

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

Flood and Water Issues

October 10, 2006

Attendees:

Peter Brundage LAFCO
Julie Carr County
Pete Dangermond
Michael Dangermond

Don Lockhart LAFCO
John Roberts NBC

Brian Collett TDG
Helen Selph City

There are two types of flood issues in the Natomas area:

1. Localized flooding from basin area water capture
2. Regional flooding: Perimeter levee breach from the major water arteries of the Sacramento River, Dry Creek etc.

There are three primary flood issues:

1. 100 year flood zones established by FEMA
2. Tendency for the accumulation of water within the Basin
3. The integrity of the existing levee system protecting the Basin Perimeter

1. Localized flooding

- Water build up for urban areas is comparable to agricultural accumulations
- The existing channel system works but the ideal would be to allow wider corridors to expand internal capacities using a 100 foot width as a standard.
- Another option would be to allocate all existing 100 year flood areas as the required flood zone and restrict development from that area.
- A third option would be to create an equivalent area within the general vicinity
- And a fourth option would be to excavate smaller areas and achieve capacity by compensating area by increasing depth.
- Local developers are already trying to work out onsite storm water retention capabilities in their project concepts
- The issue of dissipating local storm water back into the river system does not appear to be a significant concern because of the pumping infrastructure at the south end of the Basin

2. Regional Flooding

The existing perimeter levee system surrounding the Natomas Basin according to recent SAFCA investigations has been found to be significantly deficient in providing protection against potential extreme storm run-off conditions. Excerpts from the SAFCA Study are as follows:

Deficiencies in the Natomas levees were identified based on the following engineering criteria. For levee freeboard, the criterion was to provide at least two feet above the 200-year design water surface elevation.

- (1) Much of the upper 11 miles of the east levee of the Sacramento River downstream of the mouth of the Natomas Cross Canal does not provide at least two feet of freeboard and needs to be raised one to two feet;

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

- (2) The east levee of the Sacramento River between the Natomas Cross Canal and the American River also contains several at-risk erosion sites totaling over two miles in length; and
- (3) Almost 20 of the 26 miles of levee extending along the northern, western and southern flanks of Natomas are susceptible to seepage at the 200-year water surface elevation, and, at several locations, this susceptibility also occurs at the 100-year water surface elevation. This suggests that the risk of levee failure is greater than was previously thought.

Proposed remedies for identified deficiencies were developed based on established levee improvement and bank protection techniques. The draft report proposes to address levee freeboard deficiencies through levee raising; address foundation stability issues primarily through construction of slurry walls; and address erosion risks through minimum impact toe rock and bank re-vegetation techniques in use along the Lower American and Sacramento rivers.

The draft report also considers the possibility of addressing identified deficiencies in the upper five miles of the east levee of the Sacramento River through construction of a new secondary levee set back about 1,000 feet from the existing levee. Under this alternative, the existing levee would continue to confine the river channel and serve as a local roadway for residents along the Garden Highway. The new levee would eliminate the uncertainties associated with refurbishing the existing levee, avoid ongoing erosion problems, and ensure safe containment of the 200-year flood if the existing levee fails.

The land use and open space implications of these findings were summarized as follows:

- Keep development away from levees – establish a setback of an optimum 500 feet, minimum 300 feet to ensure a defensible levee system
- In a 300 foot strip from the toe of the levee on the landside backfill up to the top of the levee with additional fill material to broaden the width of the levee structure
- Create gradual slopes on the back of the levees (2% min?) to shore up the integrity of the levee
- Where possible increase the freeboard of the existing levee
- The earth required for implementing these levee modifications is a significant factor – roughly equivalent to one square mile of earth excavated to six feet depth
- Consider construction of a new secondary levee set back about 1,000 feet from the existing levee. Under this alternative, the existing levee would continue to confine the river channel and serve as a local roadway for residents along the Garden Highway.

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

Airport Issues

10 October 2006

Attendees:

Scott Mende, City

Peter Brundage LAFCO
Council

Julie Car, County
Systems

Greg Rowe, Sacramento Airport Systems

Pete Dangermond, TDG

Michael Dangermond TDG

Don Lockhart LAFCO

Diane McElhern County

Marcia Newhouse, Airport

John O'Farrell City Consultant

Brian Collett, TDG

Helen Selph City

- Airport management follows the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) that establishes development standards to protect areas surrounding the airport.
- These standards affect the densities of residential uses and the intensities and lot coverages for commercial and industrial uses within the safety zones.
- The airport is aggressive about noise. For now it maps a 60 NREL threshold because it predicts that will become 65 NREL sooner or later.
- CLUP based density limitations are enforced around airport
- Airport maintains a 3000' arc around each runway as a safety zone
- CLUP safety zone (height and safety) is not likely to change
- Outermost arc is over flight zone (see SACOG online)
- Emphasized that Airport management is an enterprising agency and has commercial and/or other development interests for potential revenue generation
- Airport management includes a "wildlife biologist" coordinator f/t position primarily to address the high incident of wildlife strikes – second worst in state.
 - Encouraged to oppose wetlands development or other wildlife attractors such as rice production, sunflower corn or other seed producing crops as a deterrent
- Airport Trends & Planning Stats
 - Terminal "B" to be demolished and upgraded
 - 3 to 4% increase in total passengers per year
 - Currently handling approximately 10.6 million passengers a year
 - Already Running out of parking already during busiest holidays.
 - >2013, runway extension.
 - ~2025, third runway.
 - Plans to develop a parcel south of I-5 for additional parking
 - Commercial/industrial uses are also being considered for these peripheral areas
 - Currently in the process of conducting a NEPA focused environmental assessment regarding its plans for expansion
- **Airport property is not bound by City/Resource Agency HCP agreements and is required to mitigate independently. (April CC Report included incorrect assumptions about Airport property with regards to HCP)**

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

- FAA wants open water 10,000' from runway centerline. Part 139, FAA on "hazardous wildlife"
- Currently underway with a NEPA process for the proposed expansion actions identified above but is attempting to drop the additional runway from the NEPA environmental document to keep the level of significance below that which would require full EIS assessment
- FAA expects 5 mile buffer from airport as a deterrent area to limit "wildlife attractants"
- Look at the Greenbriar EIR as a good template for wildlife mitigation procedures
- The Sankey Road GGS reserve (mitigation area) was established in 2004 at a cost of \$25k/per acre – its estimated cost is \$50k/ac today
- There are residual agricultural serving drainage canals throughout the airport property. Their objective is to redirect, remove from grounds or reconfigure from ditch to a grassy swale type cross section that can be mowed.
- Land use decisions on airport property are dictated by FAA regulations.
- Referenced the "4F" special regulatory status of airport lands affecting public lands adjoining or near airports with regards to possible trails or parks in the vicinity of the airport.

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

Agricultural Issues

October 10, 2006

Attendees:

Stan Van Vleck (SVV)
Peter Brundage LAFCO
Julie Carr County
Charlotte Mitchell
Michael Dangermond

Don Lockhart LAFCO
John Roberts NBC
Dave Wilson
Brian Collett TDG
Helen Selph City

The fundamental question is regarding Agricultural viability [in an area like Natomas] and its corollary, why protect agriculture?

Rising constraints:

- Costs of infrastructure (ports, processing facilities, trucks, harvesters, etc)
- Market forces
- Impacts to operations/production/profitability caused by nearby urban uses

Ag Viability – two approaches:

- Value of land – i.e. \$20,000/ac for easements
- \$3-5000/ac for crop production

Stan Van Vleck (SVV): Do you want agriculture for products and food security, or for good looking open space? Potential values:

- Aesthetic values
- Open space values
- Habitat values
- Food security

These values all should be a part of basis for compensation for those who continue to farm in these near urban locations.

Farmers are not going to continue farming without sufficient compensation.(SVV)

One of the most important issues for the Natomas area is related to water: both its cost and timely delivery (SVV)

SVV: Identify what ag is worth to the community, then ask the community to pay for it.

DL: The flip side is asking what it would take to keep agriculture to stay in these near urban locations.

SVV: **In general, the urban-agriculture interface is making farming more and more difficult.** (SVV has 100,000 visitors to his property in East Sacramento County for recreation uses!).

Appendix B Meeting Notes

Peter Brundage (PB): LAFCO has a mandate (?) to preserve and protect prime agricultural land where possible

Note: Different perspectives between the Cattlemen's Association & the Farm Bureau –
Cattlemen tend to let the market drive where development goes and where land may turn over while the Farm Bureau tend to be more aimed at ag land protection

SVV: It's about economics. – Farmers do what they know and are good at. That's why tomatoes have been a preferred crop

SVV: Offset- for development rights. Agronomics/numbers. Market-based choices.

LAFCO: Vacaville-Dixon Greenbelt strategy is a good example:

- Open space easement created through compensation for development rights using land as collateral
- Estimated \$30k/acre to keep in perpetuity (?)

SVV: Open space or agriculture? Market forces are key for the ag community. Assurances to the ag community and dependent industries are necessary. (i.e. processing plants, Harvesters, truckers, etc.)

SVV: Important to note that the majority of farmers in Natomas are tenant farmers!

SVV: Consider acreage guarantees. Keeps the dependent industries in business and around.

SVV: Be sure not to penalize the people who have waited longer to sell their land.

SVV: Removing development rights can make banks call back their loans. This has the effect of accelerating the farmland loss.

SVV: With more certainty, business will want to expand.

John Roberts (JR): The notion of “landowner farmers” in Natomas basin is a misconception. It's all speculators who own the land.

JR: Tenant farmer viability is the key. It's the long term importance to preserving agriculture in Natomas. Buying down rents. The Conservancy helps to preserve the tenant farmer.

- Cost of water in the Basin is around \$122 and acre \$22 an acre in Chico area.
- Urbanism decreases the number of water customers and inversely increases the costs of individual shares
- In general diminishing infrastructure forces farming costs to go up, fewer farms causes infrastructure to decline
- Even with Williamson act protections, property taxes alone can exceed the value from crop production

JR: Not many crops are making any money. Profits are so marginal that farmers can not pay their bills even after selling their crops.

JR: The “boot” is perfect for row-crops. Boutique Farmer's market type production.

Appendix B Meeting Notes

JR: Rent draw-downs are supposed to last 50 years. These keep tenant farmers in business.

JR: The Nature Conservancy hires tenant farmers as their own employees. NBC can not do this because of federal regulation in the current farm bill. They are hoping they can use similar strategy when the current farm bill expires.

SVV: The economics of agriculture are tough, and involve survival choices.

JR: When NBC started there was fear, anger, and anxiety on the part of farmers. Gradually this changed to positive things.

JR: NBC are able to (somehow) guarantee farmers are not going to lose money on their farms.

JR: The rain this spring ran two alfalfa farmers out of business. It's a high risk business.

Don Lockhart (DL): Acquisition for conservancy. Fee simple would work better in Natomas. It's all speculators there.

DL: Banks are a big factor. There is a big difference between the value of a property the tax rolls show and the value a bank sees for a given property.

DL: Have a look at Yolo County, organics, etc. See if we can learn more for the "boot" area.

Julie Car: A significant portion of the Natomas properties are in the Federal Preserve Program

- A decision needs to be made regarding how much ag land needs to be protected and for what purposes
- Dedication ratios: acquired fee simple?
- JPA type holdings?

DL: Yolo County general plan update is going on now. It's a wildcard along with several Yolo board of supervisors coming up for election.

Appendix B Meeting Notes

Parks and Recreation Issues and Opportunities

October 19, 2006

Attendees:

Gary Kukkola,

Patricia Davey

Peter Brundage LAFCO

Helen Selph, City

Julie Car County

Brian Collett TDG

Rhonda Smith TDG

Don Lockhart LAFCO

Charlotte Mitchell

Ed Cox

J.P. Tindell

Jill Ritzman, County Parks

Michael Dangermond

- BC – Idea of multiple purposes for open space: Airport protection/, flood considerations, separation of communities, important habitat, ag preservation and open space
- Patricia Davey (PD) – Levees historic district/flood control RD 1000 (rural landscape historic agricultural district and therefore has State Historic Preservation (SHPO) requirements. **Part of historic canal system (see Paul Devereau) “Natomas Rural Landscape Historic District”** might be in comprehensive drainage plan E112 (1997) or North Natomas Community Plan EIR
- Panhandle annexation may delete park idea ????
- **SACOG may have regional linkages shown (per Jill Co. Parks)**
- M.D. – Developed maps incorporated Parks & Recreation 1997 or 2005 land use layer open space Panhandle Annexation bike trail
- **Ed Cox- will get updated 2004 GIS shape files for Bikeway Master Plan trail from City of Sacramento to Michael Dangermond - South to W. El Camino.** Doesn't show data set – hardcopy version shows adopted GIS version most updated in 2004 by City (with City trails only)
- Ueda Parkway is under construction – from Sotnip Road to W. El Camino Rd.
- There is a Wetland/SAFCA project at Ueda south end an another wetland (SAFCA mitigation site) north end of Ueda
- (Recap of Airport feedback related to parks) Airport is reducing rice lands – took out 1000 oak trees – Airport using 1 mile safety buffer to justify the reduction of habitat features including nesting sites around & besides airport--- Airport management stated that for safety issues it also applies to public facilities such as trails (cited 4-F Regulations)
- Don Lockhart- Buffers around airport shown on map need to be looked at carefully. What are actual airport lands? – Garden Highway and levee go right through airport buffer!!

Appendix B Meeting Notes

- Jill suggested a meeting to be set up between parks and Greg
- Airport may make exceptions for 4F
- Sacramento Greenway plan – did County adopt? Had comprehensive plan- State lands commission Sacramento River Greenways Plan - adopted by City of West Sacramento City
- OSP joint parks planning process with city and county (recommendation)
- Parks and recreation master plan #3- JP can send PDF
- No funding for Hansen Ranch portion of Ueda parkway trail
- Dry Creek Parkway includes a soccer complex (Jill) Jim has master plan (JR) will provide Dry Creek Parkway example of county implementation (city limits through Placer County)
- JR – Existing County park holdings include Winter Ranch, Elkhorn Boat Launch and Sand Cove
- J.P. Tindell- Public access – Map 3 send PDF Parkway system/Greenway to M.D.
- Ed Cox- C 1 Canal planned as bike trail within city limits RD 1000
- J.P – Gold Rush Park (Foundation Proposal) idea is out there- need place for zoo- regional- cultural centers- such as for wildlife [but] where to put it. JP hopefully recreation potential in community separators JP- Bob O. envisions regional attractions in 1 mile buffer area.
- Patricia D. – Suffering farms add ducks & call it wildlife – Farm Bureau has researched this – converts agricultural to wildlife
- Helen Selph- multi-use farm and trails farm can be self supporting [economically]
- Julie – what’s the demand- mitigation lands least detrimental from City and County ‘s perspective?
- Patricia D. – Park standards need to be maintained: regional parks generally equal 100 acres or more – new growth potential – dog park
- Ed Cox- there is a need for an unpaved road for mountain biking but no current plan from City
- Jill – Dirt roads from County -70 mile loop American River Parkway-Ueda- Dry Creek- Greenway (legacy) then back to ARP
- Lanar – open space and parks – community separator 1 mile on County and 1 mile City

Appendix B Meeting Notes

- Regional active parks need to get money from local business owners
- Peter K - TDG to provide concepts of what to do with space
- www.cityofsac.org City parks standards – County doesn't have any equivalent standards
- Passive type regional parks are intended to maintain natural habitat values and therefore are applicable to Joint Vision Open Space purposes and thus could include County regional parks as part of the mitigation mix
- Generally City parks because they are oriented to providing active recreation their facilities are not appropriate for habitat mitigation
- Sacramento northern bike trail (Ron Vikari has info about it Per Ed Cox)
- Engage Rio Linda recreation and parks district (Elkhorn and east levee road?) equestrian facility: Contact for Rio Linda Parks District – Don Schatzel
- Rio Linda Recreation Park District goes through Highway 99
- Private conservation easements – Farm Bureau might have inventory
- Constant issue for County parks – need funding for operations & maintenance!
- Trish – program in city parks in urban reserve area using city parks standards (8 acres/per 1000 people) for regional parks
- Both city and county have park needs – regional park concept could be joint project- could be in County area – but needs to be close to urban edge
- Regional parks could include trails and soccer fields, cross country running areas to accommodate the new growth areas
- Could city parks buffer NBC lands?
- Other than Dry Creek, County has no integrated habitat areas with active Parks
- Should stay away from 1-mile buffer area because mitigation would be high???
- Demand for unpaved bike trail (both City & Co) trails should be links or have a destination 70 mile loop – ARP, Ueda, Dry Creek, legacy, ARP (Ed Cox and Jill)
- Sutter County – Measure M area includes mixed uses & joint planning by Lenar homes that includes new parks
- Regional park near community – (Tricia) nexus between regional parks very strong, unmet need, however this is an urban use (per Brian) put in developed area per Jill.
Misc. Notes:
 - Don't forget active needs (regional dog parks)
 - Michael needs a better vegetation layer
 - Don has a new soils map

Appendix B Meeting Notes

Back up notes

B.C.- Airport protection/ separation communities and open space

Patricia Davey – Levees historic district/flood control RD 1000 (rural landscape historic agricultural district)

M.D. – Parks & Recreation 1997 or 2005 land use layer open space Panhandle Annexation bike trail

Ed Cox- will get updated 2004 GIS shape files for Bikeway Master Plan trail from City of Sacramento to Michael Dangermond - Soutnip to W. El Camino

Airport reduce rice lands – took out 1000 oak trees – Airport using 1 mile habitat nesting trails through or besides airport--- for safety issues no go 4-F Concept

Don Lockhart- Buffers along airport – show on map holdings FAA what are airport lands – Garden Highway goes through airport and levee

County Parks holdings Winter Ranch, Elkhorn Boat Launch and Sand Cove

Sacramento Greenway Plan – West Sacramento City adopted

J.P. Tindell- Public access – Map 3 send PDF Parkway system/Greenway to M.D.

Ed Cox- C 1 Canal planned as bike trail within city limits RD 1000

Jill will send Drycreek Master Plan city limits through Placer County

J.P.- Gold Rush Park (Proposal) (Foundation) idea is out there- need place for zoo- regional-cultural centers- wildlife where to put it. Rio Linda Recreation Park District goes through Highway 99

Patricia D. – Farms suffering add ducks call it wildlife – Farm Bureau researches this – converts agricultural to wildlife

Helen Selph- multi-use farm and trails farm self supporting

Julie – what's the demand- mitigation lands least detrimental from City and County

Patricia D. – Park standards need to be maintained regional parks 100 acres or more – new growth potential – dog park

Ed Cox- unpaved road for mountain biking no plan from City

Jill – Dirt roads from County -70 mile loop American River Parkway-Ueda- Drycreek- Greenway (legacy) then back to ARP

Lanar – open space and parks – community separator 1 mile on County and 1 mile City

Appendix B Meeting Notes

Regional active parks need to get money from local business owners

Peter K.- TDG to provide concepts of what to do with space

www.cityofsac.org City parks standards – County doesn't have any standards

Passive regional parks applicable to Joint Vision – could county regional parks as mitigation

City parks never used as habitat mitigation

Rio Linda Parks District – Don Schatzel

Other Miscellaneous Parks & Recreation Issues

RD 1000- Historic agricultural district levees – Trish Davey Part of historic can system see Paul Devereau Natomas Rural Landscape Historic District might be in comprehensive drainage plan E112 (1997) or North Natomas Community Plan EIR

Panhandle annexation may delete park

Ed Cox will provide GIS layer with bike trails for City. Doesn't show data set – hardcopy version shows adopted GIS version most updated in 2004 by City (with City trails only)

Panhandle annexation may delete park

Ed Cox will provide GIS layer with bike trails for City. Doesn't show data set – hardcopy version shows adopted GIS version most updated in 2004 by City (with City trails only)

SACOG may have regional linkages per Jill (Co. Parks)

Ueda Parkway under construction – from Sotnip to W. El Camino

Wetland/SAFCA project at Ueda (south)

Another wetland (SAFCA mitigation site) north end of Veda

Jill suggested we set up meeting with parks and Greg

Map clear zones vs. in holdings (might get unpaved trail)

Airport may make exceptions for 4F

Elkhorn Boat launch, whether Winter Ranch, County Parks and Sand Cove

Greenways plan – did county adopt? Had comprehensive plan- State lands commission Sacramento River Greenways Plan

OSP joint parks planning process with city and county (recommendation)

Parks and recreation master plan #3- JP can send PDF

C1 canal planned as bike trail in city limit

No funding for Hansen Ranch portion of Ueda parkway trail

Appendix B Meeting Notes

Dry Creek Road – soccer complex (Jill) Jim has master plan she can provide Dry Creek Parkway example of county implementation

Sacramento northern bike trail Ron Vikari has info about? Per Ed Cox
JP hopefully recreation potential in community separators JP- Bob O. vision- regional attractions in 1 mile buffer like zoo

Engage Rio Linda recreation and parks district (Elkhorn and east levee road?) equestrian facility

Private conservation easements – Farm Bureau might have inventory

County parks – need funding for maintenance

Trish – program in city parks in urban reserve area using city parks standards (8 acres/per 1000 people) regional parks

Both city and county have needs – regional piece could be joint project- could be in county area – needs close to

Regional parks needs trails and soccer fields, cross country running provide in new growth areas in city parks could buffer NBC lands?

Don't forget active needs (regional dog parks) Michael needs a better vegetation layer

Don has a new soils map

Other than Dry Creek, County has no connected habitat parks should stay away from 1-mile buffer because mitigation would be high

Demand for unpaved bike trail (both City & Co) trails should be links or have a destination 70 mile loop – ARP, Ueda, Dry Creek, legacy, ARP (Ed Cox and Jill)

Sutter County – Measure M area joint uses joint planning Lenar homes

Regional park near community – Tricia nexus between regional parks very strong, unmet need, this is an urban use (per Brian) put in developed area per Jill.

Appendix B Meeting Notes

WILDLIFE ISSUES MEETING NOTES

Swainson's hawk:

No trade offs. Maintain at least existing population levels

Swainson's hawks exhibit "Nest fidelity" i.e. return to the same nesting site year after year

Maintain and currently below long-term viability levels although the Sacramento River area is relatively high density

NBC supports high habitat value, and generally city as low quality habitat-- -that was the rationale for the 0.5 ratio

HCP or continued

GGS Snake or water species

Need water for NCE during entire season

Interconnection of waterways

If NCE the connectivity is lost – resulting in island populations

Carol: city's goal is to identify low habitat value.

Jenny M.: Prior HCP analysis assumed it (The Basin) was all habitat.
NBC lands will be higher value

John: River otters toy with the GG snakes and sometimes kill.
Great blue heron are also effective predators

Jenny: Need to discuss where is where presumed.

John: 4 NBC priorities

1. Continuity in north (Ganer?) north drain to drain
2. Culverts under 99
3. Expand central Basin reserve
4. Expand north Basin reserve

Re-open the HCP – even if county initiated (changed circumstances)

Anticipate potential for higher mitigation ratios

Airports could push back FAA regarding management (Airport's 5000 acres are a huge loss in habitat assumed in HCP new fish screens at Sacramento River will help snake/Jenny)

September 2007 end of OSP

NMWC viability is key – assured supply of water

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

Jurisdiction Representatives Meeting

December 15, 2006

Questions and Comments (In order of discussion)

Sutter County –

Measure M Area

- (Richard Hall) – Measure M Area – Sutter Co. – specific plan will be ready in about two years
- Details like storm water not worked out yet.
- Estimated that grading will start around 2008
- Sutter County is part of SAFCA and therefore developer must bear their part
- Mitigation requirement is same as Sacramento land for mitigation probably already owned by developers
- Thinks that Measure M designers may have concepts for trails and parks
- Airport overlap also into Sutter County and Measure M footprint has been pulled back to adjust–
- Sutter County wants to retain its agricultural character as much as possible and they have a right to farm and (they still call
- Just embarking on General Plan Update for Sutter Co. Ag/OS a primary debate in Sutter Co. also NCP/HCCPW/ Yuba Co. inter jurisdictional mitigation not something people want to talk about

Reference to farm adjacency issues

- Have buffers up to 800' – but still get complaints that must be investigated by Ag Commissioners no applicable noise standards

Maria Wong- Yolo JPA – Habitat vs recreation- need for balance

Monthly meeting northern California habitat

Look a Swainson's Hawk biology – not just policy re: inter jurisdictional mitigation

Yolo Co. can't absorb any more SH mitigation, at least until GPU done

Major GPU- a year away from vision before environmental analysis

City of Davis – Mitch Sears

Agricultural mitigation ordinance-1995 (funding)- done through local jurisdiction

San Joaquin County did same

Open Space tax-2000

Mitigation

Other= assessment on housing Trust for Public lands

Pass through agreement – tax sharing between City of Davis and Yolo County

Urban Agricultural Buffer doesn't count as mitigation min 150. Allowable uses = agricultural managed grass lands (species getting push out into buffer zones)

Some differently finding farmers to put in a lot of effort into it. Trying to integrate into community.

Appendix B Meeting Notes

Tretheway –Organic farmers to fill gap that people don't want to farm 30 something / UC Davis

Mitch Sears- No good way around agricultural commission calls

Maria Wong- NNHCP- mitigation ratio inadequate amount of land for mitigation not enough reliance on water tremendous land development pressure high prices of land undermine next generation of farmers

Placer County- Christopher Smith- HCP multi agency alternatives in process getting everything south and west of Auburn

SH and vernal pools mostly

Placer Parkway

Placer vineyards

1=1? 50,000 acres mitigation land in 1st place

David S. – SACOG – inventory of mitigated habitat lands based on NCP's and HCPs boundaries, key resources

Contingent on application of SACOG Board Open Space Resource map

Streamline NEPA and CEQA process for transportation planning SACOG role clobbering maps together and helping permit process

Also streamline 404 process --- south Sacramento HCP as for all kinds of projects pilot for region SAMP- Special Area Management Plan- regional?

Maria- important to have a regional definition for OS if value OS- mechanisms needed to pay for at regional level so people don't vote with feet

History leading to Measure M

1. 20 years ago Sutter Bay- well planned with conservation components and included three phased new towns: voters did not approve
2. Own Boss Specific Plan- all industrial uses (Cisco)(no go)
3. Measure M- advisory vote with housing in plan

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

Land Owners Meeting

December 15, 2006

Questions and Comments (In order of discussion)

- What does the larger circle around airport mean?
- Is there an HCP required? [this process] must be a part of an HCP program – if not in sync it will fail
- Don't identify Open Space that has low biological value – look for combined values
- Consider out basin lands?? – north side of Basin canal for flood & biological values
- Read record of decision document for the Giant Garter Snake (GGS) for what constitutes suitable habitat lands
- Balance needed between development and open space
- Don't require SAFCA and private sector to both acquire habitat
- Concern – Open Space Plan created without a development plan
- and not taking into consideration development impacts on habitat from adjacency issues:
- Need to have an understanding of finances and development impacts in order to have viable plan
- Look at Placer County HCP plan – 12 years in process and still not complete
 - Positive element – HCP process includes a 404 Permit requirement addressing Corp wetlands take requirements
 - Look at values
 - Federal actions???

- Group requested list of agencies this planning process has met with
- Natomas Conservancy Acquisitions map inaccuracies: Needs to be updated
 - Reference: 3 trades in last 6 month
- Considering financial?
 - Source of dollars to accomplish plan?
 - Money needed for flood control, infrastructure, etc. as well as Open Space requirements
- Better coordinate the MSR/Open Space planning process interface
 - How to deal with overlap?
- How do we handle the Open Space definition?
- In joint vision? LAFCO vs. City vs. County OPR
 - Specifically – how was it handled with the Greenbrier proposal?
 - Reference to both City and County General Plan language for definition
- Boot landowners: Position on contractual obligations
- Need a copy of open space definition
 - Request comments from landowners
 - County definition will go to Board of Supervisor on January 9
- Farmland map classifications are evolving according to changing conditions State criteria application changes with changing circumstances
- Evaluation and ranking of layers? Parcel-based ownership lines or more polygon-based?
- Ultimate defining of boundaries is outcome? Some key landowners could block effort
- Who qualifies as a stakeholder?
- Meet with environmental interests separately and as a part of a larger mixed stakeholder meeting

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

- Suggest individual focus meetings but
 - Dialog is needed
- How does this [process] mesh with development plan?
 - Need for logical barriers between OS and urban
 - Another layer should show them
- Maps don't show boot study area.

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

Agriculture Viability Meeting

January 8, 2007

Meeting Purpose

This is a “pre-concept” stage information gathering meeting regarding the Natomas Joint Vision Open Space Program. The consultant has been meeting with various stakeholder interests including regulatory and jurisdictional agencies within the study area as a part of its formulation of primary considerations for open space. The principal categories of investigation include habitat considerations, airport protection and buffers, flood and storm water management considerations, community separators, agricultural resource preservation and parks and recreation.

1. Discussion of Natomas Mutual and their costs of operations
 - Three fees connected with water service
 - a. Per type of crop
 - b. Service volume
 - c. Other service fees
 - Water fees for rice going up
 - A smaller pool of shareholders results in higher rates
 - Basic costs of operations going up for company
 - Currently 98% of water allocated for farms and 2% for M & I
 - Consequently Natomas Mutual is presently struggling and if it goes under so does the agricultural lands it supports
 - There is a goal to create an endowment to support sales to consumers
 - National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) issues
 - Diminishing user base: Could Natomas Mutual supply water for airport?
 - Has the company done analysis of urban lands displacement of ag lands?
 - Bottom-line development on west side of Natomas will be bad for company and therefore bad for the remaining ag water users in Natomas
2. Reference to a meeting between Board Of Supervisors and Farm Bureau regarding Right to Farm policies
 - Does not offer immunity to farm related activities – if people want to complain they still can
 - But offers some latitude of actions regarding specific nuisance factors like odor
3. Important point that Agricultural viability has to be the farmer’s decision
 - Value of land falls into 3 categories
 - a. As agriculturally productive land
 - b. For some type of preserve status through easements or other
 - c. Developed as urban
 - Fundamental point: must consider private property rights
 - Ag land should receive fair market value
 - Cost of farming [near urban] is becoming too prohibitive
 - With regards to farming, there are many unknowns – can’t control value of crops
 - Other market factors for crops
 - Labor requirements

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

- Industrial scale crops
 - Niche markets
 - Long term versus short term return crops (orchards or vineyards producing 800 to \$900 a ton)
4. County wide farm production brought in \$320 million
 - Consultant team will research what % Natomas contributes to that total County production
 5. Recreation and public in general is a bad fit for ag uses: many issues
 - Vandalism
 - Trails/easements
 6. Specialty crops Idea: these higher-end crops seem to be successful in some places (Yolo and El Dorado Counties were cited)
 7. Conservation has become a significant option with various strategies such the Sacramento Valley Land Trust buying development rights for Swainson's Hawk habitat
 8. Other options:
 - Use of farmer's markets to aid local farm economy (Orange County reverence)
 - Use of development fees to support staff time and regional projects (loss of important farmland mitigation fees?)
 - Engaging local schools as part of a public awareness program (City of Galt reference) note: there are over 350 agricultural commodities produced in California with over 75 from Sacramento County)
 9. Other Agriculture organizations to engage
 - Cattlemen's Association
 - California Rice Commission
 - Dairymen Association
 - USDA/Natural Resource Conservation Service
 10. Agriculture/Urban interface
 - Urban perspective: agricultural buffers never big enough – noise, light, dust, spraying and other nuisances
 - Burden of buffer should be shared by both municipal and farming interests
 - *Review 300ft buffer imposed along Elkhorn?????*
 - Look at other type of uses that allow good transition [from farm to urban] like golf courses, parks and greenbelts to separate farm areas from agricultural areas

Appendix B Meeting Notes

Notes from Phone Conversation with Jenny Marr DFG.

Jan 11, 2007

Questions regarding the One Mile Swainson's hawk Buffer along the Sacramento River.

The One Mile Swainson's hawk Buffer was a negotiated item in the Final HCP.

Assumptions

1. The HCP was USFWS driven and primarily focused on GGS and other aquatic species.
2. Upland habitat preferring species (especially Swainson's hawk) were given an insufficient part of the constructed habitat lands based on the assumption that all ag lands provided some habitat value.

Substantial amounts of foraging habitat will remain in the basin as well as abundant foraging habitat in nearby Yolo County, and the proposed action will result in the addition of high-quality foraging habitat managed specifically to benefit the hawk (i.e., located in close proximity to nest trees, managed to produce most of hawk prey, available throughout the hawk's time in the Basin, etc.).

3. Recognizing this deficiency, the one buffer concept addressed the protection of the primary concentration of existing nesting habitat along the river including a one mile foraging zone adjoining that nesting area.
4. Also concern about island habitat supported the linear one mile corridor
5. Buffer is from the levee centerline to a mile distance landward side.
6. Yolo County habitat is thought to compliment the foraging habitat in the Basin for this species.

Because any additional development beyond the 17,500 allotted for subsequent

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

Joint Vision Open Space Definition

For the purpose of the Joint Vision Open Space Program open space shall be defined according to its functional purpose, its relationship to developed versus undeveloped lands and in some instances the extent of its physical area. Scale is a factor in that scale determines how well it can accommodate the various purposes for which is intended. Open space must serve one or more of the following purposes:

- Provides habitat for key species as listed in the Natomas HCP
- Supports biological connectivity between existing or developed habitat areas
- Contributes to the community separator function which is understood to include major jurisdiction areas of interface rather than urban to urban edges such and development areas that adjoin transportation corridors
- Contributes to the protection and buffering of airport operations and facilities
- Includes and or helps buffer existing farmland and/or accommodates the delivery and drainage of water to farmlands
- Accommodates flood detention or other flood-related improvements in conjunction with either habitat values and/or passive recreation functions

Appendix B Meeting Notes

Natomas Joint Vision Wildlife Agencies Issues Meeting March 8, 2007, 9:00- 11:00 am 2800 Cottage Way, Cafeteria Room (C1001)

Participants: US Fish and Wildlife Service: Cay Goude, Lori Rinek
Eric Tattersall, Holly Herod, Kelly Fitzgerald, Lynn Cox
California Dept. of Fish & Game: Kent Smith, Jenny Marr, Todd Gardner
LAFCO: Don Lockhart, Peter Brundage
City of Sacramento: Carol Shearly, Scot Mende, Helen Selph, Arwen Wacht
County of Sacramento: Julie Car, Leighann Moffitt
County of Sutter: Rich Hall
The Natomas Basin Conservancy: John Roberts
Contracted Consultants: John O'Farrell; Brian Collett (TDG); Christine Roberts

Meeting Summary

Carol Shearly started off meeting with clarifications on the following:

- City does not want to jeopardize NBHCP/ITP
- City has valid reasons for moving forward with Greenbriar. These reasons will be discussed in a separate meeting at 2:00pm.
- City will do it's best to coordinate projects in Basin with NJV and make landowners/developers aware of their obligations, however, it's "somewhat like herding cats" (clarification – For example, with respect to the school district project in today's paper, City does not have land use jurisdiction over the District, just influence).

Agenda Items

1. Accepted notes (with various perspectives reflected in comments) from February 8, 2007 meeting
 - A matrix was provided showing other Natomas Basin projects, and what is currently known by City/County/LAFCo/TDG staff about the impacts. The intent is to add additional information to the matrix as we learn more about the projects.
 - Airport buffer lands – we will discuss our differences in perspective at a later meeting
 - SAFCA levee project – We had a meeting with SAFCA (Stein Buer, Tim Washburn) in Mayor's office on Tuesday, March 6. Stein & Tim presented a very different picture than we heard previously. Potential impacts on existing HCP may be less than we thought. TDG will have another meeting with SAFCA/Stein to obtain details.

Appendix B Meeting Notes

- **Area B – Bottom line per wildlife agencies: Area B cannot be used for Swainsons hawk mitigation.**

2. The following protocols were agreed on:

- **Developers will go through the City. Wildlife agency staff will refer calls from developers to City.**
- **We will have a standing meeting with the wildlife agencies on the 2nd Thursday of every month from 9am – 11am. Sutter County will always be invited to attend.**

Off-Agenda Item: Next 2 x 2 (April 6)

- **Up to this point we have mostly been talking about process. Now we would like to include more detail on the issues.**
 - **There was a discussion about the need to educate the BOS about the NBHCP. County staff will report back to BOS on NJV status on May 30th. Prior to that, the BOS needs to understand that it will be difficult and expensive for the County to develop in the Natomas Basin if BOS abandons the NJV.**
 - **It was agreed that the wildlife agencies will attend a 2 x 2 (also SAFCA?)**
- 3. Carol summarized the process of amending the City's Sphere of Influence and the annexation process, using a flow chart that showed wildlife agency input/involvement in pink text.**
- **Project was initiated in Dec. 2002 with City-County MOU as a collaborative approach to regional growth. It was initiated because landowners were pressuring the County to move the Urban Services Boundary.**
 - **There was some discussion about the definition of open space. It was agreed that County staff would bring the definition to the next meeting for discussion. In addition, the wildlife agencies will look up their definition. It was agreed that it is important to define what it is, and what it is not.**
 - **MOU requires minimum 1:1 ratio of development to open space, with half or more of that as habitat. We acknowledged that it may need to increase.**
 - **Two key issues for Phase 2: 1) What is habitat 2) What is needed in addition**
- 4. Chartering the team (who, what, when): Everyone at the meeting described their title & role in the NJV.**
- 5. Due to lack of time, we will revisit list (now a matrix) of projects from previous meeting at a later date.**
- 6. Also due to lack of time, we will review & discuss TDG preliminary open space analysis of available acreage at our next meeting.**
-

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

Next Steps:

- **City staff requested that USFWS send electronic file of meeting notes, retain unresolved issues as comments in track changes.**
- **Invite SAFCA & Airport staff to next meeting (April 12)**
- **County & wildlife agencies to bring definition of open space to next meeting**
- **Wildlife agencies will be invited to attend 2 x 2**

Preliminary Agenda Items for April 12:

- **TDG preliminary OS analysis**
- **Discussion with SAFCA + USACOE & Airport + FAA**
- **Project Matrix**
- **Post 2 x 2 discussion?**

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

NJV Prep for Public Workshop Exercise

Post Meeting Outline for Further Discussion

Concept: Keep it simple and stay true to previous commitment.

- 1) Develop an exercise for July 12th workshop to let participants grapple with the problems that we have been trying to solve.
 - Exercise should force them to deal with tradeoffs, possibly involve the tiered mitigation idea.
 - What should TDG bring to the workshop in the way of alternatives?
 - When should economic analysis fit in if we use this approach?)
- 2) Suggestion: TDG prepare background paper which memorializes the findings presented in the PowerPoint.
- 3) TDG Economic Analysis – For example,
 - Assuming ~6k acres each OS: Dev, what is residual land value, profits, mitigation fees per acre and does this pencil out from OS preservation perspective?
 - Landowner perspective: Does the mitigation fee above represent adequate compensation to landowners?
 - Developer perspective: Does the scenario insure reasonable expectation of profit? Is profit margin narrow enough so that people on sidelines are satisfied?

Brian's Post Meeting Suggestion:

Develop 3 alternatives for ~6,000 acres open space: ~6,000 acres development (qualify that 6,000 acres is not absolute):

- Each of the 3 alternatives will vary geographically and test different open space priorities
- TDG would develop economic potentials, including fee transfers and other concepts for compensation to landowners to present at the workshop
- Again, there would be multiple caveats.
- We may still use the matrix (with agreed upon criteria) as an evaluation tool.
- Include identified OS framework features:
 - Buffering existing NBC lands
 - SAFCA levee work with recreation component
 - Biological corridors
- The idea is to link the alternatives with the different value sets or biases associated with the open space plan i.e.
 - Airport protection emphasis
 - Community separator emphasis
 - Farm protection emphasis
 - Habitat emphasis
 - Recreation emphasis etc
 - Internal flood management emphasis

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

- Exercise should provide audience with tools for evaluating the different alternatives – allowing them to deal with tradeoffs and issues involved

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

Public Workshop Exercise

July 12, 2007

Public At large Comments

- Why is a new HCP needed?
- Concerns that several of the dark blue parcels have previously been determined to not be high value to the NBC.
- Issues w/the 1:1 ratio
- Airport protection areas and how it affects landowners
- Concerns about why certain areas (s of 1 mile w of 99) are not shown w/a high value
- 1:1 ratio can be higher (yes) what if people object to this ratio (should/be more/less)?
- Have the wildlife agencies indicated that they will issue a ITP for 6,000 acres? (no) Is this activity premature?
- How many acres is the RBF study area?
- Premature activity
- Concerns about separators
- Premise for consultant was an HCP flawed because it excluded county land owners *specifically w/in 1 mile buffer*
- East and west sides of the airport should be developed
- Long term property owner , appreciated the opportunity to express his opinion
- Felt the activity was biased (was not evenly distributed – owners/developers) should have been more fairly distributed.
- Valuable exercise that should be taken seriously
- More time should have been given felt rushed
- Some tables the activity went well; others the division of power was not evenly distributed
- Airport MP should have been provided (info)
- What does airport protection mean? *Related to operations*
- Hard to find balance in the group
- Should have been a 3rd color habitat/open space/development – additional land uses
- Property owners should have identified their properties
- City should acquire lands in the Basin with public monies/funds
- Several areas that were shown as open have development applications submitted/ in process
- People did not have an understanding of where more realistic/sustainable habitat may be located not familiar with the characteristics of the land (physical/habitat/etc.)

Individual Table Comments

Table 3

1. Green Briar & Camino Norte already segregated from JV so they should be excluded from exercise and total recalculated.
2. 1 mile buffer zone is theory – can be shaped in some areas more in others less near freeway

Appendix B

Meeting Notes

3. Section west of airport: was split with 50% said all green 50% said all orange. Both sides throughout it should be 100% one way or the other.
4. North of Fisher Lake south of I-5 majority said all green. Two strong objections.

Table 8

1. Airport protection only when the airport says how far west they to go
 2. One mile buffer and airport are major impediments to forming
 3. impacts of the airport proximity on farming
- All six thousand acres of open spaces should be within the Natomas Basin.
 - Work shops are not productive and nothing can be determined and flood issues are settled
 - Provide some large lot residential development.