

REVISED Agenda Item No. 7

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

August 2, 2006

TO: Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission

FROM: Peter Brundage, Executive Officer
Donald J. Lockhart AICP, Assistant Executive Officer

RE: **Policy Discussion Paper:**
Open Space and Agricultural Land Preservation Policy (LAFC 12-03)

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that your Commission receive testimony this evening, and direct staff to continue to prepare the revised Draft policies (Exhibit A) for further consideration at the regularly scheduled meeting of October 4, 2006. The Guidelines will encourage cities to develop General Plan policies, ordinances, and programs that consider and mitigate impacts on open space and prime agricultural resources.

OUTREACH EFFORTS

This is a report back on the ongoing development of Open Space and Agricultural Land Preservation Policies. These policies will provide your Commission sound criteria to apply to future proposals. At your direction, staff has conducted public workshops in the cities of Galt, Elk Grove and Rancho Cordova, as well as the County of Sacramento Southeast Area Planning Advisory Council. We have also discussed the policies several times with the local North State Building Industry Association. Staff has continued inclusive public outreach via an extensive "e-mail tree," and the issuance of a "Call for Presentations." The County of Sacramento, Folsom and Rancho Cordova, as well the BIA have expressed interest in participating in the upcoming Open Space Workshop, as their resources allow.

Your staff has surveyed the County and all cities within the county regarding adopted Agriculture and Open Space preservation policies. The responses received to date are provided in the attached matrix, Exhibit A1. Staff will continue to work with the affected cities to complete the matrix.

Further, your staff has conducted a comprehensive assessment of 231 organizations that are active in Open Space preservation, primarily in Northern California's Bay Area. The simple survey asked:

- 1) the name and date the organization/agency was established;
- 2) means of participation and financing for acquisition, operation and maintenance;
- 3) number of acres preserved;
- 4) level of public access provided.

About 35% of those surveyed responded (80 of 231.) The results are provided in the attached matrix, Exhibit B and also reflected in the revised Draft Policies. The many non-profit organizations, special districts and cities have worked together to preserve thousands of acres in the Bay Area. Some of the organizations surveyed did not hold any land but participated in management and conservation processes.

BACKGROUND

Staff has revised the earlier Draft Sacramento LAFCo Policies and Procedures to reflect legislative changes, public and agency input, as well as information gleaned from further research. The revised policies inform the public about how Sacramento LAFCo will evaluate the preservation of open space and prime agricultural resources during LAFCo proceedings.

Staff recognizes that cities are mandated to develop responsible community based local land use policies that address the economic, political, environmental and social issues of the respective jurisdictions. However, there may be a tension in the ability to maintain a regional perspective regarding issues beyond the control of a single entity, which may not be congruent with local preferences.

Open Space and Agricultural Land Issues Research Results

At your direction, staff has conducted extensive literature review regarding: open space and agricultural land preservation efforts across the Country, and throughout California. This review has included acreage and production statistics on agriculture, and means to reflect the value of open space and agricultural preservation with land use decisions. Synopsis of the studies are provided in Exhibit C.

Studies in Minnesota confirmed that open space resources such as parks, nature preserves, greenways, wetlands and lakes had a positive and lasting effect on nearby property values. Results from a referendum indicated that Minnesotans value open space enough to raise taxes to pay for open space acquisition and preservation. Elsewhere, a study from Maryland concluded that the value of vacant land and agricultural land proximity is highly location dependant. Other studies have showed positive and negative effects. In North Carolina, vacant land had a positive effect on nearby land, while agricultural land operations had a negative effect. (Anton 2005)

Although there are varying outcomes regarding agricultural land, California remains the number one agricultural state in the nation. These proposed policies will contribute to sustainable agricultural resource preservation to meet the growing demand for producing food and fiber, as well as, allow each region (i.e. Central Coast, Desert, North Coast, Sacramento Valley, San Joaquin Valley, and South Coast) to continue competing in the global economy. From 1998-2000 the County of Sacramento lost 3,405 net acres of agricultural land, while accommodating a considerable growth. Public opinion consistently indicates that many Californians believe the loss of farmland is a “very serious” problem. Unchecked, the encroachment of development may pose a serious threat to farmland. Agricultural land is an essential part of California’s identity, and it is appropriate for your Commission to adopt policies for Agricultural and Open Space Resource Preservation. Total cash receipts generated by California agriculture in 2000 was \$24.8 billion, as compared to total cash receipts generated by Texas, the second leading agricultural state, of \$13.2 billion. In 2000, the Sacramento region alone produced crops valued over \$955 million; about 5% of the total value of California’s agricultural commodities. These statistics show the contribution and importance of agricultural land to our quality of life, and the economic vitality of this sector.

Staff also reviewed a study regarding how open space and farmland protection policies play a role in shaping urban growth patterns. The study used Orlando, Florida and Seattle, Washington – to contrast differing growth management regimes – to explore the effects of growth policies on metropolitan form. In Orlando, growth management is achieved through open space protection guided by state law and environmental concerns which focuses more on providing concurrent infrastructure with new development than shaping urban form. In Seattle, a Washington state growth management law, in conjunction with the adopted Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), was the major policy influence on metropolitan growth. Overall the study found that:

- UGB’s can help redirect urban growth but are the most effective when used congruently with other policies such as an Agricultural Protection District. Using a single policy approach is problematic and of limited effectiveness in providing the foundation for a fundamentally different urban form.
- Open space protection efforts can divert growth away from important natural areas. They are a defensive or reactive approach; they cannot shape a coherent metropolitan form.
- The metropolitan fringe is a development battleground and often the most politically troublesome growth area in any region. Many policy tools available can not withstand the political and economic pressure pushing for more development. Metro growth strategies must recognize where these areas are and how to handle them. If government agencies are not willing to devote resources to preserving them and if urban growth is not desired, then an economically sustainable strategy must be devised or some type of urban or suburban growth must be permitted.
- UGBs and open space protection need to be coordinated or these differing policies will work at cross-purposes and lead to higher costs for land preservation and/or open space protection. Government agencies will have to spend large sums of

taxpayer dollars to buy their way out of land-use decisions that conflict with open space policies. (Fulton 2006)

Overall, it is often hard to fully reflect the value of open space in the financial analyses underlying local land use decisions. As decision makers, your Commission must balance the seemingly abstract value of open space into monetary values such as tax revenues, development costs, and infrastructure spending. It is important for communities to have an understanding of the fiscal implications of open space resources to be better equipped to set priorities and strike a balance between open space preservation and other objectives that will lead to a higher quality of life for present and future residents. By adding the property taxes paid by nearby properties, the avoided cost of public services generated by alternative development, and the potential cost savings, such as from enhanced stormwater management as additional financial impacts to the framework for evaluating the value of open space, better-informed decisions in land use can be made. There are various tools available that can help communities perform this comprehensive fiscal impact analysis for open space preservation, such as, the Ryan and Taft Workbook, the Development Impact Assessment Model: a Technical Resource (DIAMaTR), and the Federal Reserve System Fiscal Impact Tool (FIT). (Anton 2005)

Notes:

Fulton, William, Linda E. Hollis and Chris Williamson. 2006. *The Shape of Metropolitan Growth: How Policy Tools Affect Growth Patterns in Seattle and Orlando*. The Brookings Institution, Washington DC.

Anton, Paul A. 2005. *The Economic Value of Open Space*. Wilder Research. Saint Paul, MI.

(1) Agricultural Issues Center, *The Measure of California Agriculture 2000* (www.aic.ucdavis.edu).

(2) Poll conducted by Faribank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates for the Nature Conservancy and the Conservation Fund (July 1999)

(3) CA Farm Bureau Federation (www.cfbf.org)

(4) CA Farmland Conversion Report - http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/finmp/pubs/2000_2002/FCR/FCR_00_02_entire.pdf

(5) Sacramento Region Quality-of-Life 2002 Index Report. Created by: Valley Vision, CSUS, and SACOG

LAFCo Legislative Mandate

As you know, your Commission plays a role in regional planning issues by taking into consideration a wide range of land use and growth factors when acting on matters under your jurisdiction. LAFCo has broad statutory responsibility to facilitate planned, orderly, efficient patterns of urban development; preserve agricultural lands; and discourage urban sprawl. Your decisions must balance the competing needs for affordable housing, economic opportunities, public safety and the preservation of natural resources.

By making decisions about the extent of the geographic area over which a local government or special district may control planning, services provision and development, LAFCo may influence the extent and path of growth and development both locally and regionally. Local growth pressures are influenced by an array of external variables which necessitate that local governments respond in an equally varied manner. They may choose to grow, or not to grow. Also, the electorate may initiate referendums on growth management. These considerations contribute to the nature and direction of growth.

LAFCo oversees logical and timely changes in local governmental boundaries (§56001); conducts special studies which review ways to reorganize, simplify and streamline governmental structures (§56031); and prepares Spheres of Influence for each city and special district within the County (§56425). The mission of LAFCo is to promote orderly

development, discourage urban sprawl, preserve open space and prime agricultural lands, provide for housing for persons and families of all incomes, and encourage the efficient extension of governmental services.

In fulfilling this mission, LAFCo has various mandates which may be in conflict: (1) provide land for orderly development and efficient service delivery; (2) preserve and protect open space and prime agricultural lands. These two mandates often compete with one another.

Linkage and Interrelationship Between Open Space, Agricultural Preservation and Urban Development

Open space and agriculture preservation policies are directly linked to land use planning decisions. The timing and extent of an area to be annexed is a function of the level of efficiency of how a city develops existing land inventory, and how it plans to use the area to be annexed. In-fill strategies, mixed-use and smart growth principles, redevelopment and re-use (brownfield) programs, intensity of use and distribution of density, all contribute to the character of the city. In light of this direct linkage and integration of planning for growth, it is beneficial for localities to develop General Plan land use and development strategies which include open space and agricultural preservation policies.

Open Space and Agricultural Preservation Mitigation Measures

As discussed previously, it may be difficult, and even imprudent, to develop a single set of rigid, pre-determined mitigation requirements for all annexations and Sphere of Influence amendments. Each Sphere of Influence and annexation proposal has distinct factors including, but not limited to, soil types, geography, topography, species and habitat issues, infrastructure capacity and availability, service delivery issues, civic standards and environmental resources. Consequently, each area will need to be analyzed in the context of constraints and opportunities related to the specific location.

LAFCo should act as a filter for the timing and direction of new growth outside existing jurisdictional boundaries during the evaluation of Sphere of Influence and Annexation proposals. Your Commission must weigh the needs and resources of each community, the regional implications, and impacts to environmental resources.

LAFCo policies and procedures should encourage each city to adopt General Plan policies, local ordinances and programs committed to minimize adverse social and environmental impacts and direct growth inward and/ or away from “greenfield” prime agricultural and open space resources. New growth should take advantage of existing public and private infrastructure investment, resources, and capacity.

Selected Other LAFCo Open Space and Agricultural Preservation Policies

Staff has exhaustively reviewed the policies and procedures of other LAFCo's around the state, and selected polices or approaches which may also be applicable for Sacramento.

The twenty LAFCo's with applicable adopted open space/ agriculture preservation policies are shown in the attached matrix, Exhibit D. Many of the LAFCo's largely carry forward the language of Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg, while others reflect local standards.

LAFCo Policies for the Evaluation of Annexations, Detachments, Sphere of Influence and Incorporation Proposals

Local Agency Formation Commissions should adopt written procedures for the evaluation of proposals, including written definitions of terms, consistent with state law.

Policy Goal

Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission should evaluate Sphere of Influence, annexation, and incorporation proposals in order to meet projected population growth **in relation** to its requirements to preserve and protect open space.

Assumption: Cities annex property to provide land to meet employment and population growth and demand. Cities typically do not acquire land for the preservation of open space or agricultural pursuits, although there are cases of land being annexed for community buffers/ open space form. Also, based upon local government finance structure (i.e. “fiscalization of land use”) cities require some level of economic growth to sustain financial viability. This provides a significant dilemma causing cities to face difficult choices. New growth allows cities to improve, or in some cases simply maintain, the level of services available.

Nonetheless, the Sacramento LAFCo current policies may be enhanced to require each city to address specific factors within its General Plan and local ordinances prior to submitting a request for a Sphere of Influence Amendment or the annexation of territory. This approach provides guidance to the annexing agency, while respecting oversight by the city, based on local needs, to determine community standards to mitigate impacts to open space, prime agricultural and habitat resources prior to submitting an application to LAFCo.

Your Commission currently has general standards and policies to preserve and protect open space and prime agricultural lands. The proposed policies allow your Commission to be able to make findings that annexing new undeveloped territories will not adversely affect the economics of infill development and redevelopment. Given a regional market to such things, there are limitations to what individual cities can do (i.e., one city may not expand and then growth just occurs in the unincorporated county or other communities rather than in infill areas). It is important to consider regional context about growth and timing to frame decisions. For example older cities (ex: Citrus Heights) may have considerable infill potential from expansion, while newer cities (ex: Elk Grove) experience considerable new growth, as there are so few older neighborhoods.

The context of the proposed amendments to the LAFCo polices and procedures are discussed below.

LAFCo would favor a proposal where the city has adopted General Plan policies, implementing ordinances and programs that address:

- demand analysis – timing of buildout and use of existing land inventory
- habitat preservation as applicable
- mitigation and acquisition program for prime agricultural and open space resources
- infill, reuse, and redevelopment programs - level of assessment of infill development capacity and goals.
- Smart Growth Principles and Civic Standards for:
 - transit supportive land uses
 - efficient density distribution and land use intensities
- capacity and ability to provide or extend services
- sustainable water supply
- performance standards for meeting Regional Housing Needs Allocations

If an affected agency's General Plan does not address these policy concerns, your Commission has the authority to modify, conditionally approve, or deny any proposal.

Analysis of Policy

General Plans and land use pressures change over time for any number of reasons. Each community has changing needs because of population and demographic shifts, availability of local resources, employment trends, etc. Thus, it may be problematic for LAFCo to impose specific requirements on land use decision-makers.

In addition, preservation standards and mitigation requirements are likely to vary from one geographic setting to another. Therefore, it is very difficult to develop a single regional or a countywide mitigation fee or ratio program for the protection of open space and prime agricultural lands. For example, annexation of prime agricultural land should have a greater mitigation requirement than lesser valued agricultural land. The annexation of prime agricultural land represents the loss of a valuable statewide resource: productive agricultural land. On the other hand, the annexation of dry pasture land that has lesser production value may warrant a lower mitigation requirement in that its

development could be beneficial in diverting growth pressure away from prime agricultural lands.

To impose the same mitigation requirement on lands of highly productive quality as that on lesser productive quality may actually be counterproductive in the preservation of prime agricultural lands. Such an approach fails to encourage the use of non-prime agricultural land as growth areas, as directed per statute. A more flexible, variable mitigation program, including a fee structure, would help create an incentive to direct growth from prime agricultural areas to non-prime agricultural areas.

LAFCo needs to encourage cities and counties to consider policies and standards to help protect open space and a viable agricultural economy when a local jurisdiction adopts or amends its General Plan. LAFCo recommends that cities develop General Plan policies and/or local ordinances or programs that place emphasis on, and address the following issues:

1. Demonstrate efficient use of existing land inventory such as establishment and implementation of infill and reuse/brownfield strategies within city limits.
2. Demonstrate development and implementation of Smart Growth Principles to maximize return on existing public/ private infrastructure investment, bring certainty to the outcome, and establish a level playing field for development review.
3. Identify in the General Plan the build-out rate and inventory of all land uses.
4. Demonstrate that the city has the means to continue to provide the existing level of municipal services to the current city residents as well as the area proposed to be annexed.

A General Plan should also emphasize a broad based approach to open space and prime agricultural resources preservation. The policies should support other programs in addition to the following:

- a. Mitigation Fees/ Mitigation Ratios
- b. Habitat Conservation Plans
- c. Buffer Areas or Easements as Community Separators
(to be derived from the developing territory)
- d. Participation in Countywide and/or Regional Conservation Programs
- e. Develop Regional Funding Mechanisms for Open Space and Agricultural Lands Acquisition

Conclusion

Your Commission has considered these Draft Policies on several previous occasions. The Revised Draft Policies before you this evening represent the results of thorough statewide and nationwide research, and extensive agency, interest group, and public outreach.

LAFCo is required to evaluate Sphere of Influence and reorganization proposals for consistency with an affected city's applicable policies and adopted General Plan. These factors provide a comprehensive framework for the review of proposals. The overall focus is to avoid or minimize growth impacts on open space and prime agricultural resources. By placing the emphasis on the LAFCo mandate to preserve these resources, city General Plans should encourage growth consistent with the LAFCo legislative mandate. Your Commission reserves the right to deny a proposal if a city has not made a good faith effort at addressing any of the above listed factors.

I recommend that your Commission endorse the proposed policies and direct staff to arrange a Public Workshop for October 4, 2006, and return to your Commission for final policy adoption by year's end.

Respectfully Submitted

SACRAMENTO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Peter Brundage
Executive Officer

PB:DL:Maf
Attachments:

- Exhibit A Revised Draft Policies
- Exhibit A1 Matrix of County & City Open Space Preservation Policies
- Exhibit B Matrix of Other Open Space preservation Programs
- Exhibit C Synopsis of Related Studies
- Exhibit D Matrix of Other LAFCo Ag/Open Space Policies
- Exhibit E Definition of Open Space and Agricultural Lands
- Exhibit F Call for Presentations

(To be inserted into the Sacramento LAFCo Polices, Procedures and Guidelines.)

**PROPOSED OPEN SPACE RESOURCES AND
PRIME AGRICULTURAL LAND PRESERVATION POLICIES**

Generally

LAFCo would favor a proposal where the city has adopted General Plan policies, implementing ordinances and programs that address:

- demand analysis – timing of buildout and use of existing land inventory
- habitat preservation as applicable
- mitigation and acquisition program for prime agricultural and open space resources
- infill, reuse, and redevelopment programs - level of assessment of infill development capacity and goals.
- Smart Growth Principles and Civic Standards for:
 - transit supportive land uses
 - efficient density distribution and land use intensities
- capacity and ability to provide or extend services
- sustainable water supply
- performance standards for meeting Regional Housing Needs Allocations

If an affected agency's General Plan does not address these policy concerns, your Commission has the authority to modify, conditionally approve, or deny any proposal.

Proposed Specific Standards

I. Open Space and Agricultural Mitigation Policies

Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg refers the definition of Open Space to California Planning, Zoning & Development Law Section 65560b: "Open-space land" any parcel or area of land or water which is essentially unimproved and devoted to an open-space use as defined in this section, and which is designated on a local, regional or state open-space plan as any of the following:

(1) Open space for the preservation of natural resources including, but not limited to, areas required for the preservation of plant and animal life, including habitat for fish and wildlife species; areas required for ecologic and other scientific study purposes; rivers, streams, bays and estuaries; and coastal beaches, lakeshores, banks of rivers and streams, and watershed lands.

(2) Open space used for the managed production of resources, including but not limited to, forest lands, rangeland, agricultural lands and areas of economic importance for the production of food or fiber; areas required for recharge of ground water basins; bays, estuaries, marshes, rivers and streams which are important for the management of commercial fisheries; and areas containing major mineral deposits, including those in short supply.

(3) Open space for outdoor recreation, including but not limited to, areas of outstanding scenic, historic and cultural value; areas particularly suited for park and recreation purposes, including access to lakeshores, beaches, and rivers and streams; and areas which serve as links between major recreation and open-space reservations, including utility easements, banks of rivers and streams, trails, and scenic highway corridors.

(4) Open space for public health and safety, including, but not limited to, areas which require special management or regulation because of hazardous or special conditions such as earthquake fault zones, unstable soil areas, flood plains, watersheds, areas presenting high fire risks, areas required for the protection of water quality and water reservoirs and areas required for the protection and enhancement of air quality.

Unless otherwise provided in this Policy, the provisions of this Policy shall apply to all proposals requiring approval by the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission, related to city annexation proposals or out-of-agency service contracts.

1. Where feasible, the city should direct development away from prime agricultural land to non-prime agricultural land, encouraging logical and efficient growth patterns.

2. The city **should** adopt policies that mitigate for the **net** loss of agricultural/ **open space** land as follows:

a. **Proposed Mitigation Requirement**

Soil Type	Mitigation (acres)
Prime	1:1
Statewide Importance	¾:1
Unique	½:1
Local Importance	¼:1

Mitigation should be based on the net loss of agricultural/open space land. (i.e. 100 acres proposed to be annexed; 20 on-site acres zoned for open space and recreation equaling 80 net acres to be mitigated).

100 acres (total)
-20 dedicated to Open Space
= 80 acres to be mitigated per table

b. **How:**

1. Fee purchase with adequate O&M endowment.
2. Easement purchase/dedication
3. Payment of in-lieu fees

c. **Where:** Within Sacramento County or shared soil setting, proximate to the affected territory **if possible, or areas designated to provide regional benefits (e.g. flood control, recreation, habitat conservation, etc.)**

d. **When:** Optimally, Mitigation Measure imposed during land use entitlement process (prezoning, etc.) prior to LAFCo consideration/approval of annexation.

e. Public Agencies are exempt but are encouraged to avoid annexing prime agricultural soils for municipal services such as sewer treatment plants and landfills.

f. Any city or the county may adopt and implement more stringent mitigation measures addressing any and all open space and agricultural lands, not just prime agricultural lands.

DRAFT OPEN SPACE AND PRIME AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION POLICIES

LAFCo coordinates logical and timely changes in local governmental boundaries (§56001); conducts special studies which review ways to reorganize, simplify and streamline governmental structures (§56031); and prepares Sphere of Influence for each city and special district within the County (§56425). The Commission promotes provision of efficient and economical services while encouraging the protection of *prime agricultural and open space* lands (§56001, §56300). Further efforts include discouraging urban sprawl and encouraging orderly formation and development of local agencies based upon local conditions and circumstances (§56301).

LAFCo coordinates logical and timely changes in local governmental boundaries (§56001); conducts special studies which review ways to reorganize, simplify and streamline governmental structures (§56031

C. THE LEGISLATURE'S POLICY DIRECTION TO LAFCo

The Legislature has charged the Local Agency Formation Commission of each county with carrying out specific mandates and policies now codified in the Act Each LAFCo is authorized and mandated to promote the orderly formation and development of local agencies based upon local conditions and circumstances. The powers, duties, and responsibilities available to the Commission to comply with this mandate may be summarized as follows:

1. To review and act upon change of organization and reorganization proposals;
2. To plan for the provision of services through Sphere of Influence Plans, special studies, and reorganization plans;
3. To encourage orderly growth and development;
4. To ensure that affected populations receive efficient governmental services;
and
5. To guide development away from *open space* and *prime agricultural* land uses unless such actions would not promote planned, orderly and efficient development.

D. INCORPORATIONS AND DISINCORPORATIONS

11. The Commission will not approve an incorporation proposal unless the following conditions exist:

- a. Applicable General Plans, Specific Plans or area plans based on realistic population and growth projections demonstrate the need for urbanization of the affected area; and
- b. The areas proposed for incorporation should be urbanized or should be planned for urbanization within the next five years.

Subparagraphs a) and b) do not apply if LAFCo determines the proposal is structured to ensure the long-term preservation of *open space or prime agricultural* lands.

13. *Prime agricultural* land which is not designated for urbanization within the next five years of the date of the receipt of the application shall not be included in any incorporation approval unless the LAFCo determines that the proposal is structured to ensure the long-term preservation of *open space or prime agricultural* lands

E. AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION

LAFCo will exercise its powers to conserve *prime agricultural* land pursuant to the following standards.

1. LAFCo will approve a change of organization or reorganization which 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:

- a. The land subject to the change of organization or reorganization is contiguous to either lands developed with an urban use or lands which have received all discretionary approvals for urban development.
- b. The proposed development of the subject lands is consistent with the Spheres of Influence Plan, including the Municipal Service Review of the affected agency or agencies.
- c. Development of all or a substantial portion of the subject land is likely to occur within five years. In the case of very large developments, annexation should be phased whenever feasible. If the Commission finds phasing infeasible for the 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.

d. There is insufficient vacant non-prime lands exists within the applicable Spheres of Influence that are planned, accessible, and developable for the same general type of use.

e. 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 territory and adjacent areas relative to other agricultural lands in the region.

(2) The use of the subject and the 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 *prime agricultural* land, or will be extended through or adjacent to, any other *prime agricultural* lands which lie between the project site and existing facilities.

(4) Whether natural or man-made barriers serve to buffer adjacent or nearby *prime agricultural* land from the effects of the proposed development.

(5) Applicable provisions of the General Plan, including applicable growth-management policies, or other statutory provisions designed to protect *prime agriculture*.

2. LAFCo will not make the affirmative findings that the proposed development of the subject lands is consistent with the Spheres of Influence in the absence of an approved Sphere of Influence Plan. LAFCo will not make the affirmative findings that insufficient vacant non-prime land exists within the Spheres of Influence Plan unless the applicable jurisdiction has:

a. Identified within its Spheres of Influence all “*prime agricultural* land” as defined herein.

b. Enacted measures to preserve *prime agricultural* land identified within its Sphere of Influence for agricultural use.

c. Adopted as part of its General Plan specific measures to facilitate and encourage in-fill development as an alternative to the development of *prime agricultural* lands.

d. Adopted as part of its General Plan specific measures to facilitate and encourage “brownfield” re-development as an alternative to the “greenfield” development of *prime agricultural* lands.

3. The LAFCo will comment upon, whenever feasible, Notices of Preparation for Environmental Impact Reports or projects which involve the development of large tracts of *open space* and *prime agricultural* land and that are not scheduled for urbanization within a five-year period. Potential adverse impacts related to the loss of *open space* or *prime agricultural* land also will be commented upon by LAFCo.

4. Proposals involving the conversion of *prime agricultural* land shall be contiguous to existing city boundaries, designated for urbanization in the city and county general plans and consistent with the Sphere of Influence.

5. 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 nonprime agricultural lands, unless that action would not promote the planned, orderly, efficient development of an area.

6. Development of existing vacant or nonprime 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 or lead to the development of existing open-space lands for non-open-space uses which are outside of the existing jurisdiction of the local agency or outside of the existing Sphere of Influence of the local agency.

H. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE PLANS

A Sphere of Influence Plan is a plan for the probable, ultimate physical boundaries and service areas of a local agency. This section of the LAFCo Policies and Standards sets forth the required contents of a Sphere of Influence Plan, the procedures for submittal and approval of Sphere of Influence Plans and amendments thereto, and the use of Sphere of Influence Plans in LAFCo determinations.

1. At least 30 days prior to submitting an application to the Commission for a determination of a new Sphere of Influence, or to update an existing Sphere of Influence for a city, representatives from the city shall meet with county representatives to discuss the proposed sphere, and its boundaries, and explore methods to reach agreement on the boundaries, development standards, and zoning requirements within the sphere to ensure that development within the sphere occurs in a manner that reflects the concerns of the affected city and is accomplished in a manner that promotes the logical and orderly development of areas within the sphere.

2. If no agreement is reached between the city and county within 30 days, then the parties may, by mutual agreement, extend discussions for an additional period of 30 days. If an agreement is reached between the city and county regarding the boundaries, development standards, and zoning requirements within the proposed sphere, the agreement shall be

forwarded to the Commission, and the Commission shall consider and adopt a Sphere of Influence for the city consistent with the policies adopted by the Commission pursuant to this section, and the Commission shall give great weight to the agreement in the Commission's final determination of the city sphere.

3. If the Commission's final determination is consistent with the agreement reached between the city and county pursuant to subdivision (b), the agreement shall be adopted by the both the city and county after a public hearing. Once the agreement has been adopted by the affected local agencies and their respective general plans reflect that agreement, then any development approved by the county within the sphere shall be consistent with the terms of that agreement.

4. If no agreement is reached pursuant to subdivision (b), the application may be submitted to the Commission and the Commission shall consider a Sphere of Influence for the city consistent with the policies adopted by the Commission pursuant to this section.

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

- a. A map defining the probable ultimate boundary of its service area;
- b. A statement of the present and planned land uses in the area, including *prime agricultural and open space* lands;
- c. The present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area;
- d. The present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services which the agency provides or is authorized to provide;
- e. The existence of any relevant social or economic communities of interest in the area if the Commission determines that they are relevant; and
- f. With respect to all cities, sewer districts, water districts, community service districts, drainage districts, and multi-purpose districts within the jurisdiction of Sacramento LAFCo, a Municipal Services Review per Section 56430, and as defined in paragraph H.2. below. Other agencies may prepare a Municipal Services Review.
- g. The Commission may recommend governmental reorganizations to particular agencies in the county, using the spheres of influence as the basis for those recommendations. Those recommendations shall be made available, upon request, to other agencies or to the public. The Commission shall make all reasonable efforts to ensure wide dissemination of the recommendations.

h. For any Sphere of Influence or a Sphere of Influence that includes a special district, the Commission shall do all of the following:

- (1) Require existing districts to file written statements with the Commission specifying the functions or classes of service provided by those districts.
- (2) Establish the nature, location, and extent of any functions or classes of service provided by existing districts.
- (3) Determine that, except as otherwise authorized by the regulations, no new or different function or class of service shall be provided by any existing district, except upon approval by the Commission.

K. CITY PROTESTS OF LAND CONSERVATION CONTRACTS
(Government Code Section 51243.5)

1. The LAFCo may sustain a protest by a city of the County entering into a Williamson Act contract if both the following are true:

- a. The city's general plan designates the territory proposed to be under contract for urbanization within a reasonable period of time;
- b. A reasonable quantity of the city's total territory of sufficient quality has been set aside as *open space*/ agricultural land, and is designated as such in the city's general plan and relevant specific plans or community plans.

2. The LAFCo may sustain the protest if one or more of the following is true:

- a. No active agricultural use of the land is feasible within six or more calendar years of the 10-year term of the contract;
- b. The territory which is under contract has boundaries which would force imminent urban development to be illogical or make it difficult to serve.

The land does not meet the definition of *prime agricultural* land per the Act.

Exhibit A1

DRAFT Matrix of County & City Open Space Preservation Policies

General Plan policies and/or ordinances re: preservation of agricultural, open space and habitat resources.

Staff is gathering open space and agricultural land preservation policy information from the county and cities in Sacramento County. The following is the information received thus far; staff is waiting for additional response and will continue this policy gathering process.

	Folsom	Rancho Cordova
1. Date Policies and ordinances were established – by referendum or resolution?	Wetland and Riparian Habitat Management Ordinance (1994) Tree Preservation Ordinance (multiple dates for revisions)	a. General Plan adopted June 26, 2006 (by resolution) b. Open Space Performance Standards (under development) c. Parks Master Plan (Cordova Recreation and Parks District, under development)
2. Policies and/or ordinance title.	Wetland Mitigation and Riparian Preserve Policy (1994)	a. The General Plan (OSPT.2.1.2) establishes the framework for the City’s Open Space standards. It sets a requirement, for residential development, of 1.75 acres of “open space” for every 1,000 residents. This is in addition to the City’s standard park land dedication requirement for new residential development of five acres per 1,000 residents. b. The General Plan defines open space generally as land including open turf, tree canopy, dog parks, neighborhood greens, and communitywide open space. The City’s open space performance standards include more information regarding the intent and range of open space requirements. c. General Plan Policy NR.1.7 requires mitigation of land for development that impacts special status species that are found or are likely to occur or “where the presence of species can be reasonably inferred” in coordination with US Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and shall emphasize a multi-species approach. This may include the development of participation in a HCP. d. General Plan Policy NR.1.9 establishes a “no net loss” policy for riparian habitats through either avoidance of existing habitat, creation of new habitat, or some combination of the two. e. General Plan Policy NR.3.2 and associated actions require the preservation of natural creek alignments. f. General Plan Action NR.3.4.1 directs the City to establish performance standards for natural resource preserves. g. General Plan Policy LU.1.8 anticipates that agricultural uses will be phased out within the City but recognizes that uses may continue as long as their individual owners/farmers desire. h. General Plan Policy LU.1.9 establishes a preservation rate for farmland of 1:1 for each acre of prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland

		of statewide importance. It also includes provisions for the inclusion of conservation easements, deed restrictions, or other conservation measures that protect the land in perpetuity.
3. Means of Financing – in-lieu fee, easement, acquisition, other?	Dedication in fee title & Endowment from developer for wetland and/or riparian habitat. In case of tree ordinance, dedication in fee title or easement of preserved woodland	<p>a. Generally, parks and open space land is improved and dedicated to the City or CRPD as part of the entitlement process.</p> <p>b. Parks and open space are financed through development fees and assessment districts. The General Plan identifies the need to establish and/or update fees for park and open space improvement and maintenance.</p> <p>c. An in-lieu fee may be adopted as part of the final open space standards and adoption of the Parks Master Plan later this year.</p>
4. Means of oversight – City, NPO partner, adopted HCP, other? a. Acquisition b. Operations and maintenance	P&R department for wetlands Various for trees	<p>a. Acquisition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City oversight for agriculture preservation. 2. City oversight for open space. Policy NR.1.6 and Action NR.1.7.1 of the General Plan supports development of an HCP for natural open space areas. 3. CRPD oversight for parks. <p>b. Operations and Maintenance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generally, open space is improved and dedicated as part of land use and map approvals as required through project conditions; same for parks. <p>Ag preservation would be required as part of Conditions of Approval. For areas that are already zoned for agricultural uses, the General Plan policy (LU.1.9) would be cited as part of the denial for a rezone to urban uses.</p>
5. Ratio of mitigation acres to development acres, (i.e., 1:1 for species habitat)	N/A	<p>a. 1:1 for agricultural land that meets thresholds of significance</p> <p>b. Natural resource open space preserved as habitat for special-status plant and animal species. The City determines the design and size of the preserves and their interconnections as part of project approval. (NR 1.1.3 and NR.1.7.1) Impacts to riparian habitats and wetlands are mitigated at “no net loss” of existing function and value. (NR.1.9, NR.2.1)</p>
6. # of acres affected by policies/ordinances, including amount of mitigation acreage or funds acquired.	The ordinances/policies I mentioned are citywide. The SOI terms in our MOU and the City Charter are just for the SOI area when it is annexed. The funding mechanism has not been established, only the requirement for 30% open space.	In excess of 9,000 acres within the existing City boundaries will be subject to these standards and policies.
7. Public access. Y/N?	yes	a. Public access is required for dedicated open space that is not otherwise protected under the standard. Same for parks. Policy and corresponding action NR.3.4 encourage projects that include wetland preserves or creeks, or are

		<p>located adjacent to wetlands or creeks, to design access into the preserve or creek (e.g. trails).</p> <p>b. Natural Resource Preservations (as required by Army Corps of Engineers) are not accessible to the public per Federal regulations; however the City encourages and is working towards allowing observation areas and trails in some cases. The General Plan contains such policies and actions.</p> <p>c. Agricultural land is most likely not accessible to the public.</p>
8. Does policy distinguish between open space, agricultural, and habitat resources, or is “mitigation stacking” permitted?	Unclear	The open space performance standards encourage the development of a portion of the open space requirements in conjunction with parks and other natural open space areas. However, “stacking” is not permitted.
9. Other policies that may be of interest to the Commission (Smart Growth, Infill, etc.)		<p>a. The General Plan establishes a variety of smart growth principles all throughout the plan. The most notable of which are the nine Smart Growth Principles listed in the Land Use Element (page 9). The principles are reference in Policy LU.2.1. The smart growth principles include an integration (mixing) of land uses, the preservation and integration of natural resources, and regeneration/infill of existing areas of the City.</p> <p>b. The City’s Land Use Plan also establishes a Building Blocks concept for new development and the regeneration of areas of the City developed prior to incorporation. The building blocks are a series of walkable Neighborhoods, Villages, and Districts served by Town Centers. Policy LU.2.2 references the building blocks and requires new development to follow this pattern.</p> <p>c. Policy LU.1.7 promotes higher density and intensity land uses that support transit within one-half mile of a major transit station.</p> <p>d. The General Plan established a series of 16 Planning Areas – areas of the City where future planning efforts will direct the land use pattern. For all but four of these areas, conceptual land plans are included in the General Plan. These conceptual land plans recognize the building blocks concept, account for development constraints (e.g. wetlands), and plot residential, commercial, office, and other uses. For the other Planning Areas, specific land plans are incorporated that are parcel specific but are not plotted on the Land Use Policy Map.</p> <p>e. The General Plan calls for the creation of a Downtown Rancho Cordova, approximately 360 acres in the heart of Rancho Cordova.</p>
10. Please let me know if your jurisdiction	More information would be appreciated.	Sure. Please let us know what is involved so we can task the correct staff member(s).

<p>would like to participate in the August 2, 2006 Commission Workshop.</p>		
---	--	--

	Sacramento	County of Sacramento
<p>1. Date Policies and ordinances were established – by referendum or resolution?</p>	<p>a. General Plan adopted January 19, 1988 by resolution; amended though Sept. 2000</p> <p>b. Parks and Recreation Master Plan 2005-2010 adopted December 7, 2004</p>	<p>General Plan adopted December 15, 1993 by resolution.</p>
<p>2. Policies and/or ordinance title.</p>	<p>a. Conservation and Open Space Element (Sec.6) and Preservation Element (Sec. 10) of the General Plan.</p> <p>Sec.1. Policy 10 is the policy of the City to conserve and protect natural resources and planned open space areas, and to phase the conversation of agricultural lands to planned urban uses.</p> <p>b. Parks and Recreation Master Plan 2005-2010. Policy Chapters: 10.0 Natural Resources, 11.0 Open space, Water Corridors and Parkways, 15.0 Regional System, and 17.0 Trails, Bikeways and Bridges.</p>	<p>The Following policies are drawn from the Agriculture (AG), Conservation (CO) and Open Space (OP) Element sections of the General Plan -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban Encroachment Policies (AG-1, 2, 3, 4, 5) are to protect prime farmlands (as defined by the California Department of Conservation) and lands with intensive agricultural investments (such as orchards, vineyards, dairies, and other concentrated livestock or poultry operations) from urban encroachment. • Agricultural Zoning Policies (AG-6, 7, 8) are to retain agricultural land holdings in units large enough to guarantee future and continued agricultural use. • Encroachment by Natural Resource Preserves Policies (AG-9,10,11,12,13,14,15) are to protect Prime farmlands and farmlands with intensive agricultural investments from encroachment by natural resource preserves without compromising biologic diversity and habitat values. • Encroachment by Recreational Facilities Policies (AG-16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21) are to protect farmlands from encroachments by recreational facilities and unlawful activities associated with use of them. • Williamson Act Policies (AG-22, 23, 24) shall actively encourage new contracts through public information programs and consider limited application fee waivers for applicants. The County can also encourage landowners who have filed notices of nonrenewal to rescind their contracts in favor of a new contract with full tax benefits, as per California State Government Code Sections 51254-55. • Farm Housing Policy (AG-40) shall allow construction and occupancy of agricultural accessory dwellings provided that such dwellings provide living quarters for full-time, on-site agricultural employees. • Agricultural Land Assessment Policy (AG-33) shall ensure that proposed changes in

		<p>dependent special district levies are equitable, especially where such changes could unduly increase the tax burden on owners of agricultural lands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and Agricultural Soils Policies (CO 54, 55, 56) recognize that the loss of important agricultural soils be compensated for by long-term protection of land with similar productivity value. • Policy CO-57 is to curtail tillage of peat-rich Delta soils to retard erosion and subsidence, and protect the agricultural productivity of Delta islands. • Policy CO-58 encourages the County to work with rural landowners and existing Resource Conservation Districts to promote soil conservation practices. • Marsh and Habitat Protection Policies (CO- 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68) recognize that those areas are an integral and vital element of the County's natural landscape. Such areas serve as permanent or seasonal home to a plethora of wildlife species, several of which are listed as threatened or endangered. Such areas also preserve open space, enhance passive recreational opportunities, and provide flood control. • Habitat Restoration Policies (CO-69, 70, 71, 72, 73) are to increase marsh and riparian woodland habitat by 10 percent, respectively, by 2010. (CO-73. Specific restoration/creation areas identified in Community Plans in accordance with Policy CO-71 shall be adequate in characteristics and acreage to accommodate mitigation for likely wetland impacts resulting from development as designated in the respective Community Plans). • CO-77 Encourages habitat restoration and increasing recreational opportunities as an integral part of stabilization efforts. • Vernal Pool Preserve Policies (CO-78, 79, 80, 81, and 82) give guidance for prioritizing sites based on evaluation criteria and identifying pressures detrimental to the resource. The General Plan Land Use Diagram recognizes these major concentrations of vernal pools in the County. These concentrations are designated Resource Conservation Areas and are within permanent Open Space Area and beyond the Ultimate Urban Service Boundary. • Urban Development and Vernal Pool Policies (CO-83, 84, 85, 86, 87) direct development so as to avoid concentrated vernal pool areas and achieve a balance between essential growth needs and vernal pool resource protection.
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation Banking Program Policies (CO-88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96). • CO-115. Sacramento County stream courses within the Urban Service Boundary shall be planned so as to protect natural values. • CO-118. Uses within the Urban Stream Corridor shall be limited to recreation and agricultural uses compatible with resource protection and flood control measures. Turfed areas are acceptable provided the natural grassland buffer is maintained. • Maintenance of Urban Stream Policies (CO-123, 124, 125, 126, 127) recommends adequately funded maintenance and law enforcement programs to protect natural values of Urban Stream Corridors. • Tree resource policies (CO-128, 129, 130, 133, 137, and 138) • Rare and Endangered Species Habitat Policies (CO-141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146) require riparian and wetland environments to be managed with sensitivity to threatened species and maintained to the extent feasible in a manner that avoids conflicts with privately owned land and agricultural operations. • Rare and Endangered Species Habitat Protection Policies (CO-147, 148, 149, 150) • CO-154. Voluntary cooperative agreements shall involve those lands within Resource Conservation Areas that contain moderate to high value habitat, exhibit likely habitat restoration potential, or provide foraging opportunities. • CO-157. Significant archeological, prehistoric, or historic sites shall be protected as open space for potential future excavation. • General Open Space Policies (OS-1, 2) are to permanently protect, as open space, areas of natural resource value, including wetlands preserves, riparian corridors, woodlands, and floodplains, as well as, to maintain open space and natural areas that are interconnected and of sufficient size to protect biodiversity, accommodate wildlife movement and sustain ecosystems. • Open Space Acquisition Policies (OP-3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9) provide flexible and effective open space acquisition strategies (i.e. easements, fee titles, dedication).
3. Means of Financing – in-lieu fee, easement,	a. Implementation of General Plan policies are the responsibility of the City with authority derived from charter powers for acquisition of lands for parks, open space and entering into	All methods used CO-122. Secure easement or fee title to open space

<p>acquisition, other?</p>	<p>Williamson Act contracts.</p> <p>b. Developers encouraged to enter into development agreements to design and build “turnkey” parks to meet their parkland dedication and park impact fee obligations(Sec. 13.10); City Improvement Project (CIP) Funds for some acquisition Chapter 18.40 of Sacramento Municipal Code Habitat Conservation fee for North and South Natomas Community Plan Area.</p> <p>City’s Heritage Tree Program funds for tree planting.</p> <p>The City’s Parks and Community Services Department developed a comprehensive plan for the acquisition, development, and maintenance of parks, open spaces and flora in public areas.</p>	<p>lands within Urban Stream corridor as a condition of development approval.</p>
<p>4. Means of oversight – City, NPO partner, adopted HCP, other?</p> <p>a. Acquisition</p> <p>b. Operations and maintenance</p>	<p>a. City Planning Department for Sec. 6. and the City Preservation office for Sec. 10. There is also an adopted North Natomas Community Plan with an adopted HCP and South Natomas Community Plan Are</p> <p>b. Facilitate active collaboration through strong community partnerships with other agencies, community based organizations (CBOs) and land conservation entities to implement...regional open space system (Sec.11.6)</p>	<p>Habitat restoration – Planning and Parks Dept., Public Works Dept. and the Sacramento Tree Foundation</p> <p>Vernal Pool Management by public agencies or private organization</p> <p>Critical habitat areas containing special status species overseen by the Planning department in conjunction with State and Federal agencies.</p> <p>Open Space shall be overseen by the County’s Open Space Preservation Action Plan.</p>
<p>5. Ratio of mitigation acres to development acres, (i.e., 1:1 for species habitat)</p>	<p>none</p>	<p>CO-62. Ensure no net loss of marsh and riparian woodland acreage, values or functions.</p> <p>CO-61. Natural Preserves shall not include adjacent irrigated pasture or cropland. However, they may include up to 200 feet of adjoining grassland or grazing area, or up to one-fourth mile of grassland between parallel riparian or marsh areas.</p> <p>CO-83. Ensure no net loss of vernal pool acreage, and/or values and functions, and mitigate any loss in relation to the values of quality of habitat.</p> <p>OS-9. Sacramento County shall seek to attain the County Regional Park System standard of 20 acres of regional parkland per 1,000 population.</p>
<p>6. # of acres affected by policies/ordina</p>	<p>6,730 acres in the North Natomas Area with approximately 121 acres of agriculturally zoned land will be retained when the area is</p>	<p>Agricultural-Residential 53,000- 10%</p> <p>Agricultural 360,000- 65%</p> <p>Recreation 17,000- 3%</p>

<p>nces, including amount of mitigation acreage or funds acquired.</p>	<p>“built out”</p>	<p>Urban Reserve 2,000- <1% Waterways 14,000- 3% Industrial 39,000- 7% Commercial and Office 7,000- 1% Medium Density Residential 6,000- 1% Low Density Residential 57,000- 10% Approximately 555,000 total acres in the County.</p>
<p>7. Public access. Y/N?</p>	<p>yes</p>	<p>Public parks and trails: yes Agricultural operations (most): no Vernal pool areas and wetlands: generally no</p>
<p>8. Does policy distinguish between open space, agricultural, and habitat resources, or is “mitigation stacking” permitted?</p>	<p>Yes the GP distinguishes between resources and no, “mitigation Stacking” is not permitted.</p>	<p>Yes the GP distinguishes between resources and no, “mitigation Stacking” is not permitted.</p>
<p>9. Other policies that may be of interest to the Commission (Smart Growth, Infill, etc.)</p>	<p>The City is currently updating their General Plan. Sec. 1, Policy 7 states that the City shall work with LAFCo for SOI’s and annexations Sec. 2. Policy 4 and 5 of Goal A are infill related.</p>	<p>The County General Plan has a slough of policies promoting infill, redevelopment and Brownfield development. See: Land Use Element:LU-1, 2, 5, 53 Air Quality Element: AQ-26 Housing Element: HE-8 Smart Growth in the Land Use Element: LU-4,6,7,10,11,12,13,14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 72, 76, 81,</p>
<p>10. Please let me know if your jurisdiction would like to participate in the August 2, 2006 Commission Workshop.</p>		

	Elk Grove	Citrus Heights
1. Date Policies and ordinances were established – by referendum or resolution?	<p>a. General Plan adopted Nov. 19, 2003 (by resolution)</p> <p>b. Parks and Recreation Master Plan 2005-2010 adopted December 7, 2004</p>	<p>General Plan adopted in November 2000 (by resolution).</p>
2. Policies and/or ordinance title.	<p>a. The Elk Grove’s Parks, Trails, and Open Space Element recognizes the Costumes River, the Delta, and agricultural areas within the Planning Area (i.e. SOI) as important open space resources for the communities vision for trails and open space, and habitat/conservation needs and that these policies are considered by the County, LAFCo, and other agencies in the area outside the city limits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of parks and trails serving city wide neighborhoods. The city may work in cooperation with the EGCSO to accomplish this (PTO 1). • Provide parkland at a rate which exceeds the level historically provided (PTO 2). • Trails which parallel streams should be located beyond the riparian corridor and wetlands to minimize wildlife impacts and shall be restricted to non-motorized traffic (PTO 11). • Recreational trails should not be placed adjacent to or on farmland if feasible alternative routes exist elsewhere in the vicinity (PTO 13). • Open space lands of all types are important and should be preserved in the region for: maintenance of agricultural uses, wildlife habitat, recreational open space, aesthetic benefits, and flood control (PTO 15). • Stream corridors, floodways, electrical transmission corridors and similar features shall be considered for inclusion in the citywide trails and open space system (PTO 	<p>Sec. 2 (Community Development) of the GP recognizes open space to provide for outdoor recreational uses, habitat protection, agriculture, drainage features, public and quasi-public uses, and other areas typically limited for human occupation due to public health and safety features such as floodways or unstable soils or environmentally-sensitive features. The FAR shall not exceed 0.1.</p> <p>The Open Space polices in Sec. 3 (Resource Conservation) of the GP are intended to protect oak trees, wildlife habitat, creeks and riparian areas within the planning policy area. Current public access to these areas is not widely available. Residents would like greater access and protection of these unique natural resources. Citrus Heights has two “special status” designated plants (Stanford’s arrowhead and stinkbell), and one designated animal (while-tailed kite). Wetlands consist of perennial and intermittent streams and drainages. Open space with its natural features is to be created in future urban development for public use and enjoyment.</p> <p>GP Policy 38.1 - Provide recreational trail right-of-ways along local creek channels through development easements and agreements while respecting the privacy of adjoining properties, safety of the users, and maintenance of the natural areas.</p> <p>GP 38.2 - Continue working with the Sunrise Recreation and Parks District to develop an integrated creekside trail system</p> <p>GP 38.3 – Consider potential impacts to natural habitat areas when establishing links between</p>

	<p>16).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a regional trail/open space system which links the Cosumnes River with the Sacramento River with trail connections between Elk Grove and the open space areas (PTO 17). • Retain natural drainage courses in all cases where preservation is physically feasible and consistent with the need to provide flood protection (PTO 18). • Conversion of agricultural uses policies: CAQ-2, CAQ-3, and CAQ-4 in the Conservation and Air Quality Element. <p>b. Parks and Recreation Master Plan 2005-2010; Policy Chapters: 10.0 Natural Resources, 11.0 Open space, Water Corridors and Parkways, 15.0 Regional System, and 17.0 Trails, Bikeways and Bridges.</p>	<p>developed areas. ID alternative sites for linkages where sensitive habitat areas have the potential to be adversely impacted.</p> <p>GP 39.1 - Provide for appropriate open space amenities in new developments while protecting existing usable open space to the extent feasible.</p> <p>GP 39.2 – Require new development to provide linkages to existing and planned open space systems.</p> <p>GP 39.3 – Require buildings to conform to existing natural topography, and discourage cutting and filling. Develop and adopt Community Design Guidelines that include standards for earthwork and grading.</p> <p>GP 39.4 – Utilize the services and expertise of organizations involved in resource conservation and open space protection.</p>
<p>3. Means of Financing – in-lieu fee, easement, acquisition, other?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require public parks and trails to be included in new development projects that meet the City’s Parks and Trails Master Plan (PTO 1-Action 1). • Parks and trails maintenance funding shall be assured to the City’s satisfaction prior to the approval of any Final Subdivision Map (PTO-3); if not going to be provided by a local or regional assessment district, homeowner association, community group, volunteers or others appropriate by the city (PTO-3-Action 1 and PTO 14). • The Quimby Act (CA Govt. Code Sec. 66477, requires new residential developments to provide parks); land dedication, fees in lieu, and on-site improvements at a standard of 5 acres of land for parks per 1,000 residents (PTO-4). • City may establish a citywide fee and/or assessment system to provide funding for the purchase of open space land or easements (PTO-15-Action 1). • Existing (2003) fee programs (e.g., Swainson’s Hawk mitigation and East Franklin Specific Plan agricultural mitigation) to fund open space program (PTO-15-Action 3). 	<p>City established a trail network program for acquisition, development and administration of a natural trails system and use volunteers to construct and maintain the trails.</p> <p>Amend the Zoning Ordinance to establish standards for incorporating open space in new development (39.1 a)</p> <p>39.6 Enlist the support and efforts of appropriate state and federal agencies and private foundations in pursuit of conservation and open space protection.</p> <p>38.1 Provide for recreational trail rights-of-way along local creek channels through development easements and agreements.</p>
<p>4. Means of oversight – City, NPO partner, adopted HCP, other? a. Acquisition b. Operations and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City and its Parks and Trails Master Plan, a local or regional assessment district, homeowners associations, or others appropriate by the city, and the EGCS D. • Elk Grove Community Services District (EDCS D) with its adopted Master Plan of Parks, which describes standards for public parks, desired locations for new facilities, and new park development standards. 	<p>a. City established a trail network program for acquisition, development and administration of a natural trails system and use volunteers to construct and maintain the trails.</p> <p>b. Program managers are to coordinate with the Police Department and the Sunrise Recreational and Park District for patrol of the creekside trails and open space areas.</p>

maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City ultimately has the decision making authority on placement, size and type of public park along with trail expansions while working with the EGCS D. 	
5. Ratio of mitigation acres to development acres, (i.e., 1:1 for species habitat)	Policy CAQ-3 requires a 1:1 mitigation ratio for agricultural land lost and must be in Sacramento region equal in area, productivity etc.	35.3 Provide for “no net loss” of sensitive habitats such as aquatic and riparian areas. Quantification of mitigation measures will also be based on individual project impacts. Impose conditional use permits for mitigation measures
6. # of acres affected by policies/ordinances, including amount of mitigation acreage or funds acquired.	There are approximately 8,553 acres of agricultural uses, and over 6,000 acres of public/private recreation and natural preserve uses in the Elk Grove planning area.	There is currently approximately 494 acres left of vacant land within the city with only 35 of those acres zoned for open space. 212 acres are currently in a open space designation
7. Public access. Y/N?	Public access granted to public parks, trails and some private parks but not in agricultural operations.	Many creeks and riparian areas are currently not open to the public but the GP calls to change this.
8. Does policy distinguish between open space, agricultural, and habitat resources, or is “mitigation stacking” permitted?	The GP does distinguish between these resources and does not allow “mitigation stacking”	Mitigated stacking is not permitted
9. Other policies that may be of interest to the Commission (Smart Growth, Infill, etc.)	Policy LU-14 incorporate Smart Growth criteria and LAFCo requirements to future annexations.	Citrus Height’s GP is full of policies that promote smart growth and infill such as:
10. Please let me know if your jurisdiction would like to participate in the August 2, 2006 Commission Workshop.		

Exhibit B Matrix of Other Open Space preservation Programs

Your staff has conducted a comprehensive survey of 231 organizations that are active on Open Space preservation, primarily in Northern California's Bay Area. The simple survey asked:

- 5) the name and date the organization/agency was established;
- 6) means of participation and financing for acquisition, operation and maintenance;
- 7) number of acres preserved;
- 8) level of public access provided.

About 35% of those surveyed responded (80 of 231.) The results are provided in the attached matrix. The many non-profit organizations, special districts and cities have worked together to preserve thousands of acres in the Bay Area. Some of the organizations surveyed did not hold any land but participated in management and conservation processes. It can be seen that since the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, when local tax revenues were dramatically reduced; many non-profit organizations were formed in response for local government means to provide for open space preservation. Many Districts formed after Proposition 13 and subsequently proposition 218 – requiring a two-thirds majority to approve or reject local government tax increases and special assessments on property - - were formed by a vote of the people who chose to tax themselves for open space acquisition and operations funding.

The non-profit organizations that responded were established in the 1990's and early 2000's, they work with other non-profits and agencies and financing is paid for by private contributions, grants and some ballot measure funding. The special districts were established at differing times throughout the past century, many in the 1960's and early 1970's. The city's and Towns that hold open space land, acquire and maintain their land through the General Fund, private donations or mitigation fees. Many cities's, counties and Towns have open space land within their jurisdictions but are maintained and operated by the local Special District. Generally, open space preservation efforts are grassroots, often championed by non-profits partnering with local land use jurisdictions, to provide the means for acquisition, operation and maintenance of lands resulting from mitigation measures imposed through the development process.

The largest land holders in the Bay Area to respond are:

- California State Lands Commission
- California State Parks
- The California Coastal Conservancy
- California Rangeland Trust
- California Wildlife Conservation Board
- East Bay Regional Park District
- Marine Resource Conservation District
- Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
- Peninsula Open Space Trust
- Santa Clara Open Space Authority
- Solano Land Trust
- Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District
- Suisun Resource Conservation District
- U.S. Bureau of Land Management.

Organizations surveyed:

(Note: underlined are the organizations that responded)

1. Agricultural Trust of Contra Costa County, NOW: The Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust (BALT)
2. Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Zone 7 Water Agency
3. Alameda County Resource Conservation District
4. Ambrose Recreation and Park District
5. American Farmland Trust
6. American Land Conservancy
7. Archaeological Conservancy

8. Audubon Canyon Ranch
9. Bay Conservation and Development Commission
10. Bodega Land Trust
11. Bolinas Community Land Trust
12. Butters Land Trust
13. California Academy of Sciences
14. CA Biological Field Studies Association
15. CA Department of Fish and Game
16. CA Department of Food and Agriculture
17. CA Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
18. CA Department of Mental Health
19. CA Department of Veterans Affairs
20. CA Department of Water Resources
21. CA Oak Foundation
22. CA Rangeland Trust
23. CA State Coastal Conservancy
24. CA State Land Commission
25. CA State Parks
26. CA State Parks Foundation
27. CA State University, Sonoma
28. CA Water Service Company
29. CA Waterfowl Association
30. CA Wildlife Conservation Board
31. Carquinez Strait Preservation Trust
32. Central Coast Water Authority
33. City and County of San Francisco
34. City of Alameda
35. City of Albany
36. City of American Canyon
37. City of Antioch
38. City of Belmont
39. City of Belvedere
40. City of Benicia
41. City of Berkeley
42. City of Brentwood
43. City of Brisbane
44. City of Burlingame
45. City of Calistoga
46. City of Campbell
47. City of Clayton
48. City of Cloverdale
49. City of Concord
50. City of Cotati
51. City of Cupertino
52. City of Daly City
53. City of Dixon
54. City of Dublin
55. City of East Palo Alto
56. City of El Cerrito
57. City of Emeryville
58. City of Fairfield
59. City of Foster City
60. City of Fremont
61. City of Gilroy
62. City of Half Moon Bay
63. City of Hayward Parks and Recreation District
64. City of Healdsburg
65. City of Hercules
66. City (Town) of Hillsborough
67. City of Lafayette
68. City of Larkspur
69. City of Livermore
70. City of Los Altos
71. City of Martinez
72. City of Menlo Park
73. City of Mill Valley
74. City of Millbrae
75. City of Milpitas
76. City of Monte Sereno
77. City of Morgan Hill
78. City of Mountain View
79. City of Napa (Napa Land Trust)
80. City of Newark
81. City of Novato
82. City of Oakland
83. City of Orinda
84. City of Pacifica
85. City of Palo Alto
86. City of Petaluma
87. City of Piedmont
88. City of Pinole
89. City of Pittsburg
90. City of Pleasant Hill
91. City of Pleasanton
92. City of Redwood City
93. City of Richmond
94. City of Rio Vista
95. City of Rohnert Park
96. City of Helena
97. City of San Bruno
98. City of San Carlos
99. City of San Jose
100. City of San Leandro
101. City of San Mateo
102. City of San Pablo
103. City of San Rafael
104. City of San Ramon
105. City of Santa Clara
106. City of Santa Rosa
107. City of Saratoga
108. City of Sausalito
109. City of Sebastopol
110. City of Sonoma
111. City of South San Francisco
112. City of Suisun City
113. City of Sunnyvale
114. City of Union City

115. City of Vacaville
 116. City of Vallejo
 117. City of Walnut Creek
 118. Coastside County Water District
 119. Contra Costa County Resource Conservation District
 120. Contra Costa Mosquito and Vector Control
 121. Contra Costa Water District
 122. County of Alameda
 123. County of Contra Costa
 124. County of Marin
 125. County of Napa
 126. County of San Mateo
 127. County of Santa Clara
 128. County of Solano
 129. County of Sonoma
 130. Dixon Resource Conservation District
 131. Dublin San Ramon Services District
 132. Ducks Unlimited
 133. East Bay Municipal Utility District
 134. East Bay Regional Park District
 135. Filoli Center
 136. Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District
 137. Golden Gate Audubon Society
 138. Greater Vallejo Recreation District
 139. Guadalupe-Coyote Resource Conservation District
 140. Half Moon Bay Open Space Trust
 141. Hayward Area Recreation and Park District
 142. Homestead Valley Land Trust
 143. Land Trust for Santa Clara County
 144. Land Trust of Napa County
 145. LandPaths
 146. Livermore Area Recreation and Park District
 147. Loma Prieta Resource Conservation District
 148. Marine Agricultural Land Trust
 149. Marine Audubon Society
 150. Marine County Open Space District
 151. Marin County Resource Conservation District
 152. Marin Municipal Water District
 153. Marin Open Space Trust
 154. Marinwood Community Services District
 155. Midcoast Park Lands
 156. Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
 157. Mission Creek Conservancy
 158. Monte Rio Recreation and Park District
 159. Mount Diablo Audubon Society
 160. Muir Heritage Land Trust
 161. Napa County Resource Conservation District
 162. Napa Sanitation District
 163. Napa Unified School District
 164. Napa Valley College
 165. Napa-Solano Audubon Society
 166. National Audubon Society
 167. National Trust for Historic Preservation
 168. The Nature Conservancy
 169. North Marin Water District
 170. Novato Sanitary District
 171. Pacific Forest Trust
 172. Pacifica Land Trust
 173. Peninsula Open Space Trust
 174. Pleasant Hill Recreation and Park District
 175. The Sacramento – Yolo Port District
 176. PRBO Conservation Science
 177. The Presidio Trust
 178. Quail Ridge Wilderness Conservancy
 179. San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
 180. San Geronimo Valley Land Trust
 181. Santa Clara County Open Space Authority
 182. Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society
 183. Santa Clara Valley Water District
 184. Save Mount Diablo
 185. Save the Redwood League
 186. Sempervirens Fund
 187. Sequoia Audubon Society
 188. Skyline Park Citizens Association
 189. Solano Irrigation District
 190. Solano Land Trust
 191. Solano Resource Conservation District
 192. Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District
 193. Sonoma County Water Agency
 194. Sonoma Land Trust
 195. Sotoyome Resource Conservation District
 196. Southern Marine Land Trust
 197. Stanford University
 198. Strawberry Recreation District
 199. Suisun Resource Conservation District
 200. Town of Atherton
 201. Town of Colma
 202. Town of Corte Madera
 203. Town of Fairfax
 204. Town of Los Altos Hills
 205. Town of Los Gatos
 206. Town of Moraga
 207. Town of Portola Valley
 208. Town of Ross
 209. Town of San Anselmo
 210. Town of Tiburon

- 211. Town of Windsor
- 212. Town of Woodside
- 213. Town of Yountville
- 214. Tri-Valley Conservancy
- 215. Trust for Hidden Villa
- 216. Trust for Public Land
- 217. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- 218. U.S. Bureau of Land Management
- 219. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
- 220. U.S. Coast Guard
- 221. U.S. Department of Agriculture
- 222. U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs
- 223. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- 224. U.S. National Park Service
- 225. United Campus Conferences and
Retreats
- 226. University of California, Natural
Reserve System
- 227. University of California, Office of the
President
- 228. Vacaville – Elmira Cemetery District
- 229. Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control
District
- 230. Villa Montalvo
- 231. Walnut Creek Open Space Foundation

Organizations that responded to the survey:

	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
1	Agricultural Trust of Contra Costa County NOW: <u>The Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust (BALT)</u> Kathryn Lyddan, Executive Director Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust P.O. Box 2046 Brentwood, CA 94513 (925) 634-6738	The Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust is an independent 501(c)(3) corporation established in 2002. BALT was formed by the City of Brentwood.	BALT implements the City's agricultural mitigation program (adopted by City ordinance). BALT has a dual mission "to preserve productive agricultural land and to promote the economic vitality of agriculture in East Contra Costa County." BALT has funded the "promote economic vitality" prong of its mission through grants and fundraising. Last year, BALT received grants from the Columbia Foundation and the USDA to fund a regional agricultural marketing project. BALT also works on agricultural zoning and permitting reform, farm to school and a farmers' market in Brentwood.	The City levies a fee of \$5,500 an acre on developers who are converting agricultural lands to urban uses. The City holds all of the agricultural mitigation funds, and BALT applies on an annual basis for a grant of those funds for operational expenses. BALT applies on an easement by easement basis for funds to purchase agricultural conservation easements. The City also has a transfer of density program to encourage the preservation of land in particularly threatened areas to the south of the City.	All of the land BALT seeks to conserve is outside the City limits and located in Contra Costa County. BALT currently has two easements totally 30 acres, and is currently negotiating another 350 acres of easements.	BALT's easements are on private farmland and there is no public access.
2	Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Zone 7 Water Agency	We are a state-authorized special district, from the 50's, established by vote of unincorporated land owners. We are self-governed.	The RCD does not now hold easements or own property or endowments. We may shortly. In addition, the county has approved a new Partnership for Land Conservation and Stewardship program that will be administered by a board and with support of the RCD. It is not a trust; rather it's a facilitation service of easements and purchase, bringing together interested landowners and trusts/developers/agencies to meet mitigation requirements and to fund resources enhancement. It's not yet underway, however.	Should we acquire property or easements it will be financed by resources mitigation requirements and given to us. Endowments will be required for management and monitoring. I do not anticipate that we will seek out properties.'	None	None
3	Audubon Canyon Ranch John Petersen [johnp@egret.org] 6/8	Formed nonprofit, 501(c)(3) in 1962	Government agencies, other NPOs partner mainly in land management projects, habitat restoration, etc.	Annual operating budget for both comes approximately 50% from endowment fund, 50% from private contributions and grants.	2,000 acres	Limited public access; either by reservation on scheduled, docent-led walks or through a weekend "Public Season", March through July.
4	Bodega Land Trust Abigail Myers Executive Assistant Bodega Land Trust 17175 Bodega Highway #4 PO Box 254 Bodega, Ca 94922	Incorporated in 1992	we have monthly open board meetings, and we attend various like-organizational meetings such as the Sonoma Co. Open Space District meetings, the Salmon Creek Watershed Council, etc.	Acquisition: none yet, we hope to seek funding eventually Operations and maintenance: membership drives, annual dinners, administrative fees on easements, currently seeking grant funding	316	one (of the 10 easements) has a public hiking trail that is minimally advertised but is indeed open.

	(707) 876-3093					
--	----------------	--	--	--	--	--

	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
5	Butters Land Trust David W. Barron, Esq. Cassidy Shimko Dawson & Kawakami Tel: (415) 788-2040 Fax: (415) 788-2039 Email: dwb@csdklaw.com	non-profit corporation incorporated June 8, 2001	The received some funds from the City of Oakland under a ballot measure (Measure DD) that funded a number of open space, parks, etc. projects. Our receipt of funding was affected through a sale to the City of properties we had previously acquired, subject to open space restrictions. We have also received some grants from other non-profit organizations.	Funding has come from Measure DD, grants, and private donations. The only loans we have obtained have been for land acquisition, in the form of short term loans from private individuals (existing donors).	Approximately 1.6 acres.	There are no controls as to public access. As a practical matter, many people pass by them, but few travel across them because of they're steep slopes.
6	CA Rangeland Trust 1221 H Street Sacramento, California 95814-1910 Phone: (916) 444-2096 Fax: (916) 444-2194 Michele Clark [MClark@rangelandtrust.org]	1998	The California Rangeland Trust's mission is to preserve the open space, habitat and stewardship of California ranches. We fulfill our mission by holding conservation easements on ranches. The owners of the ranches convey, either by donation or by sale, the development rights of the property and agree to keep the ranch as a working landscape in perpetuity. Funding for the purchase of these rights is from grants from a variety of State agencies. Most of our easement acquisitions were funded by the State of California Wildlife Conservation Board. We generally do not work with local governments, but we do work with local land trusts in identifying funds for projects.	Financing is through grants from state and federal agencies, including the Wildlife Conservation Board, the California Department of Conservation, CalTrans, California State Coastal Conservancy and USDA. Operations are funded through private donations from individuals and private foundations.	CRT is the holder of conservation easements covering 176,329 acres throughout California. CRT does not own any property in fee.	There is no public access on these ranches as all are privately owned and operated.
7	CA State Coastal Conservancy Dick Wayman [dwayman@scc.ca.gov]	Established by legislation passed in 1976 and began operation the following year	The Conservancy's activities primarily consist of projects and associated research and planning. Local governments and NPOs are partners in most of the projects initiated or supported by the Conservancy. Public access will generally be a part of land acquisition projects if it does not conflict with other project purposes (e.g., wildlife habitat or farmland preservation) and if management of the access can be provided by another organization. The Conservancy frequently provides funding for such management.	Most of the Conservancy's funding has come from State general obligation bonds that must be approved by the State's voters. Additional funding has come from a variety of sources, including the State general fund, mitigation accounts, and grants from federal and other State agencies.	The Conservancy has worked with others to protect close to 200,000 acres.	One of the Conservancy's primary responsibilities is to provide public access to coastal and San Francisco Bay Area lands, and public access is the specific purpose of many of its projects.

	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
8	CA State Lands Commission	Established by statute in 1938	Primarily manage existing state lands and don't generally acquire new lands, except for coastal access easements. The purposes of the state ownership of these lands include open space but also allow for other uses including development. We occasionally lease to government and nonprofit organizations for environmental purposes. We generally partner with other public agencies when we acquire new lands. However occasionally, we also work with nonprofits. All Commission decisions are made at public hearings and staff generally consults with interested groups prior to these hearings. Almost all of the public trust land we manage underlies navigable water and is entirely open to the public.	Acquisition of coastal access easements does not involve purchase - the Commission merely accepts offers to dedicate easements for public access that are sometimes required by the Coastal Commission when it approves permits. Acquisition of other lands for public trust purposes is financed through the Kapiloff Land Bank into which funds are placed occasionally, as a result of exchanges etc. Operations and maintenance are generally financed by state appropriations in the California budget, although we charge lease applicants for processing costs.	It's hard to answer as to how many acres we've preserved. The lands we manage total 4.5 million acres. We've acquired much less than that and generally not for strictly preservationist purposes. In some areas we have leased property to various entities for environmental management.	We have occasionally litigated to foster access to these lands. The public access easements we own are open to the public.
9	CA State Parks John Arnold [jarno@parks.ca.gov] forwarded to acquisition office Kim L. Snyder [ksnyder@parks.ca.gov]	State Park System est. in 1864.	Partners financially and through various forms of stewardship	1. Acquisition: Primarily park bond Acts and special finds (i.e. off-highway vehicle trust fund) 2. Operations and maintenance: Primarily through the General Fund and return of revenue generated by the park system	Acres fee (owned by the State Parks) =1,304,244.93; Acres other = 248,083.29 (lands for which State Parks has management responsibility but owned by others)	Varies by park unity in accordance with the park purpose, the access facilities and operational resources.
10	CA State Parks Foundation Michael Bankert VP, CSPF Mike Bankert [mike@calparks.org]	Established in 1969 as a nonprofit corporation.	They are a membership organization that works with the Department of Parks and Recreation to help enhance, preserve and protect California State Parks. They also work with other nonprofit organizations on the local, state and federal level on these issues.	They do not finance acquisitions—ordinarily the Foundation either accepts the property outright as a gift from the donor or facilitates its transfer/purchase by the State of California. They have not financed operations and maintenance funds to date, but is actively working on potential structures or activities to make State Parks fiscally sustainable for operations and maintenance.	These records have not been kept over the years. The Foundation has been involved in countless acquisitions of open space and other types of acquisitions for the benefit of State Parks for its entire history.	All State Parks is publicly accessible
11	CA Wildlife Conservation Board Dave Means	Created by legislation in 1947 to administer a capital outlay program for wildlife conservation and related public recreation.	The WCB is a separate and independent Board with authority and funding to carry out an acquisition and development program for wildlife conservation (California Fish and Game Code 1300, et seq.). The Wildlife Conservation Board's three main functions are land acquisition, habitat restoration and development of wildlife oriented public access facilities. These activities are carried out under the following eight programs: Public Access Program, Land Acquisition Program, Habitat Enhancement and Restoration Program	Funding is through Grants for acquisition and restoration but they do not provide funds for operation and maintenance. See: http://www.wcb.ca.gov/pdf/Reports/ProtectingCalifornia2005.pdf	19,156 acres preserved by conservation easements, 22,771 acres in restoration projects and 11,776 acres in fee titles for the year 2005.	Public access granted for various recreational facilities

			(General), Inland Wetlands Conservation Program (IWCP), California Riparian Habitat Conservation Program (CRHCP), Natural Heritage Preservation Tax Credit Program (Tax Credit Program), Oak Woodlands Conservation Program The Rangeland, Grazing Land and Grassland Protection Program. Administers capital outlay.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
12	City of Albany	Incorporated in 1908	Albany Hill, were purchased via a voter approved assessment district in 1996 (known as Measure R). In addition, the City has a conservation easement with Target Corporation for a small area alongside Codornices Creek on our southern boundary.	The City maintains the City' owned areas as part of its general maintenance activities. The "Friends of Albany Hill" a non-profit organization, also participate in maintenance and restoration activities. The adjacent Creek (Cerrito Creek) is also maintained by the City of El Cerrito, and by the "Friends of Five Creeks."	The City of Albany owns approximately fifteen acres of open space on its northern boundary. In addition, six acres of land on adjacent Albany Hill. An additional nine acres are in private ownership by the various condominiums and are designated as privately owned open space.	The area is publicly accessible and there are trails throughout.
13	City of Benicia	<u>The Tri-City and County Cooperative Planning</u> Group was formed March 31, 1994.	The cities of Benicia, Fairfield, Vallejo and Solano County are part of the four-way Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) constituting the Tri-City and County Cooperative Planning Group for agricultural and open space preservation.	Funding for operations and maintenance are minimal at this time. New land acquisition is done with grant money for acquisition of additional open space areas. The County Board of Supervisor are trying to set aside money over the next three years to cover the cost of a Park Ranger who will supervise the area within the open space are called Lynch Canyon and enable it to be open for public access. The other partners in the JPA have been asked to endorse this initiative if the County believes it can budget the money for that purpose.	The JPA exists to preserve and manage an approximately 10,000-acre public open space area generally bounded by I-80, I-680 and Lake Herman Road. This area has been acquired as permanent open space but has not been made available for public access	Right now there is only minimal public access into the areas acquired by the JPA.
14	City of Brentwood	See the Agricultural Trust of Contra Costa County, now known as BALT – Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust				
15	City of Brisbane Smith, Fred [fredsmith@ci.brisbane.ca.us]	incorporated under state law in 1961	The Open Space program is operated entirely by the City.	Operations & Maintenance is funded by City general fund revenues	Approximately 50 acres	Varies. Some of the lands have improved trails and facilities. Most of the lands are unimproved with no designated access or facilities but the public is allowed to hike on them.
16	City of Burlingame	They do not hold any open space or agricultural land easement according to the city attorney. CLK-Mortensen, Doris [DMortensen@burlingame.org]				
17	City of Cloverdale	See Sonoma County Agricultural Lands and Open Space District				
18	City of Dublin	The city was incorporated by a vote of the people on	Policies and ordinances	The land was dedicated to the City; funding comes from the General Fund	126 acres preserved as open space/ park	Open to the public

		Feb. 1, 1982				
19	City of Hayward Parks and Recreation District	The District was formed by a vote of the people on November 7, 1944 and officially established on December 11, 1944.	We have partnered with the City of Hayward, Alameda County and the four school districts that cross our borders at one time or another. Our Board meets twice a month, with the agendas and minutes being available at our offices, to those on our mailing lists and on the District web site at www.haywardred.org. Meeting are open to the public except when in Closed Session per the Brown Act.	Acquisition: Before Prop 13 and ERAF acquisition was financed through borrowing. We are currently looking at placing a G.O. Bond Measure on the November ballot for acquisition. Operations and maintenance: Property tax revenue and program fees and charges fund operations and maintenance.	Currently manages over 1600 acres.	Open to the public

	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
20	City (Town) of Hillsborough	May 5 1910, incorporated as city	They are a local government	Acquisition - All property has been donated to city Operations and maintenance – Public Works department provides maintenance of fire breaks and vegetation	256	No public access allowed
21	City of Los Altos Jim Porter [Jim.Porter@ci.los-altos.ca.us]	They are a city that was established in 1952.	The incorporation documents define the city's powers	They couldn't think of any land conservation easements that we hold.	Most if not all are held by the Santa Clara County Water District near creeks.	They own about 22.4 acres of parks.
22	City of Mountain View	Incorporated in 1902	Works closely with the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District			
23	City of Napa (Napa Land Trust)	IRS recognized as nonprofit in 1976.	They work with local cities (City of Am. Canyon, City of Napa, City of St. Helena) on the acquisition and transfer of open space properties that are suitable for public access.	Acquisition: Private donations of conservation easement properties. Donation of private land held as Land Trust Preserves. Donation of money and grants for acquisition of lands transferred to Cities and State agencies. Operations and maintenance: Private donations, volunteer committees for management of Land Trust preserves.	Conservation Easements 19,871.00 acres= 80 parcels; Properties Transferred to Other Agencies 23,763.33 acres= 16 parcels Other Land Trust Fee Lands 846.20 acres= 6 parcels Land Trust Preserves 1,860.86 acres= 11 parcels. Total land saved:46,341.31=113 parcels	We provide access on our Land Trust properties. Access is compatible with the characteristics and conservation values of each particular property. One of the Land Trust Preserve properties serves as an environmental education center for Napa County.
24	City of Oakland	Works with the Butters Land Trust				
25	City of Piedmont	The city does not hold any property that meets our criteria.				
26	City of Pleasant Hill	The City of Pleasant Hill does not hold open space/agricultural lands or easements. On the other hand the Pleasant Hill Recreation and Park District (independent of the City of Pleasant Hill) does hold and maintain open space lands within the City. The City actively works with the district on many issues including facilities, programs, and site preservation. In addition, the City assesses and collects park fees for the District for new development projects. Troy Fujimoto [Tfujimoto@ci.pleasant-hill.ca.us]				
27	City of Vacaville info on Vaca-Dixon greenbelt. Maureen Traut Carson [MTraut@cityofvacaville.com]	Vacaville-Dixon Greenbelt Joint Powers Authority (JPA), established in early 1990's by a joint	JPA, with Dixon, Vacaville (In general, we typically require a 1:1 mitigation for ag lands annexed to City. The City doesn't really get involved in the transaction -- it is between developer and other parties -- usually the Solano Open Space Foundation.)	Means of Financing - minimal cost; acquisition was accomplished by purchasing land, and later reselling at same price with conservations easements in place -- JPA meets maybe once yearly a. Acquisition: Vacaville and Dixon bought the land and resold it with conservation easements in place b. Operations and maintenance -NA	about 1,000 acres under jurisdiction of the JPA Rough guess is that is maybe 500 acres or so -- not req'd as mitigation but just to preserve	None, is in permanent private crop production.

		resolution of the 2 agencies involved.		(Vacaville and Dixon bought the land and resold it with conservation easements in place)	hillsides.	
28	Contra Costa Water District	The Contra Costa Water District was established in 1936 to deliver Bureau of Reclamation water to agricultural users in Contra Costa County. Today, the District serves 500,000 customers	Los Vaqueros Watershed was a component of a large water development project and consequently the District was required to comply with NEPA and CEQA. These laws provide very specific opportunities for public input. As a result there was a lengthy public process that gave the public many opportunities to provide input into the development of Los Vaqueros Watershed.	The source of funds for acquisition of the watershed was special purpose bonds to be repaid over time by ratepayers (water customers).	Approximately 19,000 acres.	Public is permit access to most of the watershed through a system of trails (55-miles). Off-trail use is not permitted except for scientific purposes.

	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
29	County of Contra Costa	Contra Costa County is a general law county, one of the original counties established in California	Generally, the County acquires development rights voluntarily from landowners as part of the discretionary development review process. Development rights are a form of negative easement which prohibits the development of the property without approval of the legislative body, the Board of Supervisors	a. Acquisition: there is no financing involved in the dedication of development rights; the title is transferred along with the filing of the final subdivision map through a separate deed instrument. b. Operations and maintenance: Since only a limited property right (i.e., the right to develop the property) is conveyed, the obligation to maintain the property is retained by the fee title holder. Usually, there is a homeowner's association created which is responsible for maintenance and liability issues. Each homeowner in the development is a member of the association and is responsible for the costs associated with the fee title.	Although we do not have a running tally of the number of acres preserved through dedication of development rights, I would conservatively estimate that about eight thousand acres are dedicated throughout unincorporated Contra Costa County.	Lands with dedicated development rights are not open to public access, saved for the view.
30	County of Napa	Napa County does not have a parks department and only owns about one acre of land—for a boat launch and for a bicycle rest stop. However, of more use for your survey may be the fact that the County, as of this morning, has placed on the ballot for November a proposal to establish a Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District. If approved by the voters, the District would be governed by an independent, directly elected Board of Directors. Initial funding will come from the County from money raised by the County's Transient Occupancy Tax. You can email or call me (707/259-5933) if you have additional questions. John Woodbury, Principal Planner, Parks and Open Space, County of Napa - Woodbury, John [JWoodbury@co.napa.ca.us]				
31	County of San Mateo	Works closely with Midpeninsula Open Space District; see their answers Martha Poyatos [MPoyatos@co.sanmateo.ca.us] - Executive Officer, San Mateo LAFCo, 650/363-4224, 650/363-4849 (fax)				
32	County of Santa Clara	The following are the two organizations in the County that best can assist you in your search for information 1. Santa Clara County Open Space Authority - www.openspaceauthority.org 2. Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District - www.openspac Michael Lopez [Michael.Lopez@pln.sccgov.org]e.org				
33	Dublin San Ramon Services District	DSRSD does not acquire, operate, nor maintain any open space/conservation easements. We acquire water and sewer pipeline easements. Therefore, we will not be participating in your survey. You may try the following agencies in our service area: City of Dublin, City of San Ramon, Alameda County, Contra Costa County, and East Bay Regional Parks District. Rhodora N. Biagtan, PE - Engineering Department Dublin San Ramon Services District, (925) 875-2255, FAX (925) 829-1180, biagtan@dsrcsd.com				
34	Ducks Unlimited Nicholas Brown Special Projects Biologist Conserv@ducs.org	established in 1937 by a group of conservation-minded sportsmen	DU assists state and federal agencies along with private landowners to restore and enhance wetlands through a couple different federal programs such as Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) and Conservation Reserve Program (CRP; both part of the Federal Farm Bill) and also through the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA).	Funding is acquired through grassroots fundraising and corporate sponsorships along with the federal funding listed above. More than 80% of all funds go to on-the-ground conservation.	To date, about 11.5 million acres have been conserved by DU throughout the U.S., Canada, Mexico and the Caribbean.	DU is made up of more than 600,000 members and about 1 million supporters throughout N.A. that has access to the open space

	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
35	East Bay Municipal Utility District	District was formed in 1923 under the Municipal Utility District Act of 1921 by the State.	The two primary groups we “partner “with are the Diablo Firesafe Council (DFC) and the Hills Emergency Forum (HEF). The DFC is comprised of: EBRPD, Berkeley Fire, CDF, Contra Costa County Fire, Moraga- Orinda Fire, PG&E, Piedmont Fire, San Ramon Valley Fire, and Contra Costa Water. The HEF includes the cities of: Berkeley and Oakland, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, East Bay Regional Park District, and the University of Berkeley. An example of actual on the ground “partnership” work is the project currently underway in the Community of Canyon. This project was grant funded through the Diablo Firesafe Council to modify the vegetative plant communities in the Community to reduce the potential wild fire hazard. The project is taking place on EBMUD watershed land, District staff developed the scope of work and laid out the treatment polygons, the actual vegetation removal is being done by CDF fire crews. An example of planning-type work is the multi-agency fuel break along the east bay skyline from Wildcat Canyon in El Cerrito to Lake Chabot in San Leandro. This 13 mile fuel break is maintained by agencies that are members of the HEF. These agencies meet on a regular basis to discuss the ongoing maintenance of the fuel break, sharing ideas and discussing opportunities for improving fuel break management. In the Mokelumne area, the District “partners” with the Camanche Regional Park Advisory Board (staffed by appointees of Amador, Calaveras, and San Joaquin counties) and the Mokelumne Coast to Crest Trail Council (a NPO). Both efforts relate to the District’s planning and implementation of recreational and trail programs. We recently partnered with the Paloma Community Group on the Gwin Mine Road cleanup, on both private (the community’s) and EBMUD land.	Acquisition of lands and the operating and maintenance costs are financed from the rate and charges that are paid by the District’s ratepayers.	28,000 acres of owned land/water surface in the Mokelumne and virtually the same amount in the East Bay; 58,000 acres of watershed total. In addition, the District has 366 acres in two conservation easements we’ve purchased in the Mokelumne and we have one existing local 25-acre easement over the former Naylor property.	Public access to EBMUD’s watersheds are through 4,100 trail permits and 90 watershed entry permits issued by the District, and at the following established recreation areas in the Mokelumne watershed: Pardee Reservoir Recreation Area, Camanche Reservoir Recreation Area, Camanche Hills Hunting Preserve, Mokelumne River Day Use Area below Camanche Dam; and the following established recreations: Lafayette Reservoir Recreation Area and San Pablo Reservoir Recreation Area.
36	East Bay Regional Park District	Incorporated in 1934 as a California Special District. The District operates under Sections 5500-5595 of the Public	The Park District has a 7 member elected board of directors. Within the two county area that we serve (Alameda and contra Costa Counties) there are 33 cities and countless other special district, including other local park and recreation districts. The Park District works collaboratively	The Park District is financed through a portion of property tax revenues as well as some assessment districts, parking and other fees, and some additional revenues from grazing leases, communications site leases, etc. Acquisition funding comes largely from Measure AA, a local park	The District currently has 65 parks, 97,000 acres of parklands acquired.	The majority of those lands are part of parks that are open for public use. Approx. 17,000 of those acres in landbank status

		Resources Code The District is the largest local park agency in the U.S. by virtue of the number of acres.	and cooperatively with all of these other public agencies as appropriate when we have issues of mutual concern. An example would be many of our regional trails are constructed on water pipeline right-of-ways owned by local water agencies.	bond passed in 1988 to fund Park District acquisition and development as well as grant funds from the recent state park bond acts. The District's 2006 budget can be accessed from our website: http://www.ebparks.org/resources/resources.htm		are awaiting improvements that will allow for public access.
	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
37	Golden Gate Audubon Society	We do not hold space and agricultural lands and/or conservation easements. Tara Zuardo Office Manager [ggas@goldengateaudubon.org]				
38	Greater Vallejo Recreation District Shane McAfee [smcafee@gvr.org]	The Greater Vallejo Recreation District is a "Special Service District" that has served residents since 1944.	As a Special Service District, GVRD operates separately, but in partnership with the City of Vallejo by way of a Master lease. The Greater Vallejo Recreation District operates 25 public parks, 4 community centers and an Olympic-size swimming pool and Has 5 member Board of Directors	GVRD's budget for 2004/2005 is \$4.4 million. \$2.4 million of the \$4.4 million comes from property taxes, and the balance comes from property taxes and facility use fees. The city provides an annual subsidy to operate the North and south Vallejo Community Centers as well as Cunningham Pool. Grants provide some additional funding for improvement projects and impact fees are collected to pay for new park development projects.	manages over 1000 acres of public land.	yes
39	Guadalupe-Coyote Resource Conservation District	Formed by election of landowners in the district in March 1943, pursuant to the provisions of Division 9 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, and authorized and directed to conduct research in and to advise and assist public agencies and private individuals in land use planning, pollution control, recreation, water quality, and the conservation of soil, water, woodlands, wildlife and other natural resources. The District does not hold any lands, open space, or conservation easements. Nancy Bernardi [gcred@pacbell.net]				
40	Livermore Area Recreation and Park District Gretchen Sommers [gsommers@larpd.dst.ca.us]	1947 by referendum.	- Contract with City of Livermore for planning/engineering services - Joint bond measure for community facilities (City of Livermore/School District/LARPD) - Agreement with East Bay Regional Park District for regional park services - TriValley Conservancy easements	Acquisition: Park development fees, grants Operations and maintenance: Property tax, fees, grants	1,305 acres (4 regional parks)	Full access to Sycamore Grove: bikes, pedestrians, equestrians Brushy Peak: dirt trail for pedestrians and equestrians and guided tours - Yet to be opened Holdener Park
41	Marine Audubon Society	They are a 501 c 3 tax exempt non-profit established by individual citizens applying for tax exempt status almost 50 years ago.	We have approached other organizations to partner and they have approached us. All partnerships are voluntary	Acquisition - state, federal, local government funding, private foundations and individual donations Operations and maintenance - largely individual donor contributions	about 1,050	One is remote and there is no public road for access.
42	Marine County Open Space District	1972	MCOSD works in partnership with other organizations when acquiring land and addressing interjurisdictional land management issues (endangered species habitat monitoring and preservation, fire hazard reduction, etc). Some of these partnerships are based on a formal memorandum of understanding or other agreement, others are informal, without any written agreement.	Acquisition: To purchase land we use our own funds (from local property taxes), public and private grants, donations, assessment districts, Mello-Roos districts. We have purchased very few conservation easements. Nearly all have been donated to us. Operations and maintenance: Our own funds, primarily. We have received some federal and state grants for vegetation management to reduce fire hazard. We have no responsibility to maintain lands encumbered with conservation/open space easements.	Nearly 15,000 in fee. We hold conservation/open space easements encumbering 1,500 acres.	All lands the District owns in fee are open to the public for low impact recreational uses There is no public access on lands encumbered with conservation/open space easements.

43	Marin County Resource Conservation District	Established May 20, 1959	Five elected landowners make up the Board of Directors. The Marin RCD brings together state, federal, and local agencies with private landowners to conserve soil and water resources. Project partners include: the Calif. DF&G, Marin Community Foundation, Marin Co. Board of Supervisors, Marin Municipal Water District, State SWRCB, UC Cooperative Extension Service, and USDA NRCS.	In the past 15 years the RCD has administered over 3 million dollars in government and private foundation grants for watershed-wide erosion control and restoration projects.	Approximately 250,000 acres are included in the district which generally covers the watersheds of Stemple, Walker, and Lagunitas Creeks.	
	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
44	Marin Municipal Water District Eric McGuire Email: emcguire@marinwater.org	Marin Municipal Water District is a public corporation incorporated in 1912. Began effective operations in 1915.	With regard to land holdings, it is used primarily for the diversion of domestic water supply. At least half our boundary is contiguous with other public landholdings; federal parks, state parks and county open space. While the separate goals may be different the general land management philosophies are similar. This allows them to work cooperatively on common projects either through formal MOU's or by more informal agreements.	Acquisition: Initial purchases were funded by bond measure through either "in fee" acquisition or through condemnation proceedings. MMWD hasn't purchased watershed property since 1977 and that instance was basically a land swap that allowed us to hold title to nearly all the watershed from which we generate water. There is no need for MMWD to acquire more land since it would not serve a purpose to our primary goal. All of the O & M funding is generated through the sale of water from customers. A portion of this District's water sale revenue is allocated, from the general fund, to operations and maintenance activities on our watershed. Additional to that may be an occasional grant that pays for some maintenance activities, usually in the name of restoration.	The District own approximately 19,000 acres of watershed, some of which is a buffer and is not within the "active" watershed area.	Only "passive" recreation is allowed. This is usually defined as hiking, picnicking, shoreline fishing and, within the last 20 years, this includes bicycling on designated trails.
45	Marinwood Community Services District Tom Horne [thorne@marinwood.org] District Manager	Formed in 1962, by a public election.	The CSD purchased open space within its boundaries in 1972, paid by a bond issue. Other smaller adjacent parcels have been purchased outright, or deeded to the CSD by subdividers. They are the local government, so the question does not apply. However, I should add that the CSD owned open space has been permanently protected from other uses by granting the County of Marin a conservation easement over all of the open space lands.	Acquisition - described to the left Current year revenues, from county property taxes and from a parcel tax fund maintenance. There is minimal maintenance of the open space, and nothing in the way of facilities on the land. Marin Co. Fire Department occasionally grades and maintains fire roads on the property.	CSD owns 779 acres of open space.	Public access is free and open. The only trails aside from the fire roads are social trails, un-maintained.
46	Midcoast Park Lands	In April of 1997, Midcoast Park Lands (MPL) was formed as a non-profit organization.	MPL is governed by a board of directors who are elected to two year terms by the general membership. It now manages Quarry Park.			
47	Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District	Created a voter initiative, Measure R, in 1972. The voters expanded the District in 1976 to include southern San Mateo County. And in 1992, the District	7 member Board of Directors The District's purpose is to purchase, permanently protect, and restore lands forming a regional open space greenbelt, preserve unspoiled wilderness, wildlife habitat, watershed, viewshed, and fragile ecosystems, and provide opportunities for low-intensity recreation and environmental education. The District works to form a continuous greenbelt of permanently preserved open space	Funding is provided by a small share of the annual total property tax revenues collected within District boundaries. This amounts to about 1.7¢ per \$100 of assessed property value, which currently provides approximately \$18.5 million in annual revenue (2004-2005 fiscal year). Other revenue sources may include federal and state grants, interest and rental income, donations, and note issues.	The District has permanently preserved over 50,000 acres of mountainous, foothill, and bayland open space, creating 25 open space preserves (24 of which are open to the public).	The District's preserves range from 55 to over 17,000 acres and are open to the public free of charge, 365 days a year from dawn until one half-hour

		further expanded by adding a small portion of Santa Cruz County. With the final approval of the Coastside Protection Program in 2004, the District's boundary was extended to the Pacific.	by linking its lands with other public parklands. The District also participates in cooperative efforts such as the Bay Trail, Ridge Trail, and Skyline-to-the-Sea Trail, which are regional trail systems in the Bay Area that include District lands.			after sunset. 24 of the District's 25 open space preserves are open for public use. Two of the preserves are accessible by permit only.
	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
48	Mount Diablo Audubon Society	I am a member of Mt. Diablo Audubon, but we do not own any lands so this does not apply to us. -Jimm Edgae jimm [jedgar@ag70.younglife.org]				
49	Napa County Resource Conservation District Staff [Staff@naparc.org]; on behalf of; Staff [staff@rcd.local]	Established by state law, and funded originally through the county property taxes, the Resource Conservation District (RCD) was formed in 1945.	The RCD is managed through its Board of Directors; seven local landowners who serve as unpaid volunteers. They provide the leadership in assessing the conservation needs of the district, and in developing programs to meet those needs. The District is a technical information source for landowners, managers and residents. We have information on soils, watershed, and resource conservation methods	Funding sources now also include local, state and federal grants and contracts as well as donations.	The Napa County Resource Conservation District does not hold agricultural/open space lands or conservation easements.	
50	National Trust for Historic Preservation	The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a private, nonprofit membership organization founded in 1949.	The Trust is dedicated to saving historic places and revitalizing America's communities and provides leadership, education, advocacy, and resources to protect the irreplaceable places that tell America's story. Staff at the Washington, D.C. headquarters, six regional offices and 28 historic sites work with the Trust's 270,000 members and thousands of preservation groups in all 50 states.	In 2005, our loan funds and NTCIC committed more than \$14.2 million in financial assistance to revitalization and preservation projects undertaken by local developers, public agencies and nonprofit organizations. The Trust also awards grants to help jump-start local preservation projects or to provide timely intervention in emergencies. Many of these grants are provided through endowed funds that target specific localities or project types.		
51	The Nature Conservancy http://www.nature.org/aboutus/howwe work/about/conservation.html	Non-profit founded in 1951	All fiduciary and legal authority for The Nature Conservancy is vested in its Board of Directors. To achieve its mission, the Conservancy has developed a strategic, science-based approach to its conservation work, called Conservation by Design , which helps it identify and work to protect the highest-priority places – landscapes and seascapes that, if conserved, ensure the diversity of life on Earth over the long term. Mainly land acquisition or habitat restoration. It works closely with local communities, businesses , governments, indigenous people and traditional communities	the Conservancy will solicit tax-deductible charitable contributions from individuals, corporations and/or foundations which will be used to cover conservation project costs; will find the funds needed by selling land subject to conservation restrictions to a private buyer called conservation buyer transactions; find the needed project funds by working in cooperation with a government agency Here, two approaches may be employed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • first, the Conservancy may acquire land for later re-sale to the cooperating government agency at such time as agency funds become available; or • second, the government agency may provide a grant for the cost of implementing a habitat restoration project or management plan on Conservancy lands or on the land of a cooperating private landowner. 	Protected more than 117 million acres of land and 5,000 miles of river around the world.	Depends on activity allowed

				64 percent of its revenue coming from individual members		
52	North Marin Water District	1948	Negotiation and voter elected Board of Directors	a. Acquisition: Connection Fees, Commodity Charges b. Operations and maintenance: Commodity Charges	0	0
53	Novato Sanitary District	1928 under the Sanitary District Act	They are a special district with an elected board of directors.	a. Acquisition Bonds and State and Federal Clean Water Grants b. Operations and maintenance Sewer service charges	600 acres of irrigated pasture, 20 acres of wetlands mitigation area	none

	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
54	Peninsula Open Space Trust Anne Sharman [asharman@openspacetrust.org]	POST was founded as a non-profit organization in 1977.	POST partners with a wide variety of other organizations in many different ways. We work with other land protection agencies (such as the Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District, California State Parks, the National Park Service (through the Golden Gate National Recreation Area) and the US Fish and Wildlife Service) to provide permanent protection and public access to the lands we protect. We also work with private conservation buyers. We also work with funding agencies, such as the California Coastal Commission and the Wildlife Conservation Board, to secure funding for land protection activities, often in exchange for an OTD or a conservation easement over the property. We work with other non-profits in the area, (such as Committee for Green Foothills, the Greenbelt Alliance and the Bay Area Open Space Council) to ensure that our efforts at land protection are well coordinated on a regional level.	POST finances conservation work in a number of different ways. We rely on donations and grants from individuals, foundations, public agencies and corporations to support our work. We also depend upon public funding. POST relies on donations and grants from individuals and foundations to finance our operating budget.	POST has played a role in protecting nearly 55,000 acres on the San Francisco Peninsula.	POST works to ensure that public access will be achieved once properties are transferred into public ownership, though some POST properties are available for public use.
55	Pleasant Hill Recreation and Park District Bob Berggren [BBerggren@Pleasanthillrec.com]	Established in 1951, operate under Public Resources Code of the State of CA. People voted to establish a Rec & Park District and tax themselves	They are a local government.	Financing: General Funds of District, grants from State of CA. Property Taxes and funds generated from programs and activities	The district currently controls approximately 203.5 acres, which includes parks and open space.	All acres are accessible to the public through trails
56	The Presidio Trust Dana Polk Senior Advisor for Government & Media Relations The Presidio	The Presidio Trust was established by federal law, the Trust Act, in 1996	They work closely with the National Park Service (which shares jurisdiction of the Presidio), the City of San Francisco, and a number of nonprofit partners for various programs (natural resources, public programs, etc). The Trust holds monthly public meetings on a variety of issues, and the Trust Board of Directors hold at	The Trust receives a declining federal appropriation annually, and is mandated to be financially self-sufficient by 2013. The Trust earns revenue to support its operation and capital costs by rehabbing and leasing Presidio buildings.	The Presidio is a former military base totaling 1491 acres with 768 buildings. There are currently 991 acres of open space. The Presidio	All open space if publicly accessible, there is no entry fee

	Trust Phone: 561-2710 Fax: 561-2704 dpolk@presidiotrust.gov		least 2 public board meetings a year.		management plan calls for an increase in open space by 100 acres. Approximately 75 percent of the Presidio will be open space.	
--	--	--	---------------------------------------	--	---	--

	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
57	The Sacramento-Yolo Port District Scheeler, Tom [toms@cityofwestsacramento.org]	Authorized by Part 6 of the California Harbors and Rivers Code and the District formation was approved in April 1947 by voters within the District (Sacramento County, including Sacramento City, and the first Supervisory District of Yolo Co.). Sacramento Co. Supervisors of ficially formed the District on April 23, 1947.	Historically (inception to 1987), Sacramento County and City, and the first Supervisory District of Yolo Co. comprised the Port District and representatives from those jurisdictions sat on the Port Commission and established Port policy. In 1987, the City of West Sacramento incorporated, and around 1989 or 1990 (not exactly sure), State leg was introduced to give W. Sacto. a seat on the Commission. The Port is presently in a interim organizational state. Legislation has been introduced in the State legislature to change the Port District to West Sac and Yolo Co. first supervisory district. That leg. is working its way thru and hopefully will be on the Governor's desk soon. Presuming the Gov's signing, legislation changing the Port District will take effect in early 2007.	a) Original land acquisition for the Port terminal and ship channel lands was by General Obligation (GO) bond. Subsequent capital project costs have been paid for by Revenue Bonds. b) Operations and maintenance are funded out of operational revenue derived from cargo handling and storage.	26.5 acres of Port property are slated to be placed under Conservation Easement as mitigation for the initial phase of the channel deepening project and an additional 183 acres will be similarly placed for the completion of the channel deepening. Port lands have been sold and/or placed under conservation easement to mitigate for Reclamation District flood levee work or for other agency's mitigation. The acreage for these types of projects totals approximately 60 acres.	The Port has historically leased property to a number of private boat clubs to facilitate access to the waterway. Public access has also been permitted on Port property for bank fishing south of the developed terminal. West Sacramento and the Port are working to refine and improve this public bank access as well as examining facility improvement opportunities for the boat clubs.
58	San Francisco Creek Joint Powers Authority	The JPA was created through the adoption of a joint powers agreement by the member agencies on May 18, 1999.		The JPA operational budget is funded through contributions from its member agencies. The JPA receives grants for projects and is conducting strategic planning to establish long-term funding sources for operating costs and capital projects.	They protect and maintain the 14-mile San Francisco Creek and its 45 square-mile watershed.	
59	Santa Clara County	Created by the California	They partner with governmental agencies and nonprofits in preserving	Major funding for OSA is derived from benefit assessments adopted annually by the	To date, OSA has preserved	So far, 2 properties

	Open Space Authority Lark Burkhart [lburkhart@openspaceauthority.org] Public Information Specialist Santa Clara County Open Space Authority 408-224-7476	Legislature on February 1, 1993. This was in response to efforts by local governments and interested citizens to provide a means of acquiring and managing open space in Santa Clara County.	open space lands through either direct purchase or easement. Peninsula Open Space Trust, The Nature Conservancy, Silicon Valley Land Conservancy, California Department of Conservation and U.S. Natural Resource Conservation Service have worked with us on open space acquisitions. We also work with US Fish and Wildlife and CA Fish and Game in managing our lands, particularly on issues concerning threatened and endangered species. Santa Clara County Sheriff's Department has also been invaluable in the annual struggle to eradicate marijuana plantations on public lands, including ours. In addition, we have an Urban Open Space Program that returns 20% of our annual net revenues to Santa Clara County and the 5 cities that chose to participate in OSA (Milpitas, Santa Clara, Campbell, San Jose and Morgan Hill) for open space projects within their boundaries that meet our established goals.	Board. In 1994, the Board approved formation of Assessment District 1, which levies an assessment of \$12 per benefit unit. This provides \$4 million in revenues. In 2001, voters approved Assessment District 2, which provides for an additional \$20 assessment to raise \$8 million per year. The funds from Assessment District 2 are being held in escrow pending the outcome of a lawsuit challenging the assessment. Additional funding for acquisitions come from governmental and foundation grants.	12,088 acres, 9,533 through fee purchase and 2,555 under conservation easements.	have been opened to the public. One a multiuse trail (hiker, bicycle, and equestrian) and the other is restricted to hikers and equestrians. Both connect to trail systems in parks held by other entities. In December, 2005, they opened a parking/staging area with vault toilet to expand access to our largest property, Rancho Cañada del Oro.
	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
60	Santa Clara Valley Water District Deanna Forsythe [DForsythe@valleywater.org]	The District, formed in 1929 and acts as a State Special District	As the county's water wholesaler, the water district makes sure there is enough clean, safe water for homes and businesses. As the agency responsible for local flood protection, the water district works diligently to protect Santa Clara Valley residents and businesses from the devastating effects of flooding. Our stream stewardship responsibilities include creek restoration and wildlife habitat projects, pollution prevention efforts and a commitment to natural flood protection.	Funding for district operations comes from a number of sources, including revenue from the sale of water to local jurisdictions and water retailers, property taxes, and state and federal project cost-sharing and reimbursements. The district's finances are a matter of public record	Stewards of the county's more than 800 miles of streams and 10 district-built reservoirs.	some are open but not all
61	Save the Redwoods League Susie Heller [sheller@saveredwoods.org]	SRL was founded in 1918.	They buy land from private parties and either donate or sell the land to CA DPR, BLM or National Parks. We occasionally enter into transactions with other land trusts, as well.	Acquisition - Public funds from WCB, SCC Maintenance & operation - Private funds from: individual donors, private foundations	170000 acres acquired and conveyed to the public. They also protect almost 9,000-acres through the use of conservation easement.	They transfer property as additions to CA Parks, BLM land or National Parks so most of the land they work with has high potential to be used by the public.
62	Solano Irrigation District	Apparently this inquiry does not apply to Solano Irrigation District. Please see below. Cindy A. Perazzo Executive Assistant admin@sidwater.org (707) 455-4080				

		I think SID does not "hold open space and agricultural lands and/or conservation easements." These sound like habitat preservation areas or mitigation banks. So my answers would be, "not applicable." – Jim				
63	Solano Land Trust Ken Poerner Land Steward Solano Land Trust ken@solanolandtrust.org	Established in 1986 through litigation over a housing development	We partner with UC Davis Natural Reserve System at Jepson Prairie in which they organize research and assist with stewardship and volunteer coordination. At Rush Ranch we have partnered with the National Estuarine Research Reserve System to enhance research opportunities and educate the public and decision makers about estuarine systems. We have partnered several times with the State Coastal Conservancy to assist with acquiring lands and funding public access improvements at Rush Ranch, Lynch Canyon, King Ranch and Swett Ranch. We partner with several state, mostly CFCP, and federal agencies, NRCS, to fund easement acquisition	Acquisition: City of Fairfield is required to provide some CFD funding due to the initial litigation, Green Valley Homeowners also provide some funding for easement acquisition due to another litigation. The Nature Conservancy purchased Jepson and Wilcox and turned them over to us. Operations and maintenance: Grazing fees, mitigation and soon Solano County may be operating Lynch Canyon public access. We are establishing endowments from mitigation funds and donations for Jepson, Wilcox and Rush Ranch	Fee-10,343 Transfer to other-2,085 Easement-5,331	Rush Ranch has public access 5 days a week, Jepson has a picnic site, fishing access site, a self-guided trail and docent hikes in the spring, Lynch, King and Swett only have docent led hikes at this time.
64	Solano Resource Conservation District	The Solano Resource Conservation District does not hold any open space at this time. Salz, Jodie - Dixon, CA [Jodie.Salz@ca.nacdn.net] – District Manager				

	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
65	Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District Maria J. Cipriani Assistant General Manager Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District 747 Mendocino Ave., Suite 100 Santa Rosa, CA 95401 mcipri@sonoma-county.org	In November 1990, Sonoma County voters approved two ballot measures, A and C, that created the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District and funded it with a quarter-cent sales tax through March 2011, respectively.	The District collaborates with numerous governmental agencies and non-profit organizations to leverage financial and staff resources to purchase or protect land in Sonoma County. The District has also applied for and been awarded grants for assistance with acquisition and management. The District partners with agencies, organizations and landowners to provide public educational programs and organized outings on District-protected lands, including conservation easements. The District provides funds and technical assistance to local cities, agencies and non-profit and organizations for recreation, public access, restoration, and other open space projects in urban areas. Conservation partners include the State Coastal Conservancy, Wildlife Conservation Board, California State Department of Parks and Recreation, Sonoma County Regional Parks Department, Sonoma County Water Agency, LandPaths (a local non-profit), cities, and others.	The District's funding for acquisition and stewardship of its protected lands comes from the quarter-cent sales tax, which generates approximately \$17 million annually. The District also has received significant funds for acquisition from numerous partners including the State Coastal Conservancy, City of Sonoma, Federal Farm and Ranchland Protection Program, Forest Legacy Fund, Sonoma County Water Agency, State of California Department of Parks and Recreation, and the Wildlife Conservation Board.	To date, the District has preserved approximately 68,785 acres through conservation easement and fee acquisitions from willing sellers.	The District also partners with agencies, organizations and landowners to provide public educational programs and organized outings on District-protected lands, including conservation easements.
66	Sonoma Land Trust	Said they would respond				

		but never did				
67	Sotoyome Resource Conservation District Elin Shogren-Martinez Sotoyome RCD Office Manager PO Box 11526 Santa Rosa, CA 95406-1526 (707) 569-1448 – phone (707) 569-0434 – fax generalmail@sotoyomercd.org = email	The Sotoyome-Santa Rosa Resource Conservation District (RCD) was formed as a consolidation of the Sotoyome RCD and the Santa Rosa RCD on March 3, 1975. Santa Rosa RCD was originally formed as the Central Sonoma Soil Conservation District on February 25, 1946. The Sotoyome Soil Conservation District was formed on January 13, 1953. In January 1997, the name of the District was shortened to the Sotoyome Resource Conservation District (SRCD).	Resource Conservation Districts are legal subdivisions of the state organized under Division IX of the California Public Resources Code. They are managed by elected or appointed volunteer directors who provide assistance to private landowners in cooperation with local USDA Service Centers, other public agencies, private entities and community organizations. They are empowered to develop and carry out natural resource conservation programs that affect their districts. Article I of Division 9 describes the general policy and purpose of resource conservation districts.	Currently, the Sotoyome RCD simply holds the conservation easement for the privately owned Laguna Valley Mitigation Bank property. The Sonoma County Agriculture and Open Space District also holds an easement on this property.. The LVMB has been approved through an agreement between Domenic and Lynda Carinalli and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; to provide mitigation for certain impacts of various wetland fill projects on the Santa Rosa Plain pursuant to the Laguna Mitigation Bank Enabling Instrument. Proceeds from the sale of mitigation credits are used to provide a construction fund to construct wetlands on the bank property, provide a contingency/security fund to cover short-term maintenance, monitoring, remediation and reporting, and provide for an endowment fund to manage the site in perpetuity. The Sotoyome RCD acts as the Bank Operator – handling all sales of the mitigation credits	The Laguna Valley Mitigation Bank (LVMB) was established for the conservation of high quality habitat for Sebastopol meadowfoam (<i>Limnanthes vinculans</i>) and contains natural seasonal wetlands (vernal pools and wet swales), oak woodland, riparian woodland, hillside seep, and non-native annual grassland on the 33.09 acres property. This property is located on the Santa Rosa Plain, County of Sonoma, State of California.	At present there is no public access allowed at the site.
68	Stanford University		The land was financed and bought by the University but it is not permanently conserved	University funds	Roughly 700 acres as open space for research and trails	Parts are open to the public

	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
69	Suisun Resource Conservation District	In 1963, local landowners in the Suisun Marsh formed the Suisun Resource Conservation district (SRCD) to protect the environmental quality of the marsh.	Resource Conservation Districts are authorized under the California Public Resource Code to assist the State in soil and water conservation by giving assistance to landowners and municipalities to control soil erosion and runoff, stabilize soils, and improve water quality. SRCD performs both administrative and technical functions that include representing the interests of the landowners.		The District includes 116,000 acres, consisting of approximately 52,000 acres of managed wetlands, 6,300 acres of unmanaged tidal wetlands, 30,000 acres of bays and sloughs, and 27,700 acres of upland grasslands.	0
70	Town of Corte Madera	The Town of Corte Madera does not own or operate any open space in either fee title or easement. Public open space that is located within the Town is owned by the Marin County Open Space District. Bob Pendoley [RPendoley@ci.corte-madera.ca.us] Planning Director / Assistant Town Manager Ph: (415) 927-5066 Fax: (415) 927-5039				
71	Town of Los Gatos John Curtis, Director, Parks & Public	Incorporated in September 10, 1887.	We are a local government. The Mid Peninsula Open Space District manages the major elements of open space surrounding us.		We are a local government. The Mid Peninsula Open Space District manages the major	Hiking trails exist in this open space and are available to the public,

	Works Town of Los Gatos 408-399- 5774 jcurtis@losg atosca.gov				elements of open space surrounding us.	dawn to dusk
72	Town of Ross Gary Broad [gbroad@town ofross.org]	I don't believe we qualify. - Town Manager and Planning Director Town of Ross, P.O. Box 320, Ross, CA 94957 415.453.1453 extension 107 facsimile 415.453.1950				
73	Town of San Anselmo Jonathan Braun - co chair of the <u>San Anselmo Open Space Committee</u>	Established in 1981. It serves as an advisory body to the Town Council. Our responsibilities include advocating for open space preservation, long term planning of open space in and near San Anselmo, review of appropriate planning and development matters, generation of public support and fund raising to implement adopted open space goals.	Our committee works in concert with the Town Council and Administration and we advise and consult with the neighboring Towns of Ross and Fairfax. In particular we work closely with the Marin County Open Space District on planning, implementing land purchases, trail development and management of certain open space preserves.	a. The Town of San Anselmo does not have a budget for Open Space. The Open Space Committee is self sustaining. In 1991 the Open Space Committee established a donor advised fund with the Marin Community Foundation that accepts private donations to be used strictly to purchase open space identified in the San Anselmo General Plan. The Town has sold two residential lots to help with the funding of a larger open space land purchase. Other funds have come from the Marin County Open Space District and The Beryl Buck Open Space Fund of the Marin Community Foundation. b. Maintenance of Town owned open space is quite limited. The Town Parks department has provided some resources and volunteers are used on a number of on going projects.	Since 1981 approximately 52 acres of open space have been purchased in San Anselmo. Certain development projects have included private open space dedications, the number of acres of private open space is not available.	San Anselmo's open space is easily accessible via a fairly well developed trail network. Citizens place a high value on this access and there is a fairly high level of usage. The Towns open space in many cases is contiguous with public lands of other agencies.
74	Town of Tiburon	The open space land within the City is held and managed by the Marin County Open Space District. They also have land at Ring Mountain Open Space and Old Hilary Open Space Preserve Diane Crane Iacopi [DCrane@ci.tiburon.ca.us] – Town Clerk				
	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
75	Trust for Hidden Villa	1960, as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit	- being part of our programs (CA Native Plant Society) - sending students or clients to participate in our programs (e.g. St. Vincent DePaul) - collaborating on projects (e.g. Community Services Agency of Mountain View) - co-sponsoring events (e.g. Town of Los Altos Hills)	a. Acquisition - Property was donated by the Duveneck family 2800 Operations and maintenance – Program fees (30%) and charitable contributions (70%)	1600	Open to public certain days
76	U.S. Bureau of Land Management	BLM was formed during government reorganization in 1946, combining two former federal agencies – the General Land Office and the U.S. Grazing Service.	12 Management Framework Plans - 4.5 million acres; 9 Resource Management Plans – 12.5 million acres; 15 Land Use Plan Updates – 14.8 million acres; 13.3 million acres non-federal lands under cooperative Habitat Conservation Plans; 5 National Monument/National Conservation Area Plans – 700,000 acres.	Paid by County in-lieu taxes	BLM is managing over 15 million acres of public lands in California	yes
77	U.S. Bureau	Reclamation	Many different ways. A few	Contact me or John as depending on the	We do not	Generally,

	<p>of Reclamation http://www.usbr.gov/mp Chuck Johnson, CPSS Chief, Land Resources Branch Regional GIS Program Manager Regional Soil Scientist US Bureau of Reclamation voice 916-978-5266 2800 Cottage Way (MP-450) FAX 916-978-5290 Sacramento, CA 95825-1898 cbjohnson@mp.usbr.gov</p>	<p>Act of 1902 (Federal legislation)</p>	<p>California centric activities are the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) conservation and mitigation programs, the CALFED initiatives, and the Central Valley Joint Venture program. Contact John Thomson (916-978-5052 or jthomson@mp.usbr.gov) for more details on Reclamation's conservation activities. He is also a good point of contact should Sacramento LAFCO want to have Reclamation participate in any open space/conservation easement workshops.</p>	<p>circumstances, there are different funding programs. However, keep in mind that in general one would need to demonstrate that the proposed acquisition will provide a benefit to the Central Valley Project. Reclamation does not normally get directly involved with conservation O&M activities unless the land in question is Reclamation land.</p>	<p>maintain "preserved acreage" figures in an easily retrieval form since Reclamation have extremely few acres of "conservation" land in Sacramento County. While we have a few acres scattered throughout the county that could be considered conservation land, they are not identified as such. Rather, we've assisted other organizations over the years to preserve lands, e.g. the creation of Stone Lakes NWR, TNC Cosumnes Preserve, American River Parkway, Folsom Lake recreation area, etc.</p>	<p>there is no public access on Reclamation lands in Sacramento County.</p>
--	---	--	---	---	--	---

	NAME	DATE EST.	MEANS OF PARTICIPATION	MEANS OF FINANCING	# OF ACRES PRESERVED	LEVEL OF PUBLIC ACCESS
78	<p>U.S. Department of Agriculture (Farm Service Agency) http://www.fsa.usda.gov/pas/</p>	<p>FSA was set up and reorganized in 1994, incorporating programs from several agencies, including the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (now a separate <u>Risk Management Agency</u>), and</p>	<p>e Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) is a voluntary program for agricultural landowners. Through CRP, you can receive annual rental payments and cost-share assistance to establish long-term, resource conserving covers on eligible farmland. The Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) makes annual rental payments based on the agriculture rental value of the land, and it provides cost-share assistance for up to 50 percent of the participant's costs in establishing approved conservation practices. Participants enroll in CRP contracts for 10 to 15 years. The program is administered by the CCC through the Farm Service Agency (FSA), and program support is provided by</p>	<p>The Farm Service Agency continues to administer farm commodity and conservation programs for farmers and makes and guarantees farm emergency, ownership, and operating loans. They use federal tax moneys allocated to them and service payments</p>	<p>They have helped nearly 90,000 farms in CA</p>	

		the Farmers Home Administration. Though its name has changed over the years, the Agency's relationship with farmers goes back to the 1930s.	Natural Resources Conservation Service, Cooperative State Research and Education Extension Service, state forestry agencies, and local Soil and Water Conservation Districts.			
79	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	The Service traces its origins to the U.S. Commission on Fish and Fisheries in the Department of Commerce and the Division of Economic Ornithology and Mammalogy in the Department of Agriculture.	The U.S.F.W.S. has National wildlife refuges but no "open space or agricultural" easements	Congressional appropriations and grants through the North American Wetland Conservation Program	Many refuges throughout the U.S.	Most of the refuges are open to the public, but not all.
80	University of California, Office of the President	The University of California (UC), formed in 1868 by an act of the California legislature	Acquisition. They hold open space land on numerous sites, including but not limited to 33 sites of the UC Natural Reserve System spread over thousands of acres spanning the state. In addition, the University and its ten campuses hold many agricultural research farms and forests, also encompassing thousands of acres spanning California.	They were acquired by a variety of means (e.g. state funded purchases, privately funded purchases, gifts, grants, legacies, etc...) and have been acquired over more than a century.	None of these holdings is 'preserved' in the technical sense of the word, but many involve relatively pristine settings.	yes
81	Walnut Creek Open Space Foundation	The Walnut Creek Open Space was created by voters in 1974 with passage of a park and open space bond.	It began as a county special district and was later taken into the city structure.	The bond was paid off in 2004 and property tax assessment and general fund cover expenses now.	There are 2704 acres.	yes

Exhibit C Synopsis of Related Studies

Conflicts at the Ag/Urban Edge:

Synopsis of literature on Agriculture and Urban Area issues
Prepared By Caitlin Camp
Senior Intern, August 2, 2006

Sokolow, Alvin D. 2003. Chapter 12 - California's Edge Problem: Urban Impacts on Agriculture of California Agriculture Dimensions and Issues. University of California Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

In California today, the advancing industrialization of farm activities and increased scale and intensity of residential encroachment into rural areas has led to the agriculture-urban edge problem which has economic, land use, life style, and health dimensions. A rough estimate of the total linear scope of agriculture-urban edges is more than 10,000 miles throughout the state (p. 290). Farmers operating next to urban areas often experience reduced productivity and income, regulatory constraints, vandalism, and legal liability. Urban neighbors often complain of the dust, noise, odor, and health effects of living next to industrial-like farming activities that use chemicals, heavy machinery, and concentrated animal facilities (p. 289). Anecdotal information shows that the perceptual differences of edge issues arise from lifestyle backgrounds. In order to achieve edges that allow the stable coexistence of farmers and urban neighbors it is recommended that a combination of public policy measures, farm management practices, and a fundamental change of human behavior be used to reduce the conflicts arising from these edge problems.

Besides the immediate impacts of farming, the long-term consequence for agricultural operations located in areas of ongoing urbanization is seen as the "impermanence syndrome," meaning, there is a high level of uncertainty among farmers about their ability to continue their operations in areas experiencing rapid population increase and land use change (p.295). They believe their ultimate and only option is to sell out or become too restricted by surrounding urbanization and become an unviable source of income. For farmers, the annexation plans of nearby cities are a key sign as to whether or not agriculture will survive in their area. Public policy measures and incentives; such as, Right-to-farm ordinances, conflict resolution procedures, agriculture education for urban residents, limiting number of new residents in Ag areas, use of UGB's, LAFCo control of city annexations, county-city agreements on the direction of urban development, mitigation of farmland impacts, Ag buffers and zoning, etc... are extremely important to keeping agriculture production viable.

Some conversion of farmland is inevitable where cities are surrounded by agricultural uses, such as cities throughout the Central Valley. However, research in several eastern states has shown that urban proximity can provide profit-making opportunities, as well as, problems for farmers considering the potential for direct marketing, other forms of access to urban consumers, such as farmers markets, and off-farm income operators (p. 298). The USDA characterizes these metro farms as smaller, producing more per acre, more diverse, and more focused on high-value production than farms in non-metro areas (p. 299) that tend to be larger and homogenous.

Many farmers located in close proximity to urban areas have switched from large scale commodity operations to unique higher value commodities, such as, tree, ornamental, and vineyard crops. Higher value commodities typically involve more intensive and expensive cultivation practices but on smaller parcels allowing some agricultural operations to become productive and profitable in highly impacted urban growth areas. (p. 297) Alameda, Los Angeles, Orange, Santa Clara, and San Diego Counties are examples of high population counties that experienced rapid Ag land conversion from 1950-2001 and subsequently switched to higher value commodities to accommodate the changing times (p. 298)(see table maybe?).

Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCos) are California's boundary control agencies at the county level with semi-independent boards that have the power to review, deny, or change city plans to annex territory and to designate their future growth areas (SOI). LAFCo strives to provide land for orderly growth while protecting valuable agricultural lands and discouraging extensive sprawl. LAFCo has the power to

develop regulations that can direct development away from prime Ag. land and/or help mitigate the loss of Ag land by requiring cities to adopt measures to meet these regulations prior to LAFCo approval (**Vista Montana Subdivision is a good example**). “Some counties and cities in agricultural areas have negotiated agreements that divert urban development from unincorporated areas to city areas, usually in return for financial considerations that allow the county to share in municipal growth revenues” (p. 300). The two land use policies that most specifically address edge issues are agricultural buffers and mitigations imposed on new development for the loss of farmland or to limit negative impacts on farming. The Ventura County Ag Alliance has developed a set of principles to achieve sustainability in edge areas.

Ventura County Ag Futures Alliance. *Land Use Principles to Achieve Agricultural Sustainability in Ventura County. Issue Paper No. 3. September 2003.*

People need to understand that agriculture is not simply a form of open space; it’s a business. Land use practices of building residential neighborhoods directly next to farmland cause continual conflicts, resulting in the steady erosion of the agricultural industry. The Ventura County Ag Futures Alliance “suggests buffers and reasonable boundaries between agricultural and urban uses to reduce conflicts and allow the best use for each segment of society, allowing both to survive and prosper.” The Ag Futures Alliance (AFA) proposes the following land use principle for residents and leaders of the cities and the County to promote meaningful consensus on an applicable, long-term strategy for the protection of agriculture in Ventura County. Just as in Ventura County, as counties strive to meet the growing demands of an ever increasing population, it is imperative that both cities and counties come to an agreement about a set of policies and effective procedures to guide land use decisions. The suggested principles are as follows:

Principle 1: Buffers are necessary between agriculture and neighboring uses

- Create and maintain buffers between Ag lands and urban uses.
- Buffer zones should be based on consistent standards
- Responsibility rests with encroaching urban use (not pre-existing Ag use).
- If no buffer exists, grower should be compensated for production loss.

Principle 2: Permanent boundaries are needed between agricultural production areas and urban uses

- Boundaries should be physical features (natural or man made).
- Voter est. growth boundaries should be reviewed to ensure long-term boundaries.
- Should encompass large swaths of land
- Allow public open space to serve as boundaries whenever possible.
- Use proven land conservation tools (LCAs, FSZs, easements, TRDs etc.)

Principle 3: Development strategies should encourage protection of agricultural lands

- General plans should contain an Ag element that contains specific principles/strategies to sustain Ag.
- Urban development should be directed to areas least desirable fro Ag (like to the east areas of Sac. County)
- Smart Growth – encourage creative models of mixed-use development/higher density in already urban areas
- Promote and maintain farm worker housing.
- If Ag conversion must occur, protect nearby Ag operations from “domino” effect through buffers and boundaries.
- Direct protection and preservation toward large blocks of land.
- Create policies and agreements that preserve Ag resources before conversion pressures occur
- Urban function sites (schools etc.) should be located to not conflict with Ag uses
- **Encourage LAFCo to adopt regulations consistent with principles**
- County should fund staff to monitor land use projects affecting Ag

Principle 4: Regulatory structure should allow flexibility for Ag operations

- Zoning should be flexible and not unduly restrict use of Ag lands.

- Widest definition of Ag uses should be allowed due to changing markets
- Encourage public education and awareness of Ag operations
- Local gov't must support critical Ag-supporting businesses (packing houses, chemical distribution facilities, irrigation supply companies etc.)

Sustainability, livability and accountability – principles of Smart Growth – are key to the coexistence of Ag and Urban forms.

Kraus, Sibella. *Sustaining Ag on the Edge: A Regional Food Systems Perspective*. Presentation at CALAFCO Conference Monterey by the Sustainable Agriculture Education Organization (SAGE), September 7, 2005.

To meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs we need *sustainable agriculture*: a form of agriculture that is economically viable, environmentally sound, and socially just (social and economic equity), also known as the three E's. Sustainable agriculture is important to reduce edge conflicts. Its goals are: farmland protection; soil, water, and biodiversity protection; reduced reliance on chemical pesticides; efficient use of non-renewable resources; optimized use of on-farm resources; organic and biological farming; fair labor practices; humane and ecological animal husbandry; viable family farms and rural communities; and the need to satisfy human food and fiber needs (slide 5).

One concept that LAFCo could promote is the urban edge "Food Belt" Program in the Farm Bill for buffers between Ag and urban areas. The vision of the Food Belt concept is an "economically vital agricultural areas that provides fresh food, and an environmental, educational, recreational, and aesthetic amenity for an adjacent urban area." The area would be designated and administered as a district for multiple Ag operations and provide farmland protection, economic development, smart growth, conservation, food systems, cultural, and trial linkages. These areas could also receive assistance for easements, infrastructure, farmer technical support, and promotion programs from the National Resource Department of Conservation (NRDC) Farm Bill.

Questions asked at the end of the presentation: Could LAFCos be recipients of 'Food Belt' funding? Could LAFCos develop an 'agricultural conservation and enhancement plan as a mitigation requirement? I think so!

Sustainable Agriculture Education (SAGE) is a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt nonprofit organization that addresses agriculture/urban interface needs and challenges through its mission, goals, and activities and can provide assistance in implementing 'Food Belt' program concepts. They're mission: To engage regional diverse populations with the sustainable agriculture movement and to develop urban edge agriculture as a vital urban-rural interface. They're goals: To foster and support innovative projects linking urban and rural places. To demonstrate the connections between community health, sustainable agriculture, metropolitan infrastructure and growth, housing, and regional land use planning. To link urban community food security needs with the needs of sustainable family farmers. (www.sagecenter.org)

CALAFCO Mobile Workshop, Agricultural/Urban Interface. Vista Montana Subdivision in Watsonville, Santa Cruz County. September 7, 2005.

The City of Watsonville's Vista Montana Subdivision proposal is a good example of how mitigation measures can help reduce edge conflicts between agricultural and urban uses. Santa Cruz LAFCo required a 200 foot buffer between the Ag and urban area as a mitigation measure to annex land from the county to construct the new residential subdivision.

In the 1980's, the property owners of an apple orchard petitioned LAFCo to annex their 72-acre property to the City of Watsonville. LAFCo approved the annexation but was sued by a local environmental group for

a contentious environmental impact report (EIR). In Santa Cruz County's General Plan, the approval violated their Viable Agricultural Land Division Criteria (Sec. 5.13.14d) and Sec. 5.13.17 that specifies the division must not hamper long term agriculture. The City's 1987 Agricultural buffer Policy (Res. No. 334-87) had also not been applied. The urbanization of the site had the potential to have cumulative impacts on prime Ag land to the west, north and east of the site.

The courts agreed with the plaintiffs and invalidated the annexation. The city; lead agency in fixing the EIR, and LAFCo; responsible agency in using the EIR for hearing the proposal, entered in to a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to fix the EIR and re-hearing the proposal. The MOU acknowledged that the cities Ag/urban buffer resolution would apply if the property were annexed. The resolution allowed the City to require buffers up to 200 feet wide, allow streets within the buffers, and prohibits structures (except fences) in the buffers. The buffers were to be mitigation measures to reduce the chemical, noise, dust, and vandalism conflicts that may occur between the urban and agricultural land uses.

The city produced a subsequent EIR in 1992 and LAFCo approved it in 1994 with the specific findings that the design features of the buffer presented in the EIR was the critical factor in the approval of the annexation. The project applicant was required to provide a 200-foot-wide buffer (indicated a tentative map) along all the perimeters except the southern portion where the city adjoins it and landscape at least 15 feet of the buffer with dense vegetation. An 8-foot masonry wall and row of evergreen trees within the buffer zone shall also be provided by the project applicant to further deter chemical drift and dust that may result form the nearby farming operations along with providing the City with an agreement for subsequent upkeep and maintenance of the required landscaping- provided through a homeowners association .

The City's buffer policy was subsequently updated in 2004 requiring a 200 foot agricultural setback buffer with reduction of the setback only under certain conditions for all projects. The Agriculture Buffer Policy (Res. No. 334-04) requires the buffer to be located entirely on the urban side of development and specifically addresses permitted uses within the buffer area. This was to provide concurrency with the County's agricultural buffer provisions and meet the requests of the Santa Cruz County Farm Bureau to lessen agricultural/urban conflicts. The agricultural buffer shall be put into an easement and be recorded over the entire buffer area in conjunction with a Final Map or prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. The easement shall be held by the City or a City approved non-profit conservation entity. The first 150 feet of buffer area shall be restricted open space while the remaining 50 feet can have roads and trails open to the public. The City shall also establish the mechanism (e.g. landscape lighting maintenance assessment district (LLMAD), homeowners association, etc.) for the maintenance in conjunction with its approval of any project requiring a buffer. Residents must also sign the City's Right to Farm ordinance and confirm developer/ owner disclosure responsibilities.

Additional notes from Regional Open Space Workshop CD

What is open space?

Open space is many things to many people.

Open space is best defined by the user at the time they "use" the resource. One individual could consider the land to be a working landscape such as timber or agricultural lands. Another person at the same time may consider the same land a scenic vista when viewed from their car window during a family drive. Each perspective helps to define open space but neither truly exists without the other.

For the purposes of land use planning the State defines open space in the State Government Code under Section 65560 et. seq. For the General Plan the following applies:

- Open space for the preservation of natural resources.
- Open space used for the managed production of resources
- Open space for outdoor recreation
- Open space for public health and safety

Open space is an integral part of our region's economic growth. For our region's economy to be healthy it is necessary to conserve open space. Open space enhances the region's potential to compete for high quality employers and employees

Exhibit D Matrix of Other LAFCo Ag/Open Space Policies

STATEWIDE LAFCO SELECTED AGRICULTURAL/ OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION POLICIES		
COUNTY	POLICY	STAFF COMMENTS
<p>Alameda Adopted 5/02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed project includes or plans for infrastructure capacity, especially water and sewer lines, that exceed the needs of the proposed project and may be used to serve areas not planned for development, or subject to previous and adequate CEQA review, especially those containing prime agricultural land, mineral, sensitive plant and wildlife or other important natural resources; • The proposed project may result in substantial loss of prime agricultural and open space land... or other important open space or resource land as identified in local, regional, state or federal inventories, plans or programs; • The proposed project may cause premature, ill planned, illogical, or inefficient conversion of prime agricultural, open space, mineral resource or other important resource areas not planned for development in the next five years especially when such land is not located within the SOI of a proposed service provider and there is alternative sufficient vacant land available for development; • The proposed project is substantially inconsistent with applicable SOI Plans, including any service plan or service review recommendations, phased land use plans of any city or county, or resource conservation plans of the state or federal government providing that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. In the case of public agency land use or resource plans, the affected agency provides specific information regarding the nature and substance of the project's potential impacts upon its plans or programs; • The proposed project may induce substantial growth on important agricultural and open space lands because it would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Permit the extension of, or require, infrastructure such as flood control levees or water diversions, electrical, water or sewer lines, especially trunk lines, roadways or other public facilities that would permit new development in a substantial area currently constrained from development; b. Encourage or foster development by permitting uses that adversely impact adjacent agricultural operations, significantly increase property values of adjacent or proximate resource land, or remove natural or man made buffers between urban and agricultural, mining or other conservation uses. c. Be adversely and substantially inconsistent with the agricultural, open space, resource conservation or preservation, growth management, trip reduction, air quality improvement or other plans, policies or Ordinances of the General, Community, Specific or other Plan of the land use jurisdiction responsible for the project site or vicinity. d. The proposed project, when considered in conjunction with other recent, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, may cause significant adverse cumulative impacts; e. The project would result in substantial noncontiguous urban development which, in turn, results in adverse physical impacts; f. There is no need for service and the proposed project adversely affects important public resources or the public health and safety 	<p>Sets levels of significance in CEQA review.</p> <p>Oversizing of infrastructure.</p> <p>Loss of prime ag or open space lands.</p> <p>Accelerate development ahead of SOI.</p> <p>Consistency with SOI.</p> <p>Growth inducing facilities</p> <p>Adversely impact ag operations.</p>
<p>Alameda (cont.)</p>	<p>c. Be adversely and substantially inconsistent with the agricultural, open space, resource conservation or preservation, growth management, trip reduction, air quality improvement or other plans, policies or Ordinances of the General, Community, Specific or other Plan of the land use jurisdiction responsible for the project site or vicinity.</p> <p>d. The proposed project, when considered in conjunction with other recent, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, may cause significant adverse cumulative impacts;</p> <p>e. The project would result in substantial noncontiguous urban development which, in turn, results in adverse physical impacts;</p> <p>f. There is no need for service and the proposed project adversely affects important public resources or the public health and safety</p>	<p>General Plan consistency.</p> <p>Noncontiguous development.</p> <p>Counter to public health and safety.</p>
<p>Contra Costa Adopted 2/99</p>	<p>Although not bound by policies of other agencies, it is the general policy of LAFCO to honor the limits placed on urban development by other agencies. Therefore, LAFCO generally has honored the County Urban Limit Line (ULL), discouraging sphere of influence (SOI) amendments and annexations beyond the ULL. A proposal for an SOI change or annexation of territory beyond the ULL generally will be denied unless the proponents present</p>	<p>The ULL set by 1990 voter initiative - 65% of Contra Costa set aside for open space/ ag lands and</p>

<p>Contra Costa (cont.)</p>	<p>evidence demonstrating that the need for the SOI change or annexation compellingly outweighs the public interest in limiting growth to areas within the ULL.</p> <p>While not bound by the regulations promulgated by local agencies in this County, LAFCO prefers that proponents of any boundary or SOI change demonstrate that their proposal will be consistent with such local regulations as may be relevant to the factors that LAFCO must consider pursuant to Government Code Section 56668. This policy is to include (but is not limited to) the regulations of water, sewer and transportation agencies such as the East Bay Municipal Utility District, the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, and the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority.</p>	<p>35% set aside for urban use. The line can be changed by a 4/5 vote of the Board of Supervisors.</p> <p>Proponents to demonstrate consistency with relevant affected agency regulations.</p>
<p>El Dorado Adopted 11/88 <i>Revised:</i> 9/90, 2/96, 12/96, 11/98, 7/99, 7/01</p>	<p>2.10. AGRICULTURE 2.10.1. LAFCo's decisions will reflect its legislated responsibility to work to maximize the retention of prime agricultural land while facilitating the logical and orderly expansion of urban areas (Adopted 11/5/98).</p>	<p>Also adopted CKH criteria as local policy.</p>
<p>Kings 2/99</p> <p>Kings (cont.)</p>	<p>II. KINGS CO. LAFCO POLICIES FOR REVIEWING PROPOSALS <u>D. ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT AND PRESERVATION OF OPEN SPACE:</u></p> <p>1. The Commission encourages orderly, well planned and compact urban development for all developing areas. Additionally, the Commission encourages the county, cities and special districts to develop and implement plans and policies to insure orderly, well planned and compact development, with consideration of preserving open space within the urban patterns.</p> <p>2. Development of existing vacant non-open space and non-prime agricultural land within an agency's boundaries is encouraged prior to further annexation and development.</p> <p>3. Annexation proposals of undeveloped or agricultural land shall exhibit that urban development is imminent in the proposed area; that urban development will be contiguous with existing or proposed development; and that orderly, well planned, compact development will result. Proposals resulting in leap frog, non-contiguous development patterns shall be discouraged.</p> <p><u>E. CONSERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND:</u></p> <p>1. Annexation and development of existing vacant non-open space land and non-prime agricultural land within an agency's sphere of influence is encouraged prior to development outside the sphere of influence.</p> <p>2. Proposal involving the conversion of prime agricultural land shall be contiguous to existing city boundaries, designated for urbanization in the city and county general plans and consistent with the sphere of influence.</p> <p>3. The Commission shall consider proposals for development of territory under California Land Conservation Contract if the contract was protested by the city and protest was upheld by LAFCO. However, as of January 1, 1991, Government Code Section 51243 went into effect which eliminated the city protest provision of the California Land Conservation Act. Cities may still annex Agricultural Preserve property and have the contract canceled if the contract was protested, and the protest was upheld, before 1991. New applications for Agricultural Preserve contracts may not be protested by the city and Protest Hearings before LAFCO are not necessary. Annexation of Agricultural Preserve property established after 1991 would not cancel the contract outright as in the past. Development could only occur if a Notice of</p>	<p>Encourages orderly, well planned development and compact urban development for all developing areas with consideration of preserving open space within the urban patterns.</p> <p>Infill on existing land before further annexation and development.</p> <p>Urban development on ag land must be pending in proposed area and proposals must not lead to leap frog, non-contiguous development patterns.</p> <p>Consistency with SOI.</p> <p>Agricultural Preserve property under the California Land</p>

	<p>Non-renewal is filed and the ten year contract is allowed to expire.</p> <p>4. Pursuant to Section 51243.5, LAFCO shall determine whether a city may exercise its option to not succeed to the rights, duties, and powers of a “Williamson” Act land conservation contract, and so state in its resolution approving such an annexation or reorganization. (http://www.kingslafco.com/Procedures/Lafco_Procedures.pdf)</p>	<p>Conservation Contract may be developed if protested prior to 1991.</p> <p>Have the option to not succeed Williamson Act contracts.</p>
<p>Madera Amended 11/05</p>	<p>2.10. Agriculture</p> <p>2.10.1. LAFCo’s decisions will reflect its legislated responsibility to work to maximize the retention of prime agricultural land while facilitating the logical and orderly expansion of urban area.</p> <p>2.10.3. Development or use of land for other than open space uses shall be guided away from existing prime agricultural lands in open space use towards areas containing non prime agricultural lands unless that action undermines adopted County and City land use plans (Sec. 56377 of CKH).</p> <p>2.10.4. Development of existing vacant or prime agricultural lands for urban uses within the jurisdiction or SOI of a local agency shall be encouraged before any proposal is approved which would lead to the development of prime agricultural or open space lands outside the jurisdiction or SOI of any local agency (Sec. 56377 of CKH).</p> <p>2.10.5. Land specifically identifies as prime agricultural, generally should not be approved for annexation to any city or special district for the extension of services to or through such areas if the land owner requests exclusion.</p> <p>2.10.6. Development of existing vacant lots for urban uses should be encouraged before any proposal is approved which would allow for or lead to the development of existing prime agricultural lands for non agricultural uses. SOI’s should reflect consideration for existing and/or potential prime agricultural uses.</p>	<p>Focuses mainly on CKH criteria as local policy.</p> <p>SOI consistency.</p>
<p>Marin</p>	<p>Section 1. General Policies & Standards</p> <p>B. Agricultural Lands Policies</p> <p>1.Land which is currently engaged in the substantial production of food, fiber, or livestock, or is identified as agricultural land under Williamson Act contract shall not be annexed to a city or a sanitary sewer agency for the purpose of promoting urban development. (Originally Adopted: July 13, 1977; Revised: January 13, 1983)</p> <p>2.Development of existing vacant or non-prime agricultural lands for urban uses within a city's and/or special district's jurisdiction or within a city's and/or special district's sphere of influence should be encouraged before any proposal is approved which would allow for or lead to the development of existing agricultural or open-space lands for nonagricultural or non open-space uses which are outside of the city's and/or special district's jurisdiction or outside of a city's and/or special district's sphere of influence. (Adopted July 13, 1977)</p>	<p>Williamson Act contract lands shall not be annexed for urban development.</p> <p>SOI Consistency.</p>
<p>Monterey Adopted 1979</p>	<p>Undergoing comprehensive update with focus on ag buffer language. Coordinated with County General Plan Update.</p> <p>Proposed Policies:</p> <p>1. In determining whether an annexation or incorporation proposal may affect prime agricultural land, the commission shall apply the definition of “prime agricultural land” established under Section 35046 of MORGA.</p>	<p>Staff will track process.</p>

	<p>2. Annexation or incorporation proposals which would allow or likely lead to the conversion of prime agricultural land or other open space land (as defined in Sections 35046 and 65560) to other than open space uses shall be discouraged by the Commission unless such an action would not promote the planned, orderly, efficient development of an area, or the affected land use planning jurisdiction has accomplished the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Identified within its Sphere of Influence all “prime agricultural land” as defined under Government Code Section 35046; (b) Demonstrated to LAFCO that effective measures have been adopted to preserve for agricultural use those prime agricultural lands identified in (a). Such measures may include, but not be limited to, establishing agricultural preserves pursuant to the California land Conservation Act; designating land for agricultural or other open space uses on that jurisdiction’s general plan, adopted growth management plan, or applicable specific plan; adopting an agricultural element to its general plan; and undertaking public acquisition of prime agricultural lands for the purpose of leasing back such lands for agricultural use; (c) Prezoned pursuant to Government code Section 54790(a)(3), both territory within the agency’s general planning area to be maintained for agricultural use, and also territory within the annexation area to indicate anticipated level of development. <p>3. In reviewing a proposal which will lead to the conversion of agricultural or open space land to urban use, the Commission will consider the following criteria to determine whether the proposed action would (a) adversely affect the agricultural resources of the community, or 9b) not promote the planned, orderly, efficient development of an area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The agricultural significance of the proposal area relative to other agricultural lands in the region (soil, climate, and water factors); (b) The use value of the proposal area and surrounding parcels; (c) Determination as to whether any of the proposal area is designated for agricultural preservation by adopted local plans, including Local Coastal Plans, the County General Plan, land use and Open Space Element and Growth management Policies; (d) Determination of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Whether public facilities would be extended through or adjacent to any other agricultural lands to provide services to the development anticipated on the proposal property; (2) Whether the proposal area is adjacent to or surrounded by existing urban or residential development. (3) Whether surrounding parcels may be expected to develop to urban uses within the next five years. (4) Whether natural or man-made barriers would serve to buffer the proposal area from existing urban uses. <p>4. The Commission shall encourage proposals that result in in-filling, particularly where the prime agricultural land represents a small unit and is essentially surrounded by nonagricultural land.</p> <p>5. The Commission shall discourage proposals that intrude on prime agricultural land when such intrusion would lead to the disruption of viable agricultural units and the encouragement of further urban development on such lands.</p> <p>6. Proposed annexations or incorporation of prime agricultural land shall be consistent with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) City General Plan; (b) County General Plan; 	
--	--	--

	<p>(c) Spheres of Influence (when adopted).</p> <p>7. The Commission shall encourage proposals for land uses adjacent to prime agricultural land which would result in compatible uses 99.e., green belts, greenhouses, linear parks, light industry). Similarly, the Commission shall discourage proposals which would result in less compatible uses (e.g., residential and retail commercial uses).</p> <p>(http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/lafco/AgPreserve.htm)</p>	
<p>Merced Adopted 1/02</p>	<p>Policy 3: Cities should adopt phasing policies in their General Plans which identify priorities for growth and annexation which meet the joint objectives of extending urban services in an economic and efficient manner and avoiding the premature conversion of prime agricultural lands or other valuable open space resources.</p> <p>Policy 4: Where the City and County have reached agreement on proposed sphere of</p> <p>b. Does the City’s General Plan contain policy regarding the phasing of future annexations which is consistent with the policies of Merced County LAFCO and the Cortese/Knox/Hertzberg Act?</p> <p>c. Are there local policies regarding the timing of conversion of agricultural and other open space lands and the avoidance of conversion of prime soils?</p> <p>d. Does the City’s General Plan demonstrate the present and probable need for public facilities and community services (including the sequence, timing and probable cost of providing such services) within the proposed sphere of influence boundary?</p> <p>e. Does the City’s General Plan identify the existence of any social or economic communities of interest within the planning area, such as the relationship between any adjacent or nearby cities or special districts which provide urban services, which may affect the boundaries or the proposed sphere of influence?</p> <p>Implementation: Cities that address the above referenced criteria/issues in their General Plans will have their sphere of influence amendment proposals scrutinized more thoroughly by LAFCO. The Commission shall adopt findings for each of the criteria indicating conformance with State and local LAFCO policy. Upon approval of the sphere boundary, LAFCo’s review of future annexations within this boundary will be limited to the appropriateness and efficiency of the boundary, conformance with the City’s General Plan including relevant phasing policies, and public service availability.</p> <p>However, when the Commission finds that the City’s General Plan does not satisfy one or more of the above sphere of influence criteria in accordance with State and local LAFCO policy, action on the sphere will be more limiting. Approval of an amended sphere boundary will reflect the City’s interest in the future annexation of the territory but will not represent a general acceptance of future individual annexation requests. All subsequent annexation proposals will be scrutinized against the full factors outlined in the Cortese/Knox/Hertzberg Act under Section 56668, including justification for annexing prime agricultural or other valuable open space lands when other non-prime or non-significant open space lands are available in the sphere; availability of public services; and the timing of the annexation in relation to vacant land availability within the existing City limits.</p> <p>Policy 6: Analysis of agricultural or open space impacts from an annexation will be minimized when the Commission can make a finding that these resources were fully addressed during establishment of the City’s Sphere of Influence and the annexation is consistent with any related sphere policy to</p>	<p>Largely places onus on county and cities to adopt General Plan Policies. Also encourages urban and rural special districts to adopt local policies for timing out of area contracts.</p> <p>Rely on City/County SOI agreements.</p> <p>City General Plan Phasing.</p> <p>City General Plan Timing.</p> <p>City General Plan need for services.</p> <p>City General Plan identified communities of interest.</p> <p>Implementation measure where the city General Plan addresses LAFCo criteria, provides for more extensive SOI, with phasing considerations. Lessens subsequent annexation scrutiny.</p> <p>Inadequate City General will result in more cursory SOI. Places greater scrutiny on subsequent</p>
<p>Merced (cont.)</p>		

<p>Merced (cont.)</p>	<p>protect these resources.</p> <p>Policy 7: Utilize considerations consistent with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act of 2000 when evaluating agricultural and open space impacts on an individual annexation level.</p> <p>d. Evaluate any alternatives to the annexation which would be more consistent with orderly growth, open space protection and public service efficiency goals of LAFCO.</p>	<p>individual annexations. Encourages City General Plan to establish policies.</p> <p>CKH criteria.</p> <p>Alternative analysis.</p>
<p>Nevada Adopted 4/94 Amended 10/02</p> <p>Nevada (cont.)</p>	<p>Public Interest. While the Commission is largely composed of members appointed by individual local agencies, the Legislature requires the Commissioners to exercise their independent judgment in carrying out the provisions of the Act and to make their decisions impartially, on behalf of the public as a whole. Decisions required of LAFCo relating to the most efficient form of local government and the preservation of agricultural and open space land inherently involve the balancing of potentially competing interests of cities, counties, and special districts. In addition, such determinations usually affect the public at large because of various options for the delivery of services. The legislative charge to LAFCo Commissioners is to bring their experience and perspectives to bear in a manner which carries out the best policy from the perspective of the public as a whole. Commissioners are not selected to represent or to cast the vote of their appointing agencies. While Commissioners’ decisions may be informed by their experience at their agency, those decisions must not be dictated by the interests of that agency. Since Commission members are appointed by law to impartially carry out objective policies concerning public policy issues, it is presumed that they will do so. It is for this reason that the Legislature determined that it is not an automatic conflict of interest for a Commissioner to vote on issues that may affect their appointing agency. Nevertheless, if a Commissioner feels that he or she is unable to act impartially, then the Commissioner should voluntarily disqualify himself or herself.</p> <p>N. AGRICULTURAL AND OPEN SPACE LAND CONSERVATION Among LAFCo’s core purposes is preservation of open space and prime agricultural ("ag") lands. The Commission will exercise its powers to conserve prime agricultural land as defined in Section 56064 of the Government Code and open space land as defined in Section 65560 of the Government Code pursuant to the following standards. In order to more effectively carry out this mandate, the Commission may develop local standards to define and identify prime agricultural and open space lands.</p> <p>1. Conditions for Approval of Prime Ag/Open Space Land Conversion. LAFCo will apply a heightened level of review when considering proposals for changes of organization or reorganization which are likely to result in the conversion of prime ag/open space land use to other uses and will approve such proposals only when the Commission finds that the proposal will lead to planned, orderly, and efficient development. For purposes of this standard, a proposal leads to the planned, orderly, and efficient development only if all of the following criteria are met:</p> <p>a) The land subject to the change of organization or reorganization is contiguous either to lands developed with an urban use or to lands which have received all discretionary approvals for urban development.</p> <p>b) The proposed development of the subject lands is consistent with the Sphere of Influence Plan(s) of the affected agency or agencies, including the Master</p>	<p>Policy clarifies the wearing of the "LAFCo Hat."</p> <p>The Commission may develop local standards to define and identify prime agricultural and open space lands.</p> <p>Apply a "heightened level" of review when proposals likely to result in the conversion of prime ag/open space land use.</p> <p>A proposal leads to the planned, orderly, and efficient development only if specific criteria are met:</p> <p>Contiguous to existing or approved urban development</p> <p>Consistent with the Sphere of Influence and Master Services Element</p> <p>The land subject to the change of organization is likely to be</p>

<p>Nevada (cont.)</p>	<p>Services Element(s), and the land subject to the change of organization is within the current five-year sphere of influence boundary or the ten-year boundary.</p> <p>c) The land subject to the change of organization is likely to be developed within five years. For 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.</p> <p>d) Insufficient vacant non-prime or open space land exists within the existing agency boundaries or applicable five- and ten-year sphere boundaries that is planned and developable for the same general type of use.</p> <p>e) The proposal will have no significant adverse effect on the physical and economic integrity of other ag/open space lands.</p> <p>2. Approved Sphere of Influence Plan Required. The Commission will not make the affirmative finding that the proposed development of the subject lands is consistent with the relevant sphere of influence in the absence of an approved Sphere of Influence Plan ...</p> <p>3. Finding with Respect to Alternative Sites. The Commission will not make the affirmative finding that insufficient vacant non-prime or open space land exists within the sphere of influence unless the appropriate jurisdiction has:</p> <p>a) Identified within its sphere of influence all "prime agricultural land" and "open space land."</p> <p>b) Enacted measures to preserve prime ag/open space land identified within its sphere of influence for agricultural or open space use.</p> <p>c) Adopted as part of its General Plan specific measures to facilitate and encourage in-fill development as an alternative to the development of prime ag/open space lands.</p> <p>4. Determining Impact on Adjacent Ag/Open Space Lands. In making the determination whether conversion will adversely impact adjoining prime agricultural or open space lands, LAFCo will consider the following factors:</p> <p>a) The prime ag/open space significance of the subject and adjacent areas relative to other ag/open space lands in the region.</p> <p>b) The use of the subject and the adjacent areas.</p> <p>c) Whether public facilities related to the proposal would be sized or situated so as to facilitate the conversion of adjacent or nearby prime ag/open space land or will be extended through or adjacent to any other prime ag/open space lands which lie between the project site and existing facilities.</p> <p>d) Whether natural or man-made barriers serve to buffer adjacent or nearby prime ag/open space land from the effects of the proposed development.</p> <p>e) Applicable provisions of the General Plan open space and land use elements, applicable growth-management policies, or other statutory provisions designed to protect agriculture or open space.</p>	<p>developed within five years, with phasing encouraged as feasible.</p> <p>Approved Sphere of Influence Plan Required,</p> <p>Identify all "prime agricultural land" and "open space land.</p> <p>Enact measures to preserve prime ag/open space land identified within the SOI General Plan Infill Strategy as alternative to prime ag/open space development</p> <p>Adequate natural or man-made buffers.</p> <p>Encourages General Plan agriculture, open space preservation and growth-management policies, or other statutory provisions.</p>
<p>Placer</p>	<p>Discourages speculative proposals (i.e., without a specific development plan). Require a market absorption study to determine need. Discourages "urban style development adjacent to city boundaries</p>	<p>Flexible policy, largely reliant on County General Plan – various preservation programs, Zoning, Williamson Act.</p>
<p>Riverside Adopted 12/99</p>	<p>Strategy 1.1.1 Annexation proposals covering undeveloped or agricultural parcels to cities or districts providing urban services should demonstrate that:</p> <p>1. Urban development is likely to occur within the next ten years over a substantial portion of the proposal area, and;</p> <p>2. Urban development will be contiguous with existing or proposed</p>	<p>Urbanization within ten years, contiguous to development.</p>

<p>Riverside (cont.)</p>	<p>development.</p> <p>Consistent with <i>Objective No. 3</i> and legislative intent expressed in Cortese-Knox (<i>sic</i>), this Strategy shall be implemented with due consideration for preserving open space lands within urban development patterns.</p> <p>Objective No. 2: Preserve the physical and economic integrity of agricultural lands.</p> <p>Strategy 1.2.1 City SOIs shall be directed away from substantial areas of prime agricultural land, unless:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The result would not facilitate an orderly development pattern; and, 2. The city’s general plan allows for the continued operation of agricultural uses and provides guidelines for the ultimate development of agricultural land at the time the use is terminated or development is proposed. <p>Strategy 1.2.2 LAFCO shall deny the annexation of agricultural lands unless they meet the criteria specified below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The annexation of land located within an agricultural preserve may be approved only when: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) A notice of non-renewal or cancellation has been filed on the affected property proposed for annexation, or, b) The jurisdiction’s General Plan contains appropriate language: 1) To allow for the effective and continued operation of agricultural uses, and; 2) To provide guidelines for the ultimate development of agricultural land at the time the preserve is terminated or development is proposed. <p>2. The loss of non-prime agricultural lands should not be a central issue for annexation where city or county general plans provide for urban development and the proposal would not impact the integrity of surrounding prime agricultural lands.</p> <p>Objective No. 3: Preserve open space within urban development patterns.</p> <p>Strategy 1.3.1 The Commission shall consider the preservation of open space lands as a valid reason for the annexation of undeveloped land.</p>	<p>Consider existing development patterns.</p> <p>Status of Williamson Act Contracts (non-renewal)</p> <p>General Plan has Right to Farm criteria.</p> <p>Annexation may be viable means of open space preservation.</p>
<p>Santa Barbara</p>	<p>POLICIES ENCOURAGING ORDERLY URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND PRESERVATION OF OPEN SPACE</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Commission encourages well planned, orderly, and efficient urban development patterns for all developing areas. Also, the county, cities, and those districts providing urban services, are encouraged to develop and implement plans and policies which will provided for well-planned, orderly and efficient urban development patterns, with consideration of preserving permanent open space lands within those urban patterns. 2. Development of existing vacant non open space and nonprime agricultural land within an agency's boundaries is encouraged prior to further annexation and development. However, where open land adjacent to the agencies are of low agricultural, scenic, or biological value, annexation of those lands may be considered over development of prime agricultural land already existing within an agency's jurisdiction. 3. Proposals to annex undeveloped or agricultural parcels to cities or districts providing urban services shall demonstrate that urban development is imminent for all or a substantial portion of the proposal area; that urban development will be contiguous with existing or proposed development; and that a planned, orderly, and efficient urban development pattern will result. Proposals resulting in a leapfrog, non-contiguous urban pattern will be 	<p>Promote infill with consideration of preserving permanent open space lands within urban areas.</p> <p>If open land adjacent to boundary is of low value, annexation of those lands may be considered over development of prime ag land already existing within the agencies</p>

	<p>discouraged.</p> <p>4. Consideration shall be given to permitting sufficient vacant land within each city and/or agency in order to encourage economic development, reduce the cost of housing, and allow timing options for physical and orderly development.</p> <p>POLICIES ENCOURAGING CONSERVATION OF PRIME AGRICULTURAL LANDS AND OPEN SPACE AREAS</p> <p>1. Proposals which would conflict with the goals of maintaining the physical and economic integrity of open space lands, agricultural lands, or agricultural preserve areas in open space uses, as indicated on the city or county general plan, shall be discouraged.</p> <p>2. Annexation and development of existing vacant non-open space lands, and nonprime agricultural land within an agency's sphere of influence is encouraged to occur prior to development outside of an existing sphere of influence.</p> <p>3. A sphere of influence revision or update for an agency providing urban services where the revision includes prior agricultural land shall be discouraged. Development shall be guided towards areas containing nonprime agricultural lands, unless such action will promote disorderly, inefficient development of the community or area.</p> <p>4. Loss of agricultural lands should not be a primary issue for annexation where city and county general plans both indicate that urban development is appropriate and where there is consistency with the agency's sphere of influence. However, the loss of any primer agricultural soils should be balanced against other LAFCO policies and a LAFCO goal of conserving such lands. (http://www.sblafco.org/policies.html)</p>	<p>jurisdiction.</p> <p>Urban development must be imminent and contiguous.</p> <p>General Plan consistency.</p> <p>SOI consistency.</p> <p>Guide development toward nonprime ag lands unless the action will promote disorderly, inefficient development of the area.</p>
<p>Santa Clara (Adopted 2/97)</p>	<p>POLICIES FOR GILROY AGRICULTURAL LANDS AREA</p> <p>1. LAFCO supports the City's "20 year boundary" east of U.S. 101, as it existed in 1996, and will not approve any Urban Service Area (USA) expansion request and/or reorganization proposal to the north, east or south of this portion of the 20 year boundary, except as provided in Policy No. 6 below. An additional exception to this policy would be lands needed for the specific purpose of expanding the South County Regional wastewater Authority (SCRWA) plant.</p> <p>2. LAFCO acknowledges the City's adoption of a stable 20 year boundary east of U.S. 101 to be an effective measure of protection for a significant amount of important agricultural lands east and south of Gilroy, and also acknowledges those lands within the existing 20 year boundary are less likely to remain in long term agricultural use.</p> <p>3. When reviewing proposals within the 20 year boundary east of U.S. 101 on lands that have agricultural or open space value (regardless of the City zoning designation), LAFCO may consider this boundary, together with actions taken to implement the other agricultural protection strategies of the inter-jurisdictional agreement, to be a mitigation for the loss of prime soils, agricultural land and/or open space.</p> <p>4. Urban service area expansion proposals within the 20 year boundary east of U.S. 101 must be contiguous to the current urban service area boundary, and may not include lands under current Williamson Act contract, unless the landowner has applied for non-renewal of the Williamson Act contract within the time limits prescribed in the contract.</p>	<p>Urban Service Area consistency to protect agricultural lands.</p> <p>Designated 20 year boundary agriculture lands are to remain in land term agricultural use.</p> <p>Mitigation for loss of prime soils within 20 year boundary.</p>

<p>Santa Clara (cont.)</p>	<p>5. In addition to the conditions listed above in Policy No. 4 above, LAFCO will consider City urban service area requests specifically within the 20-year boundary east of U.S. 101, as it existed in 1996, based upon, but not limited to, the following factors. The City shall provide this information at the time of application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The City's ability to provide adequate urban services without detracting from current service levels. b. Analysis of why the conversion of land to urban uses is necessary to promote planned, orderly, efficient development of the city, given the existing amount of similarly designated vacant land within the existing USA . c. The ability of school districts to provide school facilities. d. The role of special districts in providing services. e. Fiscal impacts of the proposal upon affected agencies. <p>6. If the City amends the 20-year boundary east of U.S. 101 as it existed in 1996, LAFCO will carefully consider the amendment before endorsement of the new boundary. LAFCO will not approve any City proposals outside of the 1996 boundary east of U.S. 101 unless the commission has endorsed the amended 20-year boundary. Factors to be considered, both for endorsement of an amended boundary and for any specific proposal, will include, but not be limited to, the following. The City shall provide this information at the time of application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. City's demonstration of how mitigation for previous USA expansion projects will continue to be provided, in cases where the mitigation for loss of prime agricultural land within the 20 year boundary line east of U.S. 101 depended upon the stabilization of that boundary as it existed in 1996. b. The City's participation in efforts to support the viability of agriculture business and the preservation of agricultural lands, including strategies listed in the adopted "<i>Strategies to Balance Planned Growth and Agricultural Viability.</i>" c. Whether the conversion of agricultural and other open space lands is premature, based upon the availability of other areas of vacant land having the same land use designation already within the USA. d. The ability of the City to provide adequate urban services without detracting from current service levels or incurring excessive infrastructure or services costs. e. The ability of school districts to provide school facilities. f. The role of special districts in providing services. g. Consideration of public safety hazards within the expansion area, including flood hazards. h. The impact of public facilities, such as roads, upon adjacent agricultural lands. i. Fiscal impacts upon affected agencies. <p>7. LAFCO will only consider amending the Urban Service Area every twelve months, in keeping with previously established LAFCO Policies And Guidelines. The City may submit several requests in one application, and may combine requests in the Gilroy Agricultural Lands Area with proposals from other portions of the city for consideration. As with any urban service area expansion proposal, each geographic area will be considered separately.</p>	<p>Proposals must be contiguous to current urban service boundary and may not include Williamson Act contracts unless the land owner has applied for a non-renewal of the contract.</p>
<p>San Francisco</p>	<p>2.1. <u>APPLICATION PROCESS</u> 2.14. Applicants will be required to provide information adequate to permit LAFCO to fully consider all factors required by law including, but not limited</p>	

	<p>to the following (§56668, §56375):</p> <p>d. 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 open space conservation policies and priorities set forth in Section 56377.</p> <p>e. Effect of the proposal on maintaining the physical and economic integrity of agricultural lands as defined by Section 56016.</p> <p><u>3. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE</u></p> <p>3.55. Spheres of influence for cities and districts will promote the long term preservation and protection of San Francisco's open space resources. (http://www.sfgov.org/site/lafco_index.asp?id=5224)</p>	
San Joaquin	<p>Has not adopted any specific policies with regard to agricultural preservation. Adhere to CKH.</p>	<p>Working with County Planning to develop community separator policies.</p>
Santa Cruz	<p>Santa Cruz LAFCO Policy 3.2 - Infill</p> <p>LAFCO shall encourage the urbanization of vacant lands and non-prime agricultural lands within an agency's jurisdiction and within an agency's sphere of influence before the urbanization of lands outside the jurisdiction and outside the sphere of influence, and shall encourage detachments of prime agricultural lands and other open space lands from cities, water districts, and sewer districts if consistent with the adopted sphere of influence of the affected agency.</p> <p>Standard 3.2.2</p> <p>Proposals involving urbanization of prime agricultural lands within adopted spheres of influence shall not be approved unless it can be demonstrated that (a) there is insufficient land in the market area for the type of land use proposed, (b) there is no vacant land in the subject jurisdiction available for that type of use.</p>	<p>The best unwritten practice [they] have is a long-term commitment by elected officials to be very stingy with allowing urbanization of ag. land. The County has a referendum from 1978 prohibiting the conversion of commercial ag lands to urban uses, and the City of Watsonville has an initiative from 2002 setting up an urban growth boundary that uses little, but not much, prime ag land. For the last 30 years the majority of the LAFCO Commissioners have shared these values and have been stingy with approving ag. land annexations. This political consensus is better than good policies. Most recently, LAFCO approved a 90-acre annexation</p>
Santa Cruz (cont.)		

		of prime ag. land to the City of Watsonville. It is consistent with the city voter-approved urban growth boundary, and, in order to get LAFCO's approval, the landowners are recording a covenant that the property will be used for a business park and not converted to residential or certain commercial uses that can be accommodated on in-fill sites within the remainder of the city limits. – Patrick McCormick E.O.
San Mateo	San Mateo LAFCo has not adopted specific policies. They rely on appropriate sections of CKH and consistency with county general plan policies regarding agriculture and open space.	
Sonoma Amended 6/04	<p>7. Agricultural Lands In addition to considering the policies and priorities set forth in Government Code Section 56377 (see Appendix A of these policies), this Commission shall conform to the following policies in reviewing and approving or disapproving proposals which may result in the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses:</p> <p>A. The Commission shall consider whether the proposal would adversely affect the County's agricultural resources based on the following factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Agricultural significance of the subject territory and adjacent areas relative to other agricultural lands in the region. (2) Use of the subject territory and adjacent areas. (3) Whether public facilities for proposed development would be a) sized or situated so as to facilitate conversion of adjacent or nearby agricultural land, or b) extended through agricultural lands which lie between the project site and existing facilities. (4) Whether uses incompatible with adjacent agricultural uses are expected to result from the proposal and whether natural or man-made barriers would buffer adjacent or nearby agricultural lands from the effects of proposed development or other incompatible uses. (5) Whether the subject territory is located within the sphere of influence of a city or district providing sewer and/or water service or within an "Urban Service Boundary" designation of the Sonoma County General Plan. (6) Provisions of applicable general plan open space and land use elements, growth management policies, or other statutory provisions designed to protect agriculture. 	<p>Consider impacts on countywide ag resources.</p> <p>CKH Criteria</p> <p>Consider County General Plan USB.</p> <p>Consider applicable annexing agency General Plan</p>
Sonoma (cont.)		

	<p>B. The Commission shall discourage proposals which would likely convert to urban uses those lands identified by the County General Plan as suitable for long-term agricultural or open space use or identified by the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District Acquisition Plan as a priority for acquisition or protection in cooperation with willing landowners.</p> <p><u>7.1. Territory Subject to Williamson Act Agricultural Preserve Contract</u></p> <p>A. Proposals establishing or amending spheres of influence and/or annexations for territory with an existing Agricultural Preserve Contract shall be prohibited, unless the annexing agency protested the establishment of the contract and it was upheld by LAFCO.</p> <p>B. Notwithstanding the provision of subsection "a", the Commission may approve the inclusion of territory subject to the Agricultural Preserve Contract within the sphere of influence of a city or special district able to provide urban services if it complies with all of the following criteria:</p> <p>(1) The landowner has filed a notice of non-renewal with the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors.</p> <p>(2) The contracted territory is being phased out of Agricultural Preserve and there are no more than five (5) years remaining in the term of the contract.</p> <p>This Commission hereby requests the Board of Supervisors of Sonoma County to initiate discussions with the cities in the county regarding development of the following:</p> <p>1) Guidelines for the protection of community separators.</p> <p>2) Joint intercity community separator agreements to protect the rural, agricultural, and open-space lands between cities.</p> <p>3) Procedures providing for some flexibility in changing the form and location of community separators, provided there is no net loss of separator acreage and any agreed-to core separator acreage remains intact within the community separators.</p> <p>4) Support for the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District's acquisition and preservation of community separators as its highest priority in its soon-to-be adopted acquisition plan.</p> <p>5) Procedures for transferring development rights from land within the community separators to existing under-utilized urban areas of the county to protect the open-space character of community separators.</p>	<p>policies and programs.</p> <p>Support local Open Space District.</p> <p>LAFCo requests Board of Supervisors to initiate city community separator discussions.</p> <p>Procedure for Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)</p>
<p>Sutter</p>	<p>Has not adopted any specific policies with regard to agricultural preservation. Adhere to CKH.</p>	<p>Defer to local land use agencies – county and two cities.</p>

<p>Yolo Adopted 1/06</p>	<p><u>II. Policy Statement</u> A. Agriculture is a vital and essential part of the Yolo County and economy and environment. Agriculture shapes the way Yolo County residents and visitors view themselves and the quality of their lives. Accordingly, boundary changes for urban development should be proposed, evaluated, and approved in a manner, which, to the fullest extent feasible, is consistent with the continuing growth and vitality of agriculture within the county.</p> <p><u>III. Policy Guidelines</u> A. To promote the policy statement, proposals shall be reviewed based on the following considerations: 1. Existing developed areas should be maintained and renewed. 2. Vacant land within developed areas should be developed before agricultural land is annexed for non-agricultural purposes. 3. Land substantially surrounded by existing agency boundaries should be annexed before other lands. 4. Urban development should be restricted in agricultural areas. For example, agricultural land should not be annexed for nonagricultural purposes when feasible alternatives exist. 5. The continued productivity and viability of agricultural land surrounding existing communities should be promoted, by preventing the premature conversion of agricultural land to other uses and, to the extent feasible, minimizing conflicts between agricultural and other land uses. 6. Development near agricultural land should not adversely affect the economic viability or constrain the lawful, responsible practices of the agricultural operations. B. In considering the completeness and appropriateness of any proposal, the Executive Officer and this Commission may require proponents and other interested parties to provide such information and analysis as, in their judgment, will assist in an informed and reasoned evaluation of the proposal in accordance with this policy. C. No change of organization shall be approved unless it is consistent with the Spheres of Influence of all affected agencies. D. Where feasible, non-prime land should be annexed before prime land. E. A land's current zoning, pre-zoning or land use designation is one of the factors the Commission will consider in determining whether mitigation will be required for the loss of agricultural land. A land's zoning, pre-zoning or designation in the city's or County's general plan does not automatically exempt it from mitigation. F. The Commission encourages local agencies to adopt policies that result in efficient, coterminous and logical growth patterns within their general plan and sphere of influence areas and that encourage protection of prime agricultural land in a manner that is consistent with this Policy. G. The Commission encourages the maintenance of agricultural inter-city buffers between the cities. The Commission encourages the cities and the County to formalize and strengthen existing, but non-binding, agreements maintaining agricultural buffers H. The Commission encourages local agencies to identify the loss of prime agricultural land as early in their processes as possible, and to work with applicants to initiate and execute plans to mitigate for that loss, in a manner that is consistent with this Policy, as soon as feasible. Local agencies may also adopt their own agricultural conservation policies, consistent with this Policy, in order to better meet their own circumstances and processes. I. Unless otherwise provided in this Policy, the provisions of this Policy shall apply to all proposals requiring approval by the Yolo County Local Agency</p>	<p>Agriculture is vital and essential to Yolo County residents, the economy and environment.</p> <p>Maintain and renew existing developed areas.</p> <p>Restrict development in existing agriculture areas.</p> <p>Promote productivity and viability of agricultural land surrounding existing communities; minimize conflicts between agricultural and other land uses.</p> <p>Potential impact analysis required for proposals.</p> <p>SOI consistency.</p> <p>Non prime agricultural land should be annexed first when feasible.</p> <p>General Plan consistency.</p> <p>Encourages agricultural inter-city buffers between cities.</p>
---	---	---

<p>Yolo (cont.)</p>	<p>Formation Commission, including but not limited to, any proposal for approval of a change of organization, reorganization, or out-of-agency service agreement.</p> <p>J. This Policy applies to proposals of both public agencies and private parties. However, the Commission recognizes that there are significant differences between public agencies and private parties. In light of those differences, in some circumstances it may not be appropriate to require mitigation for the loss of prime agricultural land as would otherwise be required by this Policy. A fundamental difference is that public agencies are generally responsible to the electorate, while private parties are not. Public agencies are also generally required to provide Constitutionally or statutorily (or both) mandated services. In addition, a public agency is generally required, by law or policy considerations, to locate its facilities within its boundaries, while a private party has no such constraints. Public agencies are also generally subject to Constitutional or statutory constraints (or both) on their ability to raise revenues. Public agencies often experience increases in demand for services that are not (and often cannot) be accompanied by equivalent increases in revenues. In light of these and other fiscal constraints that are currently imposed upon public agencies, a mitigation requirement could result in an additional cost to a public agency that it is unable to recoup by increasing its revenues, which in turn could impair the agency's ability to provide its Constitutionally and statutorily mandated services. In addition, unlike private parties, public agencies are often exempt from the land use controls and regulations of other public agencies, despite the fact that the activities of the former occur within the boundaries of the latter. Although a public agency might request input from other local agencies, it is not necessarily bound by or required to follow their local planning requirements. As a result, a public agency's development or construction activities may not be subject to the same degree of control as a private party, and it might not learn of a mitigation requirement until after it has completed significant portions of the planning processes that are required by law. Based upon the foregoing factors, the Commission concludes that, in the case of proposals that are undertaken exclusively for the benefit of a public agency, the Commission should review the applicability of the mitigation requirements set forth in this Policy on a case-by-case basis to determine the appropriateness of requiring mitigation in any particular case.</p>	<p>Identify prime agricultural land loss prior to proposals.</p> <p>The policy applied to both public and private proposals.</p>
<p>Yolo (cont.)</p>	<p><u>IV. Policy Standards and Implementation</u></p> <p>A. Detachment of prime agricultural lands and other open space lands shall be encouraged if consistent with the sphere of influence for that agency.</p> <p>B. Annexation of prime agricultural lands shall not be approved unless the following factors have been considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is insufficient marketable, viable, less prime land available in the subject jurisdiction for the proposed land use. 2. The adoption and implementation of effective measures to mitigate the loss of agricultural lands, and to preserve adjoining lands for agricultural use to prevent their premature conversion to other uses. Such measures may include, but need not be limited to: the acquisition and dedication of farmland, development rights, open space and conservation easements to permanently protect adjacent and other agricultural lands within the county; participation in other development programs (such as transfer or purchase of development rights); payments to responsible, recognized government and non-profit organizations for such purposes; the establishment of open space and similar buffers to shield agricultural operations from the effects of development. 	<p>SOI consistency.</p> <p>Annexation may occur if there is insufficient marketable, viable, less prime land available.</p> <p>Mitigation required for annexation of agricultural lands.</p>

<p>Yolo (cont.)</p>	<p>C. Annexation for land uses in conflict with an existing agricultural preserve contract shall be prohibited, unless the Commission finds that it meets all the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The area is within the annexing agency's sphere of influence. 2. The Commission makes findings required by Government Code Section 56856.5. 3. The parcel is included in an approved city specific plan. 4. The soil is not categorized as prime. 5. Mitigation for the loss of agricultural land has been secured at least at a 1:1 ratio of agricultural easements for the land lost. 6. There is a pending, or approved, rescission for the property that has been reviewed by the local jurisdictions and the Department of Conservation. 7. The property has been non-renewed if still awaiting rescission approval. <p>D. Less prime agricultural land generally should be annexed and developed before prime land is considered for boundary changes. The relative importance of different parcels of prime agricultural land shall be evaluated based upon the following (in a descending order of importance):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Soil classification shall be given the utmost consideration, with Class I or II soil receiving the most significance, followed by the Storie Index Rating. 2. Consideration shall also be given to the land's economic viability for continued agricultural use. <p>E. LAFCO will approve a change of organization which will result in the conversion of prime agricultural land in open space use to other uses only if the LAFCO finds that the proposal will lead to planned, orderly, and efficient development. The following factors shall be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contiguity of the subject land to developed urban areas. 2. Receipt of all other discretionary approvals for changes of boundary, such as rezoning, environmental review, and service plans as required by the Executive Officer before action by LAFCO. <p>If not feasible before LAFCO acts, the proposal can be made contingent upon receipt of such discretionary approvals within not more than one (1) year following LAFCO action.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Consistency with existing planning documents of the affected local agencies, including a service plan of the annexing agency or affected agencies. 4. Likelihood that all or a substantial portion of the subject land will develop within a reasonable period of time for the project's size and complexity. 5. The availability of less prime land within the sphere of influence of the annexing agency that can be developed, and is planned and accessible, for the same or a substantially similar use. 6. The proposal's effect on the physical and economic viability of other agricultural operations. In making this determination, LAFCO will consider the following factors: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The agricultural significance of the subject and adjacent areas relative to other agricultural lands in the region. b. The existing use of the subject and adjacent areas. c. 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 which lie between the project site and existing facilities. d. Whether natural or man-made barriers serve to buffer adjacent or nearby 	<p>Annexation in conflict with an existing agricultural preservation contract is prohibited unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the SOI • Specific plan consistency • Not categorized as prime soil • Mitigated with a 1:1 ratio • There is an approved conservation rescission for the property <p>Less prime land should be annexed first and evaluated based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Storie Index Rating • Land's economic viability <p>Approval will result if the proposal leads to planned, orderly, and efficient development.</p> <p>Must be contiguous to existing urban areas.</p>
<p>Yolo (cont.)</p>		

<p>Yolo (cont.)</p>	<p>agricultural land from the effects of the proposed development.</p> <p>e. Provisions of the General Plan’s open space and land use elements, applicable growth management policies, or other statutory provisions designed to protect agriculture. Such provisions may include, but not be limited to, designating land for agriculture or other open space uses on that jurisdiction's general plan, adopted growth management plan, or applicable specific plan; adopting an agricultural element to its general plan; and acquiring conservation easements on prime agricultural land to permanently protect the agricultural uses of the property.</p> <p>f. The establishment of measures to ensure that the new property owners shall recognize the rights of adjacent property owners conducting agricultural operations and practices in compliance with the agricultural zone in accordance with the Right to Farm Ordinance adopted by the Yolo County Board of Supervisors.</p> <p><u>F. Agricultural Mitigation</u></p> <p>1. Except as expressly noted in subsection 8 below, annexation of prime agricultural lands shall not be approved unless one of the following mitigations has been instituted, at not less than a 1:1 replacement ratio:</p> <p>a. The acquisition and dedication of farmland, development rights, and agricultural conservation easements to permanently protect adjacent and other agricultural lands within the County.</p> <p>b. The payment of fees that are sufficient to fully fund the acquisition and maintenance of such farmland, development rights or easements. The per acre fees shall be specified by a Fee Schedule or Methodology, which may be periodically updated at the discretion of the Commission (Refer to the Yolo County LAFCO “Payment In Lieu Fee Methodology”).</p> <p>c. Any such measures must preserve prime agricultural property of reasonably equivalent quality and character that would otherwise be threatened, in the reasonably foreseeable future, by development and/or other urban uses.</p> <p>2. The loss of fewer than twenty (20) acres of prime agricultural land generally shall be mitigated by the payment of in lieu fees as mitigation rather than the dedication of agricultural conservation easements. The loss of twenty (20) acres or more of prime agricultural land generally may be mitigated either with the payment of in lieu fees or the dedication of agricultural conservation easements. In all cases, the Commission reserves the right to review such mitigation on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>3. If an applicant provides agricultural easements to satisfy this requirement, the easements must conform to the following characteristics:</p> <p>a. The land used to mitigate the loss of prime agricultural land must also be prime agricultural land as defined in this Policy and the Cortese-Knox Hertzberg Act (Government Code 56000 et. seq.).</p> <p>b. In addition, it must also be of reasonably equivalent quality and character as the mitigated land as measured using both of the following methodologies:</p> <p>(i). Average Storie Index – The USDA calculation methodology will be used to calculate the average Storie Index score. The mitigating land’s average Storie Index score shall be no more than 10% less than the mitigated land’s average Storie Index score.</p> <p>(ii). Land Equivalency and Site Assessment ("LESA") Model – The LESA calculation shall be in accordance with the methodology adopted by this Commission. The mitigating land’s LESA score shall be no more than 10% below the mitigated land’s LESA score</p> <p>4. As a general rule, the Commission will not accept, as mitigation required by this Policy, an agricultural conservation easement or property that is "stacked" or otherwise combined with easements or property acquired for habitat</p>	<p>Impact analysis required.</p> <p>Right to Farm Ordinance</p> <p>Mitigation required for loss of prime agricultural land.</p> <p>Loss of fewer than twenty acres of prime agricultural land may be mitigated by the payment of in lieu fees or the dedication of agricultural conservation easements.</p> <p>Easements must be reasonable equivalent in quality.</p>
--------------------------------	---	--

<p>Yolo (cont.)</p>	<p>conservation purposes, nor for any other purposes that are incompatible with the maintenance and preservation of economically sound and viable agricultural activities and operations. The Commission retains the discretion to make exceptions on a case-by-case basis, based upon the following criteria:</p> <p>a. Whether the applicant made a good-faith effort to mitigate separately for the loss of habitat in accordance with the Yolo County Habitat/Natural Community Conservation Plan process but such efforts were infeasible, and</p> <p>b. Whether the proposed "stacked" mitigation for the loss of prime agricultural land and habitat involves one of the following, whichever results in the greatest acreage of preserved land:</p> <p>(i). Mitigation at a ratio of no less than 2:1 for the loss of prime agricultural soils; or</p> <p>(ii). Mitigation at a ratio of no less than 1:1 for the loss of all agricultural lands in the proposal area; or</p> <p>(iii). The property subject to the agricultural conservation easement is larger than the proposal area, meets the conditions specified in this Policy, and encompasses a complete field, legal parcel, or farm line.</p> <p>5. The presence of a home on land that is subject to an agricultural conservation easement is generally incompatible with the maintenance and preservation of economically sound and viable agricultural activities and operations on that land. The presence or introduction of a home may diminish the value of the agriculture conservation easement as mitigation for the loss of prime agricultural land. Consequently, an agricultural conservation easement will generally not be accepted as mitigation for the loss of prime agricultural land if the easement permits the presence of a home, except an existing home that has been present on the proposed easement for at least twenty-five (25) years, or construction of a comparable replacement for such a home. Exceptions to this section of the Policy may be granted by the Commission on a case-by-case basis if the homesite is less than two acres and if the applicant can provide sufficient evidence that a homesite on the agriculture conservation easement is necessary to further the goals of maintaining and preserving economically sound and viable agricultural activities and operations on that easement.</p> <p>6. LAFCO favors the use of a local non-profit agricultural conservation entity or the regional branch of a nationally recognized non-profit agricultural conservation entity as the easement holder. The Commission will use the following criteria when approving the non-profit agricultural conservation entity for these purposes:</p> <p>a. Whether the entity is a non-profit organization that is either based locally or is a regional branch of a national non-profit organization whose principal purpose is holding and administering agricultural conservation easements for the purposes of conserving and maintaining lands in agricultural production;</p> <p>b. Whether the entity has a long-term proven and established record for holding and administering easements for the purposes of conserving and maintaining lands in agricultural production;</p> <p>c. Whether the entity has a history of holding and administering easements in Yolo County for the foregoing purposes;</p> <p>d. Whether the entity has adopted the Land Trust Alliance's "Standards and Practices" and is operating in compliance with those Standards; and</p> <p>e. Any other information that the Commission finds relevant under the circumstances. A local public agency may be an easement co-holder if that agency was the lead agency during the environmental review process. LAFCO also favors that applicants transfer the easement rights or in lieu fees directly to the recognized non-profit agricultural conservation entity in accordance with</p>	<p>Use LESA model for mitigated land.</p> <p>Easement "stacking" is prohibited but the commission retains the discretion to change this based on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>A agricultural conservation easement will generally not be accepted as mitigation measure if a home is permitted unless the home has existed for at least twenty-five years.</p>
--------------------------------	---	--

<p>Yolo (cont.)</p>	<p>that entity's procedures. The Commission retains the discretion to determine whether the agricultural conservation entity identified by the applicant and the local lead agency has met the criteria delineated above.</p> <p>7. The Commission prefers that mitigation measures consistent with this Policy be in place at the time that a proposal is filed with the Commission. The loss of prime agricultural land may be mitigated before LAFCO action by the annexing city, or the County of Yolo in the case of a district annexation, provided that such mitigation is consistent with this Policy. LAFCO will use the following criteria in evaluating such mitigation:</p> <p>a. Whether the loss of prime agricultural land was identified during the project's or proposal's review process, including but not necessarily limited to review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act;</p> <p>b. Whether the approval of the environmental documents included a legally binding and enforceable requirement that the applicant mitigate the loss of prime agricultural land in a manner consistent with this Policy; and</p> <p>c. Whether, as part of the LAFCO application, an adopted ordinance or resolution was submitted confirming that mitigation has occurred, or requiring the applicant to have the mitigation measure in place before the issuance of either a grading permit, a building permit or final map approval for the site.</p> <p>8. As noted in III (J) of this Policy, the Commission has concluded that, in the case of proposals that are undertaken exclusively for the benefit of a public agency, the Commission should review the applicability of the mitigation requirements set forth in this Policy on a case-by-case basis to determine the appropriateness of requiring mitigation in any particular case. In making such a determination, the Commission will consider all relevant information that is brought to its attention, including but not limited to the following factors:</p> <p>a. Whether the public agency had any significant, practical option in locating its project, including locating the project on non-prime or less prime agricultural land.</p> <p>b. Whether the public agency is subject to or exempt from the land use regulations of another public agency.</p> <p>c. Whether the public agency identified the loss of agricultural land as an environmental impact during the project's review, including but not limited to California Environmental Quality Act review, and, if so, whether it adopted a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" for that impact.</p> <p>d. When the public agency learned of the agricultural conservation mitigation requirements of the Commission's Policy or that of another public agency (whether or not it was subject to that agency's land use control).</p> <p>e. Whether the public agency could reasonably have allocated or obtained sufficient revenues to provide for some or all of the mitigation required by this Policy if it had learned of that requirement before submitting its proposal to this Commission.</p> <p>f. Whether the public good served by the public agency's proposal clearly outweighs the purposes served by this Policy and its mitigation requirements.</p> <p>g. Whether the proposal is necessary to meet the immediate needs of the public agency. If the Commission determines that it is not appropriate to require mitigation for the loss of agricultural land resulting from a public agency's proposal, or to require less mitigation than otherwise prescribed by this Policy, it shall adopt findings, and a statement of overriding considerations if applicable, supporting that determination.</p> <p><u>Payment In Lieu Fee Methodology</u> In lieu of the dedication of agricultural conservation easements that would otherwise be required by the Agricultural Conservation Policy, the Commission may permit the payment of fees as set forth in this Schedule to</p>	<p>Use a local, or a regional branch of a nationally recognized, non-profit agricultural conservation entity as the easement holder.</p>
<p>Yolo (cont.)</p>	<p>Mitigation measures consistent with this policy must be in place prior to proposal filing with the Commission.</p>	

<p>Yolo (cont.)</p>	<p>fully fund the acquisition and maintenance of farmland, development rights or agricultural conservation easements.</p> <p>Per Acre Mitigation Fee No less than 35% of the average per acre price for full and unencumbered fee title price in the last five (5) unimproved land purchases plus a five percent (5%) endowment of the cost of the easement, and the payment of the estimated transaction costs associated with acquiring an easement. The purchases must be within the general vicinity of the annexing entity and of a size equal to or greater than the total acreage of prime soils within the subject territory. Payment of the In Lieu Fee is to be made directly to an agricultural conservation entity that meets the criteria set forth in Section IV(F)(6) of the Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission's Agricultural Conservation Policy. The agricultural conservation entity receiving these funds must present to the Commission a letter stating its intention to use these funds for the acquisition of farmland, development rights or agricultural conservation easements in Yolo County whose prime soils are reasonably equivalent to the proposal area's soils and that the location of the easements will be within the general vicinity of the annexing entity and in an area within the County of Yolo that would otherwise be threatened, in the reasonably foreseeable future, by development and/or other urban uses.</p>	
--------------------------------	---	--

Definition of Open Space

Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Section 56059 defines Open Space:

Open space means any parcel or area of land or water which is substantially unimproved and devoted to an open-space use, as defined in Section 65560.

Planning, Zoning & Development Law Section 65560 further defines Open Space:

- a. "Local open-space plan" is the open-space element of a county or city general plan adopted by the board or council...."
- b. "Open-space land" is any parcel or area of land or water which is essentially unimproved and devoted to an open-space use as defined in this section, and which is designated on a local, regional or state open-space plan as any of the following:

(1) Open space for the preservation of natural resources including, but not limited to, areas required for the preservation of plant and animal life, including habitat for fish and wildlife species; areas required for ecologic and other scientific study purposes; rivers, streams, bays and estuaries; and coastal beaches, lakeshores, banks of rivers and streams, and watershed lands.

(2) Open space used for the managed production of resources, including but not limited to, forest lands, rangeland, agricultural lands and areas of economic importance for the production of food or fiber; areas required for recharge of ground water basins; bays, estuaries, marshes, rivers and streams which are important for the management of commercial fisheries; and areas containing major mineral deposits, including those in short supply.

(3) Open space for outdoor recreation, including but not limited to, areas of outstanding scenic, historic and cultural value; areas particularly suited for park and recreation purposes, including access to lakeshores, beaches, and rivers and streams; and areas which serve as links between major recreation and open-space reservations, including utility easements, banks of rivers and streams, trails, and scenic highway corridors.

(4) Open space for public health and safety, including, but not limited to, areas which require special management or regulation because of hazardous or special conditions such as earthquake fault zones, unstable soil areas, flood plains, watersheds, areas presenting high fire risks, areas required for the protection of water quality and water reservoirs and areas required for the protection and enhancement of air quality.

Definition of Agricultural Land Designations

Government Code Section 56016 defines Agricultural Land:

Agricultural lands means land currently used for the purpose of producing an agricultural commodity for commercial purposes, land left fallow under a crop rotational program, or land enrolled in an agricultural subsidy or set-aside program.

Government Code Section 56064 defines Prime Agricultural Land:

"Prime agricultural land" means an area of land, whether a single parcel or contiguous parcels, that has not been developed for a use other than an agricultural use and that meets any of the following qualifications:

(a) Land that qualifies, if irrigated, for rating as class I or class II in the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service land use capability classification, whether or not land is actually irrigated, provided that irrigation is feasible.

(b) Land that qualifies for rating 80 through 100 Storie Index Rating.

(c) Land that supports livestock used for the production of food and fiber and that has an annual carrying capacity equivalent to at least one animal unit per acre as defined by the United States Department of Agriculture in the National Handbook on Range and Related Grazing Lands, July, 1967, developed pursuant to Public Law 46, December 1935.

(d) Land planted with fruit or not-bearing trees, vines, bushes, or crops that have a nonbearing period of less than five years and that will return during the commercial bearing period on an annual basis from the production of unprocessed agricultural plant production not less than four hundred dollars (\$400) per acre.

(e) Land that has returned from the production of unprocessed agricultural plant products an annual gross value of not less than four hundred dollars (\$400) per acre for three of the previous five calendar years.



Sacramento
LAFCo

SACRAMENTO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
1112 I Street, Suite 100 • Sacramento, CA 95814 • (916) 874-6458 • Fax (916) 874-2939



Call for Presentations

Sacramento LAFCo invites agriculture/habitat and open space preservation interests to participate in a Spring Workshop. We are updating our Agriculture/Open Space Policies. Our Commission is interested in hearing about your success stories - and lessons learned.

If you are interested in attending or presenting please contact:

Don Lockhart, AICP

Assistant Executive Officer

Sacramento LAFCo

916.874.2937

916.874.2939 (FAX)

Donald.Lockhart@SacLAFCo.org

(The proposed Open Space and Prime Agricultural Land Preservation Policies for Evaluating Sphere of Influence and Annexation Proposals (12-03) may be reviewed at www.SacLAFCo.org)