

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF AUGUST 30, 2006

The Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission met this thirtieth day of August at a Special Hearing, continued from August 2, 2006, to receive testimony on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed City of Sacramento and Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Sphere of Influence Amendment and Reorganization of Greenbriar Property (12-06).

PRESENT: Christopher Tooker, Chair; Charles Rose, Elliot Mulberg; Susan Peters; Robert King Fong; Roberta MacGlashan; Sophia Scherman.
Also Present: Gay Jones.

ABSENT: Illa Collin. Not Present: John Jachens, Steve Miklos, Kevin McCarty.

STAFF: Peter Brundage, Executive Officer; Donald Lockhart, Assistant Executive Officer; Nancy Miller, Commission Counsel; Marilyn Ann Flemmer, Commission Clerk.

Call to Order

Chairman Chris Tooker called the Special Meeting to order at 5:42 P.M. Commissioner Fong led the Pledge of Allegiance; the Clerk called the roll.

GUM RANCH II ANNEXATION TO FAIR OAKS WATER DISTRICT (11-06)

[CEQA: Exemption]

Donald Lockhart gave a brief review of the staff report and recommended approval of the proposed annexation. On a motion made by Commissioner MacGlashan, seconded by Commissioner Rose, the Commission unanimously approved the Gum Ranch II Annexation to Fair Oaks Water District.

Continuation of Public Testimony on Draft EIR CITY OF SACRAMENTO AND SACRAMENTO and REGIONAL COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT SPHERE OF INFLUENCE AMENDMENTS and REORGANIZATION OF GREENBRIAR PROPERTY (12-05)

[CEQA: Environmental Impact Report]

Tom Buford, Environmental Manager for the Project, City of Sacramento, briefly addressed the Commission. He thanked the Commission for continuing the item to this special meeting and stated City staff and the project consultants are available this evening to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Gary Jacobs, EDAW, gave a brief power point presentation on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed project.

Tom McDonagh, Westlake Homeowners Association, North Natomas Resident, addressed the Commission. Mr. McDonagh requested denial of the project, stating the Draft Environmental Impact Report does not adequately address the negative impacts on infrastructure, on levees, on the bad job-housing ratio in the area, and on the proposed light rail extension. He concluded stating his belief that "at some point in the future this proposal would be valid, but not now."

Thomas Foley, Yuba City resident, addressed the Commission. Mr. Foley stated the known flood risk is not adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. The proposal does not provide for 100 year flood protection.

Joe Sullivan, Sacramento County Taxpayers League, addressed the Commission. Mr. Sullivan stated "the Environmental Impact Report is not our issue. Our issue is that the citizens in the City have taxes three times those of the County. If that issue is applicable to the Natomas project, there may be a statewide misuse of money. The impacts on services for this project are relevant," concluded Mr. Sullivan.

Thomas Reavey, Natomas Community Association, addressed the Commission. Mr. Reavey urged denial of the proposal. "The City needs to prove it can provide services to the Greenbriar property as well as the remainder of the Natomas community," stated Mr. Reavey. "The Draft EIR does not adequately address the concerns of services, flood control, or traffic problems that cannot be mitigated. We argue that this undermines the current West Natomas Community Plan and creates an inequitable planning process. We urge you to deny the project as contained in the Draft EIR," concluded Mr. Reavey.

Alta Tura, Sacramento Urban Creeks Council, addressed the Commission. Ms. Tura stated "We are opposed to the Greenbriar project. The Draft Environmental Impact Report does not address impacts to the levee or flood issues. In making an exception for this project, what impact on future development may occur? The Draft EIR does not address how to avoid impacts to Fisherman's Lake and other waterways," concluded Ms. Tura.

Jude Lamare, Friends of the Swainson's Hawk, addressed the Commission. Ms. Lamare stated "We are asking that you do not ask for a Final EIR until the issues brought before you in this document are more comprehensively addressed. I object to processing this as a separate project outside the North Natomas General Plan. The fast track leaves unanswered questions. Impacts on air quality cannot be mitigated. Next year, you could adopt new standards; by pushing ahead, it robs decision-makers from reviewing a synergistic mitigation system, one poorly addressed in the Draft EIR. Emissions from the two freeways are high; there are habitat lands north and south of the project," concluded Ms. Lamare.

Tara Hansen, Save our Sandhill Cranes, addressed the Commission. Ms. Hansen stated "The Draft EIR inadequately addresses issues concerning traffic, air quality, the fact that the site is outside the urban services boundary and it promotes urban sprawl without mitigating flood concerns and the preservation of habitat."

Jim Pachel, Sierra Club, Environmental Council of Sacramento, addressed the Commission. Mr. Pachel stated "The Draft EIR makes assumptions with no evidence and no reasonable probability of funding for mitigation measures. The flood hazard is severe. If your Commission approves the project you will be approving something with less than 100 year flood protection. If you do that, you will be committing fraud. You will be setting yourselves up---leaving yourselves wide open---for a CEQA issue." Mr. Pachel concluded stating he would submit written comments on behalf of his clients.

Rose Tribalet, Natomas resident, addressed the Commission. Ms. Tribalet stated she urged denial of the project "because of flood issues. Sacramento is now this country's most flood prone city. In July, the Corps withdrew its certification. In the event of a levee break, Natomas could be under 15 feet of water. On behalf of my neighbors and the City, I ask you to take care of the levees first."

Linn Hom, Friends of Truxel, addressed the Commission. Ms. Hom urged denial of the project due to transportation problems. She stated "it would be wildly expensive to build light rail to the site; the project will increase traffic on Truxel Road. It would be better to supply buses on Truxel Road."

Phil Serna, Representing Natomas 575 Investors, addressed the Commission. Mr. Serna thanked the Commission for receiving additional testimony and stated "We have members from our consultant team here tonight to answer any Commission questions."

Motion to Close the Public Hearing

On a motion made by Commissioner Scherman, seconded by Commissioner Fong, the Commission unanimously voted to close the public hearing. Staff announced that the Comment period for the Draft EIR is open until 5:00 P.M. September 5, 2006.

FY 2005-06 Appropriations Request to Move Money from Contingencies to Other Professional Services

On a motion made by Commissioner Rose, seconded by Commissioner Scherman, the Commission unanimously approved Peter Brundage's request to approve an Appropriations Request to move money from one budget object to another in the 2005-06 LAFCo budget.

Commissioner Mulberg reported on the Special Districts Advisory Committee; Commissioner Tooker confirmed the Sub-Committee for selection of the Alternate Public Member. The Sub-Committee Members are Commissioners Rose, Tooker and Mulberg. There was no further business. The meeting was adjourned at 6:41 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

SACRAMENTO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Marilyn Ann Flemmer
Commission Clerk

MAF
(Minutes August 30, 2006)