project adequately addresses LAFCo matters. As stated above, Local Agency Formation Commissions were created to oversee local agency changes of organization and are authorized by the Act to consider preservation of open space and

agricultural land, as well as the efficient provision of services in making their determinations regarding changes of organization. While LAFCo has the power to impose conditions on changes of organization, they may only act within the parameters of the powers granted by statute. (*Timberidge Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Santa Rosa* (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 873, 884; *City of Ceres v. City of Modesto* (1969) 274 Cal.App.2d 545, 550.) LAFCo may approve, disapprove, or approve with conditions an SOI or an annexation. (Gov. Code, §§ 56375(a), 56427.) However, no condition may directly regulate land use. (Gov. Code, § 56375.) LAFCo may reduce boundaries to lessen an impact, or may require the agency with land use authority to implement a mitigation measure to reduce an impact. As a consequence, LAFCo conditions are typically general in nature, leaving the means of implementation to the land use governing body, in this case, the City. Because the Greenbriar EIR involves many discretionary acts, some of which are LAFCo acts and some of which are City acts, the EIR proposed mitigation measures have been identified as either City measures or LAFCo measures.

Based on its review of the project and EIR, LAFCo will make specific findings of fact and may adopt mitigation measures accordingly. Where an impact is within the City's exclusive jurisdiction, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), LAFCo's findings will state that review of the impacts is within the jurisdiction of another public agency and any necessary mitigation measures have been, or will be, adopted by that agency. Such measures may be a condition of annexation.

A summary of the EIR analysis of the impacts is included below.

### **Summary of Impacts**

#### ***Utilities***

The LAFCo Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines document includes the following standards related to the provision of urban services to annexed areas.

- ▶ The annexation must be consistent with the applicable Master Service Elements (Municipal Service Review). An annexation ... shall be approved only if the services element of the Spheres of Influence Plan of the affected agency or agencies demonstrates that adequate services will be provided within the time frame needed by the inhabitants of the annexed ... area. Proposed annexations for land areas that lie outside of the current and next five-year increments of projected service delivery in the services element are presumed not to comply with this standard unless the applicant clearly establishes that special and unique circumstances exist which ensure the provision of quality services during the applicable time frame for the affected area consistent with the other standards. (Section I, Standard Number 4)
- ▶ The annexation must provide the lowest cost and highest quality of urban services for the affected population. LAFCo will approve an annexation ... only if the Commission determines that the annexing agency possesses the capability to provide the most efficient delivery of applicable urban services for the affected population. (Section I, Standard Number 5)

**Increased Demand for Water Supply and Facilities.** Water demands for the project would be met by the City of Sacramento through existing water supply entitlements available from the American River, Sacramento River, and the City's local groundwater well system. The City has sufficient water supplies to meet their existing and projected future demands, in addition to the proposed project, through 2030 under all water year types (e.g., normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years). Further, other than construction of the necessary infrastructure to connect the project site to the City's existing water system, no additional water supply facilities would be needed to serve the project. Therefore, this would be a *less-than-significant* impact related to water supply. No mitigation is required.

**Increased Demand for Water Conveyance.** Water supply infrastructure is not currently available on the project site; therefore, water line extensions would be required to deliver water to the project site. Proposed water supply facilities would be sized to accommodate the project's water distribution and fire flow needs. Further, sufficient capacity is available within the city's off-site water distribution facilities to serve the project site. For these reasons, the provision of water to the project would result in *less-than-significant* water conveyance impacts. No mitigation is required.

**Increased Demand for Wastewater Collection and Conveyance.** Sufficient capacity within the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) interceptor system would be available to accommodate the project's wastewater demand. This would be a *less-than-significant* impact. No mitigation is required.

**Environmental Impacts Associated with SRWTP Expansion.** The Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP) would provide wastewater treatment services for the project. The SRWTP is currently undergoing expansion to accommodate wastewater treatment demands for future growth and development. As a result, the project would contribute to the need to expand the SRWTP. According to the EIR prepared for the SRWTP 2020 Master Plan Expansion, construction and operation of facility improvements could contribute to significant and unavoidable impacts related to construction-related air quality. Because the project would contribute to the need for expanding the SRWTP, and would contribute to the impacts assessed in the EIR for the SRWTP 2020 Master Plan Expansion, this would be a significant impact to wastewater facilities. The Draft EIR includes **Mitigation Measure 6.4-4** (City of Sacramento), which states that the environmental impacts of expanding the SRWTP were appropriately evaluated in the EIR for the SRWTP 2020 Master Plan Expansion Project. All available mitigation was recommended to reduce the environmental impacts of this project where feasible. However, the EIR concluded that even with recommended mitigation, the project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to construction-related air quality. Because all feasible mitigation has been recommended to reduce potentially significant impacts associated with the SRWTP expansion and no other feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact, this impact would remain *significant and unavoidable*.

**Increased Demand for Storm Drainage.** The project would increase the volume of stormwater generated at the project site. However, Reclamation District 1000's (RD 1000) plant #3 does not have sufficient pumping capacity to pump stormwater generated from the project site. Therefore, development of the project would result in significant impact related to storm drainage. The Draft EIR includes **Mitigation Measure 6.4-5** (City of Sacramento and LAFCo), which requires the project applicant to fully fund the installation of a new pump that would increase pumping capacity at the RD 1000's plant #3 by 75 cubic feet per second. The Draft EIR concludes that, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.4-5, pumping capacity at RD 1000 Plant #3 would be increased to sufficiently pump stormwater generated on the project site. Therefore, this storm drainage impact would be reduced to *less than significant*.

**Increased Demand for Electric and Natural Gas Services.** The project area would be supplied with energy services by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) (i.e., natural gas) and Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) (i.e., electricity). Energy services are currently being provided adjacent to the project site to the east and south and extension of these services to the site would not cause any physical disturbances beyond that already anticipated at the project site. For these reasons, the provision of energy services to the project site would result in *less-than-significant* impacts. No mitigation is required.

### ***Public Services***

The LAFCo Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines document includes the following standards related to the provision of urban services to annexed areas.

- ▶ The annexation must be consistent with the applicable Master Service Elements. An annexation ... shall be approved only if the services element of the Sphere of Influence Plan of the affected agency or agencies demonstrates that adequate services will be provided within the time frame needed by the inhabitants of the annexed ... area. Proposed annexations for land areas that lie outside of the current and next five-year increments of projected service delivery in the services element are presumed not to comply with this standard unless the applicant clearly establishes that special and unique circumstances exist which ensure the provision of quality services during the applicable time frame for the affected area consistent with the other standards. (Section I, Standard Number 4)
- ▶ The annexation must provide the lowest cost and highest quality of urban services for the affected population. LAFCo will approve an annexation ... only if the Commission determines that the annexing agency possesses the capability to provide the most efficient delivery of applicable urban services for the affected population. (Section I, Standard Number 5) A variety of public services would be provided to the project site by the City and other local/regional service agencies including the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (wastewater), City of Sacramento (water, parks and recreation, fire and police), Reclamation District Number 1000 (RD 1000) (stormwater), Rio Linda Union School District and Grant Joint Union High School District (schools), Sacramento Police Department, and Sacramento Fire Department. The project site lies within the service area of these service providers

with the exception of the SRCSD and Sacramento Police Department. The project site is adjacent to and east of the SRCSD's SOI. As such, before SRCSD can provide service to the project site, the project would require approval from LAFCo for the amendment of SRCSD's SOI to include the project site. The City would be responsible for providing law enforcement services after annexation of the project site into the city.

**Increased Demand for Fire and Emergency Medical Services.** Although Sacramento Fire Department (SFD) is planning to construct a new fire station near the project site and with this facility SFD would provide services to the project site within acceptable standards, the timing of the construction of this facility is currently unknown. Because it is unknown whether adequate fire protection facilities would be in place at the time the first occupancy permit is issued, the project could result in residents living in an area where inadequate fire and emergency response services are provided. This would be a potentially significant impact. **Mitigation Measure 6.5-1** (City of Sacramento and LAFCo) requires the project applicant to coordinate with the City of Sacramento to determine the timing of construction of a new fire station and enter into an agreement with SFD to ensure that adequate fire protection services would be in place before the issuance of the project's first occupancy permit. Potential options for adequate services could include construction of a new fire station or an agreement for temporary dedicated services to serve the project site. Further, the project's Finance Plan must identify necessary public facility improvements to serve the project, 100% of the costs required, and all the project's fair-share costs associated with provision of these facilities and services. The project applicant must pay into a fee program, as established by the Greenbriar Finance Plan, which identifies the funding necessary to construct needed public facilities (e.g., police, fire, water, wastewater, library, and schools). While the mitigation proposed could result in construction-related impacts, with implementation of the above mitigation, the project's impact to fire services would be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level.

**Increased Demand for Law Enforcement Services.** Although the project would increase demand for police personnel, the Sacramento Police Department (SPD) has indicated that it could serve the project site, without the need to construct any new law enforcement facilities (McCray, pers. comm., 2005). Therefore, the project would have a *less-than-significant* impact on police services. No mitigation measures are necessary.

**Increased Demand for Solid Waste Disposal Services.** Because existing solid waste facilities would have adequate capacity to serve the project into the foreseeable future, additional solid waste facilities would not be required. Therefore, the project would have a *less-than-significant* impact on solid waste services. No mitigation is required.

**Increased Demand for School Services.** School facilities currently serving the Natomas area, including the proposed elementary school site at the project site, would provide adequate school services for the project. No additional facilities would be required. In addition, the project applicant would be required to pay development impact fees to Grant Union and Rio Linda Union school districts equal to \$2.24 per square foot for residential development and \$0.36 per square foot for commercial development. (Pollock, pers.



comm., 2005) Payment of the development impact fees would provide the maximum legally required level of funding under State law, and would fully mitigate project-related school impacts. As a result, the project would result in *less-than-significant* impacts to school services. No mitigation is required.

**Increased Demand for Library Services.** The existing library located at 2500 New Market Drive would provide library services to the project. In addition, a new library is planned to be built next to Inderkum High School when funding is available. The project applicant would pay into a fee program that would contribute to the funding of this facility. No additional library facilities would be required to serve the project. Therefore, *no impacts* related to library services would occur. No mitigation is required.

### ***Parks and Open Space***

The Policies, Standards, and Procedures document (Sacramento LAFCo 1993) include standards regarding the Sacramento LAFCo's powers to conserve agricultural land. LAFCo will approve a proposed change of organization or reorganization (such as an annexation) that will result in the conversion to other uses of prime agricultural land in open space use only if it finds that the proposal will lead to the "planned, orderly, and efficient" development of an area. To be considered planned, orderly, and efficient, the proposal must meet the following criteria:

- ▶ The land to be reorganized must be contiguous to lands developed with an urban use or lands that have received all discretionary approvals for urban development.
- ▶ The proposed development must be consistent with the applicable jurisdiction's Spheres of Influence Plan, including the Master Services Element.
- ▶ Development of all or a substantial portion of the land in question is likely to occur within 5 years. Annexation should be phased if the development is very large.
- ▶ Insufficient vacant nonprime lands exist within the applicable Spheres of Influence that are planned, accessible, and developable for the same general type of use.
- ▶ The proposal will have no significant adverse effect on the physical and economic integrity of other agricultural lands. In determining whether there will be a significant adverse effect, LAFCo will consider the agricultural significance and use of the land in question, as well as adjacent areas; potential for public facilities associated with the proposal to facilitate the conversion of adjacent or nearby agricultural land; natural or artificial barriers between adjacent agricultural land and the proposed development; and applicable policies regarding open space, land use, and growth management.

**Increased Demand for City Neighborhood and Community Parks.** A prescribed formula in the City's Quimby Act land dedication ordinance is used to determine how much parkland must be provided by proposed developments to meet demand generated by new residents. Based on application of this formula, residential development under the proposed project would require 48.2 net acres of parks. The proposed project would provide approximately 48.4 net acres of neighborhood and community parks. Therefore,

the proposed project would provide sufficient parkland to meet the City's standards for parkland dedication, and thus would provide sufficient park facilities to meet demand. This impact would be *less than significant*. No mitigation is required.

**Substantial Loss of Open Space Resources.** The proposed project would result in the conversion of approximately 577 acres of agricultural land to nonagricultural use in an area that already is experiencing substantial development and loss of open space. The conversion of agricultural land to urban development would result in the permanent loss of open space resources. This impact would be significant. The Draft EIR includes **Mitigation Measure 6.6-2** (City of Sacramento and LAFCo), which requires that, consistent with the principles of the City/County Joint Vision Plan, the project applicant will coordinate with the City to identify appropriate lands to be set aside in a permanent conservation easements at a ratio of one open space acre converted to urban land uses to one-half open space acre preserved and at a ratio of one habitat acre converted to urban land uses to one-half habitat acre preserved. The total acres of land conserved will be based on final site maps indicating the total on-site open space and habitat converted. Conserved open space and habitat areas could include areas on the project site, lands secured for permanent habitat enhancement (e.g., giant garter snake, Swainson's hawk habitat), or additional land identified by the applicant in consultation with the City. All conserved open space and habitat land must be located in the North Natomas Joint Vision area. Should the City and County change adopted mitigation ratios before issuance of any grading permits, the project applicant shall comply with the revised policy. Further, the City must implement mitigation measure 6.6-2 prior to annexation.

Implementation of mitigation requiring preservation of open space and habitat land would substantially lessen significant impacts associated with the conversion of open space on the project site because conservation easements would assist the public and private sectors in protecting other open space from the pressures of development. However, preservation of existing open space resources would only partially offset conversions of open space associated with project impacts; no new open space would be made available. For these reasons, and because no other feasible mitigation is available to reduce the impact associated with loss of open space in North Natomas, the project's impacts to open space resources would remain *significant and unavoidable* after mitigation.

### ***Agriculture***

LAFCo has adopted policies and standards related to agricultural land conversion. The following policies and standards are applicable to the project. The project's consistency with these policies and standards are evaluated in Chapter 5.0, "Project Consistency with Plans and Policies."

- ▶ LAFCo will approve a change of organization or reorganization that will result in the conversion of prime agricultural land in open space use to other uses only if the Commission finds that the proposal will lead to the planned, orderly, and efficient development of an area. For purposes of this standard, a proposal leads to the

planned, orderly, and efficient development of an area only if all of the following criteria are met:

- The land subject to the change of organization or reorganization is contiguous to either lands developed within an urban use or lands that have received all discretionary approvals for urban development.
- The proposed development of the subject lands is consistent with the Spheres of Influence Plan, including the Master Services Element of the affected agency or agencies.
- Development of all or a substantial portion of the subject land is likely to occur within 5 years. In the case of very large developments, annexation should be phased wherever feasible. If the Commission finds phasing infeasible for specific reasons, it may approve annexation if all or a substantial portion of the subject land is likely to develop within a reasonable period of time.
- Insufficient vacant nonprime lands exist within the applicable Spheres of Influence that are planned, accessible, and developable for the same general type of use.
- The proposal will have no significant adverse effect on the physical and economic integrity of other agricultural lands. In making this determination, LAFCo will consider the following factors: (1) the agricultural significance of the subject and adjacent areas relative to other agricultural lands in the region; (2) the use of the subject and adjacent areas; (3) whether public facilities related to the proposal would be sized or situated so as to facilitate the conversion of adjacent or nearby agricultural land, or will be extended through or adjacent to, any other agricultural lands that lie between the project site and existing facilities; (4) whether natural or human-made barriers serve to buffer adjacent or nearby agricultural land from the effects of the proposed development; (5) applicable provisions of the General Plan open space and land use elements, applicable growth-management policies, or other statutory provisions designated to protect agriculture (LAFCo Standards, pgs. IV-5 and IV-6).

**Conversion of Important Farmlands.** The project would result in the conversion of 518 acres of important farmlands to urban land uses. Conversion of important farmland to nonagricultural use would be a significant impact. The Draft EIR includes **Mitigation Measure 6.11-1**(City of Sacramento, LAFCo), which requires the project applicant to implement Mitigation Measure 6.6-2 described above prior to annexation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.11-1 would substantially lessen significant impacts associated with the conversion of farmland on the project site because LAFCo would only approve the conversion of agricultural land where it is consistent with its conservation policies. Further, the project would conserve open space and habitat lands some of which would be used for agricultural practices at a ratio consistent with the mitigation ratio identified in the City/County Joint Vision Plan MOU. Prior to annexation

LAFCo will require that the City and County reach agreement on the open space mitigation lands for the Greenbriar project. However, because the conservation easements are purchased for land exhibiting benefits to wildlife, including a combination of habitat, open space, and agricultural lands, the mitigation would not be applied exclusively to agricultural lands. Therefore, this mitigation would only partially offset conversions of farmland associated with the project impacts. In addition, no new farmland would be made available, and the productivity of existing farmland would not be improved as a result of the habitat conservation plan (HCP) mitigation. . Therefore, full compensation for losses of farmland would not be achieved. Impact 6.11-1 would remain *significant and unavoidable* after mitigation.

In addition to Mitigation Measure 6.11-1, **Mitigation Measure 6.12-1** requires the project applicant to dedicate land to the Natomas Basin Conservancy (NBC) to mitigate for impacts to biological resources. The NBC serves as plan operator for the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) and acquires and manages habitat land for the benefit of the 22 special-status species covered under the NBHCP, including Swainson's Hawk and giant garter snake. Habitat for these species includes agricultural land in rice production.

The project applicant will dedicate the Spangler property, which is located in northern Sacramento County along the Sutter County line, northeast of the Sacramento Airport and west of SR 70/99. The site is currently in irrigated rice and is surrounded by agriculture (primarily rice) on all sides. The North Natomas 130 site, which is adjacent to the NBC's Cummings preserve to the south, Fisherman's Lake to the east, rice land to the north, and the Sacramento River to the west, will also be dedicated to the NBC.

One of the NBC's key conservation strategies is to maintain at least 50% of its mitigation lands in rice production. Typically, the NBC puts up to 75% of the mitigation land in rice production and 25% as managed marsh. A majority of the lands that the project applicant is dedicating to the NBC for habitat management will therefore remain in agricultural use. While not included as a mitigation measure for impacts associated with the loss of agricultural land, this mitigation measure (Biological Resources Mitigation Measure 6.12-1) will keep additional lands in agricultural use.

**Conflict with Agricultural Zoning and Williamson Act Contracts.** The project site is currently not under a Williamson Act contract but the project site is currently zoned for agricultural land uses. The project would rezone the site from an agriculture designation to residential, commercial, and open space designations. Therefore, development of the project site as proposed would not result in any conflicts with Williamson Act contracts or agricultural zoning designations and *no impacts* would result. No mitigation is required.

**Conflict with Off-site Agricultural Operations.** The project site is located adjacent to agricultural operations to the north and development of the project could result in conflicts between adjacent agricultural activities and proposed residential land uses, which could lead to the abandonment of agricultural operations on lands to the north of

the project site and could potentially result in the ultimate conversion of this land to non-agricultural land uses. This would be considered a significant impact. As noted in response to comment R9-30, the DEIR does not address potential conflicts between agricultural uses on the lands south of I-5 and proposed residential uses because of the relative separation between the two. The project's southern-most residential neighborhood is separated by: 1) a planned on-site freeway buffer; 2) the entirety of the Caltrans I-5 right-of-way; and 3) the entirety of the County of Sacramento Bayou Way right-of-way. The approximate distance of the closest planned residential unit to the agricultural lands south of I-5 is 500+ feet, and because of this separation – including an interstate freeway – potential conflicts do not require exhaustive analysis.

To mitigate for impacts associated with agricultural operations to the north, the Draft EIR includes **Mitigation Measure 6.11-3**, which requires the project applicant to notify all prospective residents and tenants located within 500 feet of existing agricultural uses north of Elkhorn Boulevard of the types of existing agricultural operations that could occur within close proximity of their homes or businesses. Notification provided to residents and tenants must include information on the types of land use conflicts that could occur (e.g., noise, dust) and the appropriate means by which to address these conflicts. The City shall approve the content of this notification and this notification shall be included in all residential deed and tenant agreements at the time of sale or lease. Implementation of this mitigation measure would notify prospective residents of potential land use conflicts associated with agricultural activities that occur north of the project site; however, it would not remove or substantially reduce potential conflicts. Other than precluding development adjacent to agricultural lands, no other feasible mitigation is available to eliminate potential urban/agricultural land use conflicts. Further, because of the developing nature of the City and the fact that current plans for development to the north of the project site (e.g., North Natomas Joint Vision Plan) are under contemplation by the City, it is unknown whether lands to the north would remain in agricultural production indefinitely. It is reasonable to anticipate that these lands would likely convert to urban development within the next 10 to 20 years. As such, it would not be reasonable for the City for preclude development near these agricultural lands unless it knew that development would not occur. For these reasons, this impact would remain *significant and unavoidable*.

### **OUTSTANDING ISSUES - Public Agencies**

A Sphere of Influence Amendment may be viewed as a threshold decision by your Commission in determining the path and pattern of urbanization, in balance with the preservation of agricultural and open space resources. You may recall that in 2001, when the City of Folsom SOIA was before your Commission, there remained issues to be resolved regarding provision of water, affordable housing, and transportation impacts to Highway 50. That proposal was approved after several public hearings, subject to seventeen terms and conditions. The terms and conditions are required to be satisfied prior to the annexation of the SOIA area into the City of Folsom. A similar approach may be appropriate for the Greenbriar Proposal. By placing territory within an agency's SOI, long-term infrastructure planning and financing may be facilitated to address “big

picture” issues.

1. Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District: The District continues to be concerned with the treatment of the Health Risk Assessment (HRA) in the project’s environmental documents, including the FEIR. A condition of approval of the SOIA may be to require that the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District concerns be fully addressed prior to annexation.
2. Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan: Your Commission should note that the project area is within the Natomas Basin, and is located within the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) plan area. The Greenbriar project area, however, is located outside of the City of Sacramento Incidental Take Permit Area that was covered by the incidental take permits issued by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish & Game. Annexation of additional lands into the City that are outside of the City’s Permit Area requires reevaluation of the NBHCP, a new effects analysis, potential amendments and/or revisions to the NBHCP and the incidental take permits, a separate conservation strategy and the need to obtain a new incidental take permit by the permittee for that additional development. There are two types of changes which may be made to the NBHCP and/or the NBHCP Permit and/or its associated documents with respect to the addition of the Greenbriar project area to the City’s Permit Area:

*Revisions*

*Amendments*

Any revisions or amendments shall be in accordance with the MBJCP and all applicable legal requirements, including but not limited to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA,) the California Endangered Species Act (CESA,) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA,) and any applicable state and federal laws and regulations. The US Fish and Wildlife Service and the CA Department of Fish and Game are responsible for the review and approval of any required Habitat Conservation Plans for the Natomas Basin. A condition of approval of the SOIA may be to require that a Habitat Conservation Plan be approved by the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the CA Department of Fish and Game prior to annexation or project development.

3. Floodplain Management: The City of Sacramento has received a letter from the US Department of Homeland Security’s Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) indicating that it will be changing the flood status designation for the Natomas Basin and will be preparing a revised Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). This change is a result of the State of California, Department of Water Resources (DWR) notification to FEMA that the Natomas levee system does not meet minimum federal flood insurance program standards for 100-year flood protection. FEMA has indicated that when flood-control systems no longer meet adequate protection standards from a flood having a 1% chance of being equaled

or exceeded in any given year (i.e., 100-year flood), FEMA must revise the FIRM (FEMA 2006).

FEMA intends to revise the FIRM through the Physical Map Revision (PMR) process and will place the Natomas Basin in the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA). A preliminary FIRM revision is expected to be issued by summer 2007 with a final FIRM effective date of fall 2007 or winter 2008. As of this date, FEMA has yet to publish the preliminary FIRM. However, it is expected that FEMA would likely select one of three SFHA designations as described below (FEMA 2007):

- AE: Zone AE is the flood insurance rate zone that corresponds to the 1-percent annual event floodplains that are determined through a Flood Insurance Study. Owners of structures within these designated areas are required to purchase flood insurance. New structures developed in these areas must be elevated at least one foot above the base flood elevation.
- AR: Zone AR is the flood insurance rate zone used to depict areas protected from flood hazards by flood control structures, such as a levee, that are being restored. FEMA designates these areas if the flood protection system has been determined to be “restorable by a federal agency in consultation with a local sponsor; a minimum level of flood protection is still provided to the community by the system; and restoration of the flood protection system is scheduled to begin within a designated time period. Owners of structures within these designated areas are required to purchase flood insurance. New structures can be developed within this zone as long as the development complies with the Zone AR floodplain management regulations, which requires that new structures in “infill development” areas be elevated at least three feet above the “highest adjacent grade.” The highest adjacent grade is the highest natural elevation of the ground surface prior to construction next to the proposed walls of a structure.
- A99: Zone A99 is the flood insurance rate zone that corresponds to areas with the 1-percent annual chance floodplain that will be protected by a Federal flood protection system where construction has reached specified statutory milestones. Owners of structures within these designated areas are required to purchase flood insurance. There are no development restrictions within this zone.

Different development restrictions would apply depending on the SFHA designation selected. The City, through its land use approvals, intends to comply with all development restrictions associated with the SFHA designation assigned by FEMA and with its current Floodplain Management Ordinance. The City has also sent a letter to FEMA requesting an A99 flood zone designation. A response from FEMA has not yet been received. With approval of the Greenbriar project, construction activities could commence only upon receipt of all discretionary

permits and approvals from trustee and responsible agencies including approval of the project's Habitat Conservation Plan from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Based on the permits and approvals required for the project, the City anticipates that building permits will not be issued before 2010. Therefore, it is anticipated that FEMA will have issued the selected SFHA designation prior to the commencement of any construction activities and that new vertical construction of damageable property will be governed by the requirements of the designation. A condition of approval of the SOIA may be to require that FEMA issue the revised FIRM through the Physical Map Revision (PMR) process and place the Natomas Basin in the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA.)

### **Public Comments**

Staff has received the attached letters of concern regarding the timing of project consideration and the adequacy of the MSR:

- 1) in light of recent findings by the County of Sacramento Grand Jury. The author, Judith Lamare, Ph.D. raises questions of the timing of service delivery and public financing thereof, by the City of Sacramento to accommodate new growth within the current city limit. [Tab H]
- 2) the adequacy of the MSR regarding the timing and financing of services in the context of the Revenue Sharing Principles of the Natomas Joint Vision MOU.

The City of Sacramento has provided a response. [Tab I] The City disagrees with many, if not all, of the various assertions made in the Grand Jury report, and it can be anticipated that this position will be reflected in the City's formal response to the judge.

### **RECOMMENDED TERMS AND CONDITIONS:**

**Staff recommends adoption of the following eight terms and conditions together with the mitigation measures, attached.**

1. The mitigation measures adopted pursuant to CEQA by LAFCo under Resolution Nos. LAFC 1346 and LAFC 1347 are incorporated herein by reference. Prior to consideration by LAFCo of the application to annex property within the SOI Amended Area, LAFCo shall review the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan approved as part of the SOI Amendment for compliance and shall undertake additional environmental review if required under CEQA.
2. Prior to annexation of the property within the SOI Amended Area, the City shall demonstrate the following:
  - a. Prior to annexation, the City will provide information to the Commission in compliance with FEMA and DWR flood-plain development measures adopted regarding the public interest.



- b. Prior to annexation, the City shall re-confirm that the SOI Amended Area is surrounded by or adjacent to lands planned for urban uses.
    - c. Prior to LAFCo's consideration of the application to annex property within the SOI Amended Area, the City shall obtain a determination of substantial compliance from the California Department of Housing and Community Development consistent with Government Code Section 65585, subdivisions (d) or (h) regarding the Regional Housing Needs Allocation.
    - d. Prior to LAFCo's consideration of the application to annex property within the SOI Amended Area, the City shall adopt appropriate land use designations for all property within the SOI Amended Area, noting open space and habitat preservation measures at a minimum, as set forth in the FEIR and this Resolution.
    - e. Prior to annexation and pursuant to Government Code Section 56375, the City shall pre-zone the property consistent with the City of Sacramento General Plan, as amended. In pre-zoning within the SOI Amendment Area, the City must update its Water Supply Assessment so that LAFCo can determine water availability as required by law, in compliance with the terms and conditions of the Water Forum Agreement. The information provided shall be sufficient for LAFCo to determine water availability to the area pursuant to Government Code Section 56668, subdivision (k), or its successor.
    - f. Prior to LAFCo's consideration of the application to annex property, the City shall approve a financing plan to address the traffic/transportation measures necessary to mitigate the impacts from the development of the SOI Amended Area. To implement this finance plan, the City, in coordination with Caltrans, will provide its plan to provide traffic congestion relief and provide its plan for the fair-share contribution by the development, including the funding of a transit station and dedication of land for the Downtown-Natomas-Airport light rail line.
3. Prior to LAFCo's consideration of the application for annexation, the City shall revise and update its General Plan to include the SOI Amended Area in accordance with State law.
4. Prior to LAFCo's consideration of the application to annex property within the SOI Amended Area, the City must submit:
  - a. A Transit Master Plan for the SOI Amended Area consistent with the policies of the City's General Plan. The Plan shall identify the roadways to be used by bus transit routes, locations for bus turnouts and pedestrian

shelters, locations for bus transfer stations, alignments for fixed route rail service, and the location of rail service stations.

- b. An updated Bikeway Master Plan to delineate bikeway and pedestrian facilities within the SOI Amended Area consistent with the goals and policies of the City's General Plan.
5. Where permitted by law, the City shall incorporate feasible school impact mitigation requirements into development agreements.
6. Prior to LAFCo's consideration of the application to annex property within the SOI Amended Area, the City shall submit information demonstrating full compliance with the Joint Vision MOU.
7. Prior to annexation, the City will confirm with LAFCo that the USFWS agrees with the process for preparing the new project-specific HCP in accordance with the City's letter of August 27, 2007.
8. Prior to annexation, the City shall coordinate with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District to fully address the District's concerns.

#### **EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S COMMENTS - CONCLUSION**

The proposed SOI Amendments are subject to eight terms and conditions, mitigation measures and a Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Sacramento and the County of Sacramento. The purpose of these conditions is to respond to issues and concerns raised during the public hearing process and mitigate impacts that may have been identified in the Environmental Impact Report.

The proposed Sphere of Influence Amendment for the Greenbriar Project represents logical and orderly path of development. Currently development is occurring on three sides: east, south and west. In addition, infrastructure and services are adjacent to the proposed site. Construction of Meister Way through the project site is required for the adjacent Metro Air Park (MAP) development as well as other offsite improvements. Therefore, there are a number of benefits to comprehensively plan this area due to existing projects and development that are already occurring in the project vicinity.

Future development of the project would provide nearby housing for the employment centers proposed for MAP, the Sacramento International Airport expansion, and the Sutter County Measure M area just across the county line. The reduction of commute distances is among the goals of the SACOG Blueprint unanimously adopted by the SACOG Board.

The proposal is consistent with other elements of the SACOG Blueprint. The proposed land uses implement many of the Blueprint goals and policies; as well as the adopted City

of Sacramento Smart Growth Principles. Also, the affected territory falls within the Blueprint preferred growth scenario adopted by the SACOG Board.

Growth and development of the Natomas area within the city occurred more rapidly than anticipated in the last twenty years. However, as in much of the region, the economy has cooled off, and growth has slowed considerably. The regional housing market has gone through hot and cold cycles over the last twenty-five years. Although it is difficult to predict market changes, it is prudent to plan for growth during a slow cycle to allow for due consideration of issues without under market pressures.

Nonetheless, a number of issues will need to be resolved prior to annexation, as well as development and the issuance of building permits. There are a number of agencies that will weigh in on these issues and determine various requirements that will need to be met.

The Commission must first determine whether or not the project area should be included in the City of Sacramento Sphere of Influence.

These documents set forth very specific requirements and conditions that must be addressed prior to and after annexation of the proposed amended SOI territory. A series of underlying principles have been identified in these documents.

**Therefore, staff recommends that your Commission adopt the attached Resolutions:**

1. Resolution No. LAFC 1345: A Resolution of the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Sphere of Influence Amendments for the City of Sacramento, the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, and County Sanitation District #1. (State Clearinghouse # 2005062144) (LAFC 12-05)
2. Resolution No. LAFC 1346: A Resolution of the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission Adopting Findings of Fact and A Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Sphere of Influence Amendments for the City of Sacramento, the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, and County Sanitation District #1. (LAFC 12-05)
3. Resolution No. LAFC 1347: A Resolution of the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Sphere of Influence Amendments for the City of Sacramento, the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, and County Sanitation District #1. (LAFC 12-05)
4. Resolution No. LAFC 1348: A Resolution of the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission 1) Making written Determinations for the Municipal Services Review and 2) Approving the Sphere of Influence Amendments for the City of Sacramento, the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, and County Sanitation District #1. (LAFC 12-05)

The Sphere of Influence Amendment for the City of Sacramento includes the area located at the northwest quadrant of the intersection of State Route 70/99 and Interstate 5, referred to as the Greenbriar Project. The proposed development site is located in the unincorporated portion of Sacramento County, adjacent to and west of the City of Sacramento, outside the City of Sacramento's (City) existing Sphere of Influence (SOI) containing approximately 577 acres.

***SACRAMENTO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION***

***Peter Brundage***  
***Executive Officer***

***Attachments***