City of Greenfield

CITY HALL: P.O. Box 127 / 45 El Camino Real / Greenfield, California 93927
(831) 674-5591 FAX (831) 674-3149
CORPORATION YARD: (831) 674-2635 FAX (831) 674-3259

August 11, 2006

Kate McKenna
Executive Officer
Monterey County Local Agency Formation Commission
P.O. Box 1369
Salinas, CA 93901

Subject: City of Greenfield Sphere of Influence Update

Dear Kate:

Thank you again for meeting with City staff last year and working through the preliminary application process with us. We are now prepared to move forward with our formal application as is outlined in this letter and attachments.

Background

The City of Greenfield has been working on an update to its General Plan since 2002. The General Plan and proposed SOI were adopted by the City Council on May 31, 2005 and subsequently, an addendum was adopted on August 8, 2006 in combination with a separate Sphere of Influence modification and General Plan Amendment on the south side of town (Southend SOI Amendment Project). As you are aware, LAFCO of Monterey County is familiar with the City of Greenfield's planning process through our regular communication. The City presented a draft SOI boundary to the Commission in 2003 and a pre-application in August of 2005. The boundary has changed to address some of LAFCO's concerns and to accommodate a different SOI boundary to the south, but the overall size of the SOI is very similar to what was presented for discussion in 2003. As we have discussed on several occasions, the City understands that LAFCO prefers that cities develop a "citywide" boundary rather than piecemeal amendments. The additional time and effort the City has spent is due to this preferred process.

Key Issues

The City's General Plan update addressed several key issues that are of primary concern to LAFCO. These issues include:

Agricultural Land Conversion. The City of Greenfield is surrounded by prime agricultural land. The City recognizes that planned growth in any direction will

result in conversion of land that is currently in production as vineyard or row crops. For this reason, the City has planned a compact development pattern with a substantial amount of medium, high, and mixed use densities to house Greenfield's growing population. The City Council found this development pattern, which builds off the City's existing downtown area, to be a superior alternative to traditional, sprawling suburban development.

The City has also recognized the more productive lands to the east. For this reason the SOI and City limits extend only to 2nd Street, as discussed with the Commission in 2003. As we discussed last year, additional modifications were made to the southern SOI boundary to avoid the most productive lands to the south.

Artisan Agriculture/Visitor Serving Land Use. Of the 1,400 acres in the City's planning area subject to potential future conversion, approximately half of that acreage is either part of the approved Yanks Air Museum, is within the "ag friendly" AAVS designation, or is subject to the City's Residential Reserve overlay. The AAVS designation limits development to only 5% of total site area, encourages continued agriculture and uses compatible with agriculture, and promotes agricultural tourism.

Agricultural/Urban Interface. The City of Greenfield is sensitive to potential conflicts between our agricultural economy and new residential development. Along the City's eastern boundary, a 200-foot land use setback is required to separate new development from active agriculture. This setback has been successfully implemented by new projects along 2nd Street. In other areas of the City that are growing, Greenfield continues to use roadways and other physical landmarks to maximize separation between uses.

Provision of Public Services. The City has been updating its Capital Improvement Plans for water and sewer service on a parallel track with the General Plan. Phased expansion of these systems is currently permitted and underway, and the City has updated its impact fees to address the cost of these systems over time. The General Plan is also very specific regarding the provision of new public services within the Planning Area, and the responsibility of new development to provide infrastructure directly or appropriate fees for those services. The City's planning and policy directives in this area will ensure there are no gaps in service as the City of Greenfield grows.

Population-Projections. The General Plan Update provides a balance of residential and job-generating land uses over a time frame of approximately 20 years. For analysis purposes, the General Plan and EIR assumed a "maximum" development scenario, whereby every acre of land was assumed to be occupied by the maximum number of units, occupied by the maximum number of residents. This conservative analysis estimated the City's future population at approximately 36,000. The Southend SOI project will also be adding approximately 1,134 people in the residential portion of the project. From the City's experience in implementing development proposals, however, the "net"

development yield for a given project is typically lower once developable acreage is needed for roads, schools, parks, public facilities and easements. The "net" development scenario for recent projects in the City has resulted in unit yields up to 25% lower than the maximum allowable density. When predicting population growth based on actual development patterns, a population of about 27,000 can be expected. This rate of growth is directly consistent with AMBAG population projections for Greenfield.

Sphere of Influence "Southern Addition"

During the General Plan update process the City had continuing discussions with property owners at the south end of the existing City limits. The City believes that additional acreage in this area straddling Highway 101 is a logical extension to the SOI boundary approved by the City Council on May 31, 2005. The City did not, however, want to delay the rest of the city-wide planning process. For this reason, the City advised the property owners to submit a separate application, including separate environmental review, for the City's consideration. This process moved forward over the past year, and this property is now included in the City's application to amend the SOI. This property is shown on the maps provided in this package. This additional area, totaling approximately 171 acres, is primarily job-generating land uses and will have little affect on the City's projected population. An agreement to exchange acreage currently under Williamson Act contract has also been executed, resulting in no net impact to existing acreage protected by those contracts. The boundary to the south has changed somewhat since the pre-application in 2005 to address LAFCO's concerns regarding agricultural conversion and to accommodate a repositioned SOI boundary, resulting in very little change to the SOI acreage as proposed last year while avoiding conversion of the most productive farm land.

The City appreciates the time spent by the Commission and agencies reviewing this application. We would be pleased to answer any questions that may arise throughout the process. Please feel free to contact me or Tad Stearn at PMC at 831-644-9174 if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

CITY OF GREENFIELD

Anna A Vega

Anna Vega
City Manager

c: April Wooden, Community Development Director, City of Greenfield
Mark McClain, Public Works Director/Building Official/Planning Manager, City of Greenfield

Suzan Ehdaie, Associate Planner, City of Greenfield
Tad Stearn, Planning Consultant, PMC

Attachments:

Monterey County LAFCO SOI Amendment Application Form
City of Greenfield Resolution Approving GP and EIR
City of Greenfield Resolution Approving GPA Amendment and Addendum
City of Greenfield Resolution Approving the Southend SOI Project and EIR
GP Figure 2-1, City of Greenfield Planning Boundaries (with Southern Addition)
GP Figure 2-3, General Plan Land Use Diagram (with Southern Addition)
City of Greenfield 2005-2025 General Plan Final EIR
City of Greenfield 2005-2025 General Plan Amendment and Addendum
Southend SOI Project EIR
Southend SOI Project Final EIR

MONTEREY COUNTY

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
(831) 754-5838 P.O. BOX 180, SALINAS, CALIFORNIA 93902

KATE McKENNA, AICP
Executive Officer

JUSTIFICATION OF PROPOSAL/ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION/
PLAN FOR PROVIDING SERVICES
August 2006

1. GENERAL INFORMATON

a. Describe each requested action, i.e. annexation, detachment, etc. affecting a city or special district:

The project consists of an amendment to update the Sphere of Influence (SOI) for the City of Greenfield. The SOI would be updated to include a total of approximately 1,400 acres of land outside of the incorporated boundaries of the City of Greenfield. The attached Figures show the existing and proposed SOI, which was approved by the Greenfield City Council on May 31, 2005 as part of the City's General Plan Update and as amended to include the Southend SOI project on August 8, 2006 .

b. Check the method by which this proposal was initiated:

Resolution of Application **X** Petition _____

c. List names(s) of applicant (chief petitioner/contact person):

Mark McClain, Building Official/Planning Manager
City of Greenfield
45 El Camino Real
Greenfield, CA 93927
(831) 674-5591

d. Describe the subject territory (general location, topography, land use):

As shown in General Plan Figures 1-2 and 2-3 and the amended 2-3, the affected territory for the proposed SOI update includes an area of land north of the city limits, east of and adjacent to U.S. Highway 101; lands east of the city limits south of Thorne Road and west of Second Street; an area southeast of the city limits, south of Elm Avenue to Espinoza Road, part way to Second Street and adjacent to and east of U.S. Highway 101; an area southwest of the city limits, south of Elm Avenue; and lands on

both sides of 13th street between Walnut Avenue and Elm Avenue. The amendment would expand the existing sphere of influence by approximately 1,400 acres. Existing land uses are agricultural in nature, with row crops and vineyards predominating. Please refer to General Plan Figure 2-4 for existing land uses.

e. Indicate and justify the reason the proposed action has been requested:

The City of Greenfield is responsible for establishing a Sphere of Influence that will provide enough land for growth over the next 20 years. This application would allow implementation of the recently adopted *City of Greenfield General Plan 2005-2025* and associated amendments designed to accommodate anticipated growth over the next 20 years With LAFCO approval of the SOI, the City will be able to consider larger, more logical annexation actions rather than piecemeal proposals by individual property owners. In accordance with LAFCO policy, the proposed SOI is sensitive to the City's primary growth constraints which include the protection of existing vineyards, prime agricultural land, and existing Williamson Act lands from development. The boundary for the selected SOI stops at Second Street on the east side of the City in order to preserve the most productive agricultural land adjacent to the City.

f. Have the affected local agencies been notified?

Yes __**X**__ No _____ If yes, what was the response?

All local agencies have been notified about the project. The following agencies received a copy of the Draft EIR (or a notice that the Draft EIR was available) prepared for the General Plan Update and for the Southend SOI project:

1. **State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research**
2. **Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)**
3. **County of Monterey Planning and Building Inspection**
4. **County of Monterey Agricultural Commissioner**
5. **City of Soledad**
6. **King City**
7. **Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC)**
8. **Monterey County Water Resources Agency**
9. **Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control District**
10. **Monterey County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)**
11. **California Department of Fish and Game (Monterey Office)**
12. **Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD)**
13. **California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS)**
14. **Greenfield Unified School District**
15. **King City Joint High School District**
16. **Greenfield Fire Protection District**

17. Clark Colony Water Company
18. Monterey County Clerk
19. Monterey County Environmental Health Department
20. Regional Water Quality Control Board
21. Butch Lindley, Monterey County Supervisor – District #3

Any concerns expressed by responsible and concerned agencies, were considered during preparation of the Draft EIRs. The entire Final EIR for both the General Plan and the Southend SOI project are attached.

g. List any conditions, which may be imposed as a part of the proposal.

The General Plan was prepared with environmental factors in mind, and is intended to be self-mitigating to the extent possible through its policies and implementation measures.

h. The affected territory included within this proposal constitutes **approximately 1,400** acres.

i. Population:

1) Estimated population in the subject area:

The subject area is predominantly agricultural by nature and contains approximately 40 residences within the proposed SOI. Assuming 4.0 persons per household, the estimated current population of the proposed SOI area is approximately 160 persons.

2) Proximity to other populated area:

The project site surrounds and adjoins the City of Greenfield. According to 2004 AMBAG population projections the population of the City is approximately 15,000.

Has a survey of the property owners/registered voters within the subject area been conducted?

Yes _____ No __X_____ If yes, what are the results?

The property owners and registered voters within the affected area have not been directly contacted regarding the Sphere of Influence amendment. However, the General Plan Update process was just completed during which significant public input and deliberation occurred.

2. LAND USE AND ZONING

a. Indicate the existing land use (include residential density):

Existing land uses are generally agricultural by nature, with row crops and vineyards predominating. The following table details existing land uses within existing City limits and across the proposed SOI.

Land Use	City Limits	Future Growth Area	Total
Residential Estate	30.31	114.40	**144.91**
Low Density Residential	381.87	0.00	**381.87**
Medium Density	61.26	12.76	**74.02**
High Density	17.77	0.00	**17.77**
Neighborhood	0.36	0.00	**0.36**
Downtown Commercial	17.94	0.00	**17.94**
Highway Commercial	14.19	0.00	**14.19**
Professional Office	3.63	0.00	**3.63**
Light Industrial	30.42	0.69	**31.11**
Public Quasi Public	197.07	2.08	**199.15**
Recreation and Open	4.41	19.11	**23.52**
Agricultural	155.27	1169.04	**1,324.31**
Vacant	110.61	13.74	**124.35**
Mixed Use	29.15	0.00	**29.15**
TOTAL	**1,054.26**	**1331.82**	**2386.28**

b. What is the affected city's general plan designation for the territory in question, if applicable?

The *City of Greenfield General Plan 2005-2025* designates a variety of land uses for the affected area, as shown in Figure 2-3 amended to include the Southend SOI project.

c. What is Monterey County's general plan designation and zoning.

The Monterey County General Plan designation for the affected area is Farmlands (40 Acre Minimum), with a zoning of "F/40" or Farmlands, 40 acre minimum.

d. What is the proposed future land use?

Proposed land uses are listed below by acreage and distribution within existing city limits and the expanded SOI, as proposed in this application.

Land Use - Overlay	City Limits	Future Growth Area*	Total
Residential Estate	0.00	69.09	**69.09**
Residential Estate - Reserve	0.00	65.68	**65.68**
Low Density Residential	392.05	151.45	**523.50**
Low Density Residential - Reserve	0.00	42.13	**42.13**
Medium Density Residential	198.70	95.32	**294.02**
Medium Density Residential - Reserve	0.00	43.17	**43.17**
High Density Residential	20.10	0.00	**20.10**
Neighborhood Commercial Center	2.32	5.08	**7.40**
Downtown Commercial – Mixed Use	22.61	0.00	**22.61**
Downtown Commercial – Mixed Use - Gateway	10.86	0.00	**10.86**
Highway Commercial – Mixed Use	5.93	0.00	**5.93**
Highway Commercial – Mixed Use - Gateway	13.11	0.00	**13.11**
Highway Commercial – Regional Center Design	63.48	90.01	**153.49**
Professional Office – Mixed Use	22.44	0.00	**22.44**
Artisan Agricultural and Visitor Serving	0.00	205.38	**205.38**
Artisan Agricultural and Visitor Serving -	0.00	113.39	**113.39**
Artisan Agricultural and Visitor Serving - Reserve	0.00	107.77	**107.77**
Light Industrial	2.38	36.94	**39.32**
Light Industrial – Industrial Park	89.98	0.00	**89.98**
Highway Industrial	0.00	296.30	**296.30**
Public Quasi Public	201.34	60.00	**261.34**
Recreation and Open Space	8.96	49.11	**58.07**
TOTAL	**1,054.26**	**1,410.82**	**2,465.08**

* Future Growth Area Acreage includes Projected School Acreage (60 acres) and Community Park Acreage (30 Acres) Not Specifically Identified on the Land Use Diagram.

e. Has the area been prezoned? No **X**

f. Amount and use of publicly owned land in the area:

There is minimal publicly owned land in the proposed SOI area. Public lands include road rights of way and utility lands.

g. Could the proposal serve to encourage development of presently undeveloped areas or increase the intensity of development of already developed areas?

Yes **X** No _____

If yes, please comment:

The proposed project is the Update of the City SOI and it is anticipated that these lands will eventually be annexed by the City of Greenfield for urban uses in the future,

resulting in the direct inducement of development of a presently undeveloped area. Potable water, wastewater collection services, and other utility improvements would be extended to annexations within the SOI. However, such facilities will not be extended into areas not planned for future development. The project may also be a significant economic catalyst as areas within the SOI would eventually be annexed and developed for commercial, industrial and residential uses resulting in significant job growth.

h. Describe any special land use concerns:

None.

i. Does the proposal area include any prime agricultural land?

Yes. As detailed in General Plan Figure 7-3, most of the amended Sphere of Influence contains prime agricultural land.

j. Will the proposal result in the conversation of agricultural land to nonagricultural uses?

Yes. The project will result in the eventual conversion of Prime Farmland to urban uses. However, the Greenfield General Plan attempts to minimize this conversion through Goals, Policies and Programs that will promote the long term viability of agriculture within and without the SOI.

k. Describe any cultivated lands adjacent to the proposal.

A description and distribution of cultivated lands can be found in Figure 7-3 of the General Plan. In general, the City is surrounded by prime farmland under cultivation for the production of row crops and grapes.

l. Has the agency adopted an agricultural preservation policy?

The affected agencies have adopted agricultural preservation policies as found in the Monterey County and City of Greenfield General Plans, The City of Greenfield Right to Farm Ordinance, and the Monterey County Right to Farm Ordinance. Greenfield's "Artisan Agriculture / Visitor Serving" land use designation also serves to protect agriculture.

m. Does the affected area include any agricultural preserves (including Williamson Act contracts)?

The affected area contains isolated pockets of land subject to land conservation contracts, as demonstrated in General Plan Figure 7-3. The majority of this acreage is within lands designated as residential reserve or artisan agriculture, and as such is not

anticipated to convert to urban uses in the near future. Land conservation contracts exist on large tracts of land surrounding the City in all directions and provide a formidable constraint on future growth outside of the proposed SOI."

3. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL INTERESTS:

a. Do residents within the proposal area use facilities or programs provided by the local agency? Please give source of this information.

Since the proposed SOI is immediately adjacent to the City of Greenfield, area residents commonly use park and recreation facilities and other city facilities on a regular basis. New Development areas are planned to include new facilities. (Source: Mark McClain, Building Official/Planning Manager)

b. Do residents within the proposal area make any trips to the affected local agency for shopping, recreation, work, or other purposes? Please give source of this information (Tax data, etc.)

Being situated immediately adjacent to Greenfield and approximately 10 miles from the next closest commercial center or town, residents within the enlarged sphere of influence can be expected to shop, work, recreate and perform other regular activities in the City of Greenfield. (Source: Mark McClain, Building Official/Planning Manager)

c. Do residents participate in agency activities such as service organizations?

Unknown.

d. Do the city and proposal area share the same mailing address and zip code?

Yes.

e. Briefly describe any other factors demonstrating interdependence of the city and proposal area.

The expansion area for the Sphere of Influence is adjacent to the City of Greenfield and area residents must use city streets for access to other areas. The nearest other cities are Soledad to the north and King City to the south., approximately ten miles from the project site. Practically speaking, future residents of the proposed sphere will likely look to the City for programs, recreation, employment and shopping opportunities.

f. Will the proposal provide new employment opportunities? If so, please explain.

This project will not directly provide new employment opportunities as a specific development project is not proposed at this time. However, job growth will result as the General Plan and designated growth areas have been designed to promote economic development, especially with the addition of the Southern SOI Project. The proposal would make possible the development of new industrial and commercial land uses that will provide a variety of employment options in those sectors. New residential land uses will provide indirect opportunities for employment of maintenance workers, landscapers and other domestic employees. Additionally, the construction of homes, businesses, a new school and other structures will provide short term construction related employment.

g. Please list any related public approvals required for the project including local, State, and Federal agencies.

City of Greenfield approval is required and has been given. The City Council has certified and adopted the Final Impact Report and approved a resolution on May 31, 2005 to adopt the General Plan, August 8, 2006 to adopt the General Plan Amendment and Addendum, and August 8, 2006 to Approve the Southend SOI project and EIR. This amendment would implement these projects and is consistent with that approval. Future annexations of areas within the proposed SOI will be required as development proposals are made.

4. <u>SPHERES OF INFLUENCE:</u>

a. Please indicate whether the proposal is consistent with adopted spheres of influence for any affected local agencies.

Yes, the proposed project is itself the update of the Sphere of Influence for the City of Greenfield, and is consistent with that approved in the Greenfield General Plan 2005-2025 on May 31, 2005.

b. If not, please describe the inconsistency and any overriding considerations

Not applicable.

5. <u>EXTENSION OF SERVICE REQUESTS</u>

A service extension is not a part of this application.

6. <u>ENVIRONMENTAL:</u>

On May 31, 2005 the Greenfield City Council adopted a resolution certifying an Environmental Impact Report for the Greenfield 2005-2025 General Plan. Expansion of the Sphere of Influence was a component of the General Plan and as such was examined in the

document. A copy of the Final EIR and certifying resolution are included in this application packet. Subsequently, on August 8, 2006 the City Council adopted a resolution certifying an Environmental Impact Report for the Southend SOI Project and another resolution adopting an EIR Addendum to the General Plan EIR.

7. SERVICES

General

a. Estimate, to the best of your ability, the effect of the proposal on:

1) Cost of governmental services:

The proposed sphere of influence amendment will not immediately impact the present cost of government services. However, future costs of service delivery will increase as portions of the Sphere are annexed and developed over the next 10 – 20 years.

2) Adequacy of governmental services:

According to the Municipal Services Review for the Central and Southern Salinas Valley, Water and Wastewater Capital Improvement Plan updates, and the Greenfield General Plan 2005-2025 EIR, existing governmental services are adequate. However, additional personnel, equipment and facility capacity will eventually be required as as annexations within the proposed SOI are built out over the next 10 – 20 years.

b. What revenue will the affected local agency require to provide service to the proposed territory and how will the affected agencies receive this additional revenue?

The resultant increases in service costs will be funded in part through the City's general fund, which relies on property taxes, sales taxes, other annual revenues, development impact fees, and dedications. Development impact fees will also play a major role in funding capacity expansion and will be imposed in accordance with adopted fee programs and infrastructure master plans.

c. Describe those additional governmental services which will be required which are not presently provided.

Generally, the same governmental services that are currently provided will continue to be provided subsequent to approval of the SOI amendment by LAFCO. In most cases, services that are currently provided by the County will be provided by the City following annexation. The most significant upgrade in services will be the extension of potable water, wastewater and circulation improvements. At the time of development the property owner/applicant will be required to design and construct

such improvements, and/or pay their fair share, to adequately serve the project area, in accordance with City specifications.

d. Will the proposal require services from any agency or district which is currently operating at or above 75% of design capacity, including sanitation, police, fire, or water?

Yes __**X**__ No _____ If yes, please explain.

The City's wastewater system is currently operating at almost 90% of permitted capacity. This situation is not expected to persist as a capacity expansion project is currently underway that will essentially double the current treatment capacity from 1.0 million gallons a day (MGD) to 2.0 MGD.

<u>Sewer Service</u>

e. Provide a map, which depicts the affected agency's sewer system in the immediate area.

Please refer to the *City of Greenfield Wastewater System Capital Improvement Plan* Update (December, 2004) for a map of wastewater services and additional information regarding system capacity.

f. Briefly describe the agency's sewer system, including but not limited to treatment plant(s) and number of service connections.

The City of Greenfield is served by a municipal wastewater collection and treatment system. The system includes approximately 110,000 feet of gravity sewer, ranging from six to 24-inch diameter, and generally flows from west to east. Wastewater flow discharges into a treatment plan located at the end of Walnut Avenue approximately 1. 5 miles east of Second Street. The existing monthly average and peak treatment volume of the wastewater system is 0.87 MGD and 1.42 MGD respectively.

g. Briefly describe any present or proposed service agreements with other jurisdictions that would affect the area.

None.

h. What is the agency's present sewage treatment capacity and outfall capacity?

1.0 MGD. However, the City of Greenfield has recently been approved by the RWQCB for a capacity increase to 2.0 MGD. The City has completed Phase 1 of a 3 phase expansion project, with phases 2 and 3 currently undergoing environmental review.

i. What is the agency's projected sewage treatment capacity and outfall capacity?

The Regional Water Quality Control Board requires local jurisdictions to apply for additional permit capacity when flows reach 80 percent of permit limits. This threshold has already been exceeded. The City of Greenfield has been approved for a waste discharge permit to increase treatment capacity of its current maximum average monthly treatment volume from 1.0 MGD to 2.0 MGD. The main trunk has a capacity of 5 million gallons/day.

j. What major sewer facilities and/or expansions of existing facilities are being considered to meet anticipated demand within the proposal area?

The City of Greenfield will expand it's treatment facility in accordance with the approved waste charge permit increase issued by the RWQCB. The City charges sewer impact fees and these fees were updated based on the results of the City of Greenfield *Wastewater System Capital Improvement Plan Update* (December 2004). The project is consistent with the Water and Sewer Mater Plan and is expected to provide sufficient capacity well into the future, though capacity may be exceeded if and when the City approaches full build out of the current General Plan.

k. How will the facilities discussed above be financed?

An EDA Public Works Grant is funded in the amount of $2,200,000 and a contribution from the City's sewer and water funds in the amount of $1,000,000, including, in part, funding provided by development impact fees.

Fire Protection

l. Please show the location of the nearest existing proposed fire stations.

Please refer to General Plan Figure 4-1 (Location of Public Services).

m. What does the agency consider to be an acceptable fire response time within its jurisdiction?

According to the *Municipal Services Review*, Existing fire protection services within the City and in the outlying rural areas are currently provided by the Greenfield Rural Fire Protection District (GRFPD). the GRFPD responded to between 160 and 180 calls last year. Statistics on the types of calls and response times were not available

n. What are the response times to the proposal area?

Response times vary. See 3m.

n. What is the existing Insurance Service Office (ISO) rating for the proposal area?

The GRFPD is currently rated as a "6" on the ISO scale.

o. Would additional stations, equipment, and staffing be needed to serve the proposal area?

Anticipated growth resulting from annexations from within an enlarged SOI may lead to a doubling of existing population and commercial/industrial lands. As a result new facilities and staffing will be required to service the expected increase in calls for service.

p. How would the items be financed?

The costs of providing additional fire protection services will be funded through the GRFPD, which presently relies on property taxes (approximately 34%), benefits assessments (42%), and impact fees (16%). These revenues are expected to increase as a result of development in the project area. As with all other public services, General Plan Policies call for fair share financing through new development to offset the cost of additional fire protection service needs.

q. Does the California Department of Forestry or U.S. Forest Service provide fire protection for this area?

The GRFPD has a mutual aid agreement for emergency response from area fire departments and, when necessary, receives assistance from the Monterey County Fire Department as well as the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

r. What automatic or mutual aid agreement or service contracts have been signed that may effect the proposal territory?

The GRFPD has a mutual aid agreement for emergency response from area fire departments and other community fire departments within the Salinas Valley including Gonzales and Arroyo Seco.

s. Please describe any problems that might be encountered in providing this service to the proposal area.

No problems are anticipated.

Water Service

u. Provide a map, which depicts the water system in this area.

Please refer to the *City of Greenfield Water System Capital Improvement Plan Update* (December, 2004) for a map of the water system and additional details regarding the Water System.

v. Briefly describe the water system, including but not limited to treatment plants, storage facilities, interagency connections, and the number of service connections.

The City of Greenfield's existing transmission and distribution waterlines vary in diameter from four inches to 16 inches. The distribution system consists of over 17 miles of transmission and distribution mains made of cast iron, asbestos cement, plastic (C-900), and in a few cases, steel. The system is pressurized, and pressure is maintained with the use of variable frequency drive pumps located at Thirteenth Street and Oak Avenue.

The sole source of supply are the City's existing wells. Greenfield's municipal water receives only light chlorinating at each well site. The Oak Avenue Reservoir, a 1.0 million-gallon reservoir located at Thirteenth Street and Oak Avenue, is kept full at all times. By maintaining a relatively constant water level in the reservoir, the wells are also operated to meet peak demands and fire flows.

Well No. 1 is the primary water supply for the City of Greenfield. Well No. 2 has been capped off due to nitrates. Well No. 3 has also been concrete filled and abandoned. Well No. 4 is no longer in service. Well No. 5 is usually in use at the same time that Well No. 1 operates. Well No. 6, located adjacent to Well No. 1, alternates with Well No. 1, to prevent impacts from a combined drawdown effect of both pumping simultaneously. There are currently 2,550 service connections that draw an average daily flow of 1.6 MGD and a peak daily flow of 3.2 MGD.

w. Describe any factors, which could limit the delivery capacity of the agency (i.e. storage capacity, transmission lines, etc.)

None, though system capacity will need to be expanded as discussed below.

x. Will any major system expansions be necessary to serve the proposal area?

The City's *Water System Master Plan Update* (December 2004) estimates that water demand at full buildout could increase from an average daily flow of 1.6 to 5.3 MGD, and a peak daily flow from 3.2 to 10.7 MGD. To achieve the projected future demand, additional source capacity of about 5.4 MGD would be required. The 2004/2005 City Budget has provided funds for a new well and 1.0 MG storage tank at

the City's Corporation Yard. With the addition of this well and reservoir, the City expects sufficient water production for approximately 14 years.

y. How will any expansions be financed?

Project applicants will be required to design and construct water delivery system improvements to adequately serve the entire annexation area, in accordance with City specifications for such improvements. In addition, project applicants will be subject water system impact fees set forth in the City's *Water System Master Plan Update* (December 2004).

z. Does the proposal have the potential to degrade surface water, reduce water quality, or limit downstream availability?

No. Provisions are in place to protect water quality in the city, groundwater is the source of potable water supply and local urban runoff is captured in basins.

<u>Flood Control Service</u>

aa. Is the project within a 100-year floodplain?

No. According to FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps the proposed SOI is not located with a 100-year flood zone.

bb. Is the area within the Monterey County Flood Control District?

No.

cc. Are any major flood control facilities planned in this area? How will these items be financed?

Not applicable.

<u>Law Enforcement</u>

dd. Please submit a map showing the location of the nearest existing and proposed police/sheriff stations.

Please refer to General Plan Figure 4-1 (Location of Public Services).

ee. What does the agency consider to be acceptable police response time?

According to the *Municipal Services Review* the City Police Department does not currently have a means of accurately measuring response time. However, the

Department believes that the present level of service is adequate.

ff. What are the response times for the proposal area?

The City of Greenfield has a mutual aid agreement with the County of Monterey Sheriff's Department and, currently, the Sheriff's Department patrols the project site, as well as other areas outside of the City limits. Response time for areas patrolled by the Sheriff's Department are not available as response time is dependent on where an officer is in their patrol when a call is received. Due to the proximity of the SOI to the Greenfield Police Department, it is reasonable to expect that response times will decrease.

gg. Would additional stations, facilities, and staffing be needed to service the affected area?

Additional facilities and staff will be required to service the potential buildout area resulting from the proposed Sphere of Influence amendment. Up to 23 additional officers, staff and patrol vehicles may be needed to maintain levels of service. Greenfield is in the process of planning a new Police Facility in downtown. The new facility will have a secured parking facility and a new holding facility. Other capabilities may include an emergency operations center, locker rooms, training facilities and an impound yard.

hh. How would these items be financed?

The cost of providing additional services to the project area would be funded through the City's general fund, which relies on property taxes, sales taxes, impact fees and other annual revenues. The new Police Station / Community center is being financed through a redevelopment agency bond.

ii. Please describe any problems the agency might encounter in providing this service to the proposal area.

None.

Circulation

jj. Briefly describe access between the city and the proposal area, if applicable.

The proposed annexation area is located immediately adjacent to the City of Greenfield on all four directional sides. U.S. Highway 101 provides regional access to the City of Greenfield and the project site and bisects the City into west and east halves. A limited interchange is located at the intersection of the freeway with Walnut Avenue. The City's roadway network is comprised mainly of collector streets forming a grid with blocks of approximately 300-feet by 600-feet bisected by alleys.

The enlarged Sphere of Influence is accessible via collector streets that extend the grid pattern onto adjacent farmland.

kk. What major circulation improvements are needed to serve the proposal area?

The existing roadway network will not support the range and intensity of land uses proposed for the Sphere of Influence. An expanded roadway network, including increased capacity expansion of existing roads, will be necessary as portions of the Sphere of Influence are annexed and developed.

ll. How would the maintenance and construction of these improvements be financed?

The cost of maintenance and construction would be funded in part through the City's general fund, which relies on property taxes, sales taxes, transportation impact fees and other annual revenues. Policies in the General Plan require regular revisions of the Capital Improvement plan to include planned transportation maintenance and upgrades, and that development shall construct or pay in-lieu fees for new roadways or roadway improvements prior to or concurrent with development.

Park and Recreation Service

mm. Please describe the potential impacts of the change of organization on park and recreation programs.

The potential doubling of the population of the city over the next 20 years could significantly impact the need for park and recreation facilities.

oo. Do the proposed/existing land use plans include parklands?

The 2005-2025 General Plan plans for increased park and recreational open space at a standard of 3.9 acres per 1,000 residents of which 1.5 acres/1000 would be provided for neighborhood parks, 2 acres/1,000 for community parks, and 0.4 acres/1,000 for open space, greenbelts, recreation areas or joint use facilities. While specific locations have not yet been developed, policies exist requiring the dedication of parklands or the payment of in-lieu fees concurrent with development.

pp. Are any lands of historical significance included within the proposal area?

Yes, known and possibly undiscovered archaeological sites exist within the affected area. Future environmental analysis in conjunction with annexations and development proposals will determine more accurately the extent of historical resources. Appropriate mitigation will be prepared to conserve such resources.

Other Services

qq. Please address any other significant service issues.

None.

7. FURTHER INFORMATION:

a. Any other information, comments, or jurisdiction you wish to make that may be helpful in the Commission's review if the proposal?

No further information.

Signed: _____ Date:_____

Mark McClain, Building Official / Planning Manager