

## City Council Report

915 I Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor

Sacramento, CA 95814

[www.cityofsacramento.org](http://www.cityofsacramento.org)

---

**File ID:** 2019-01602

November 19, 2019

**Public Hearing Item 14**

---

**Title: Parkview Project and Natomas Crossing Area 2 & 3 Project – Development Agreement Amendment (P19-050) [Passed for Publication 11/05/2019; Noticed 11/08/2019; Published 11/08/2019]**

**Location:** 2621 San Juan Road; 3575 Airport Road; 3949 Truxel Road; District 1

**Recommendation:** Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion: 1) adopt a Resolution adopting the Environmental Exemption (Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) – No Significant Effect); 2) adopt an Ordinance to approve the third Amendment to City Agreement No. 97-100 (North Natomas Development Agreement) between the City of Sacramento and Alleghany Properties, LLC; 3) adopt an Ordinance to approve the fourth Amendment to City Agreement No. 2002-041 (North Natomas Development Agreement) between the City of Sacramento and Alleghany Properties, LLC; and 4) find that the project site is within an area for which the local flood management agency has made adequate progress on the construction of a flood protection system that will result in flood protection equal to or greater than the urban level of flood protection in urban areas for property located within a flood hazard zone, intended to be protected by the system, as demonstrated by the SAFCA Urban level of flood protection plan, adequate progress baseline report, and adequate progress toward an urban level of flood protection engineer's report accepted by City Council Resolution No. 2016-0226 on June 21, 2016 and the SAFCA 2019 Adequate Progress Annual Report accepted by City Council Resolution No. 2019-0398 on October 22, 2019.

**Contact:** Jose Quintanilla, Assistant Planner, (916) 808-5879; Teresa Haenggi, Senior Planner, (916) 808-7554, Community Development Department

**Presenter:** Jose Quintanilla, Assistant Planner, (916) 808-5879, Community Development Department

**Attachments:** *(See List on Next Page)*

**Attachments:**

- 1-Description/Analysis
- 2-Background
- 3-Resolution: CEQA Exemption
- 4-Ordinance: Development Agreement No. 97-100 Third Amendment
- 5-Exhibit A: Third Amendment to City Agreement 97-100
- 6-Ordinance: Development Agreement No. 2002-041 Fourth Amendment
- 7-Exhibit A: Fourth Amendment to City Agreement 2002-041
- 8-Map of Parcels Impacted by Amendments to Agreements No. 97-100 and 2002-041
- 9-List of APNs Impacted by Amendments to Agreements No. 97-100 and 2002-041

## Description/Analysis

**Issue Detail:** This is a request to amend City Agreement No. 97-100 (Natomas Crossing Area 2 & 3 Development Agreement) and City Agreement No. 2002-041 (Parkview Development Agreement) between the City of Sacramento and Alleghany Properties, LLC. The applicant is requesting to amend these agreements to vest the 2008 North Natomas Financing Plan Update and Process (Resolution No. 2009-341), which accomplished the following: established a new procedure for adjusting the amount of the Public Facilities Fee in North Natomas, revised procedures for changing the mix of public improvements financed by these fees, and limited the increase of the North Natomas Development Fee to a maximum of 15% per year.

*Public/Neighborhood Outreach and Comments:* As part of the application review process, the proposal was routed to Preservation Sacramento, Walk Sacramento, Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates, Region Builders, Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS), Natomas Chamber of Commerce, North Natomas Community Association, Natomas Community Association, Witter Ranch Community Alliance, and North Natomas Community Coalition. Staff also mailed hearing notices to all property owners within 500 feet of the project site and posted the site prior to the public hearing. At the time of writing this report, staff has received no comments expressing support or opposition to this project.

**Policy Considerations:** The Parkview and Natomas Crossing Development Agreements were adopted when the 1988 General Plan was in place. The General Plan policies discussed below were in place in the 1988 General Plan and were carried over to the 2035 General Plan. Staff finds that the project is consistent with the following General Plan goals and policies:

### *North Natomas Community Plan*

Goals and policies of the North Natomas Community Plan supported by this project:

**Policy NN.LU 1.4 Financing Plan.** The City shall ensure that the Financing Plan will provide assurance that all essential infrastructure and public facilities (necessary for public health, safety, welfare, and education) are in place and operational to serve each phase of development.

**Policy NN.LU 1.5 Financing Plan.** The City shall require all property owners in the Plan area to: 1) participate equitably in the financing mechanisms necessary to finance the design, engineering, and construction of all library, fire, police, street, traffic, water, sewer, drainage improvements and all monitoring programs provided for in this Plan, and 2) pay an equitable

share of all the costs incurred in the process of development of the Financing Plan. Guarantees for this shall be via development agreements or other means acceptable to the City staff. All property owners in North Natomas will be required to reimburse the City in an equitable manner for all planning expenses incurred in developing this Community Plan and related documents. The costs will be divided equally by each acre receiving urban land use designations by this Plan. Payment of this cost will be a condition of the development agreements.

*These development agreements, No. 97-100 and No. 2002-041, were entered into between the City of Sacramento and the Landowner prior to the adoption of the 2008 North Natomas Financing Plan Update and Process. Amending this development agreement vests the procedures adopted by Council in 2009, and included in all standard North Natomas development agreements, which established a new procedure for adjusting the amount of the Public Facilities Fee in North Natomas, revised procedures for changing the mix of public improvements financed by these fees, and limited the increase of the North Natomas Development Fee to a maximum of 15%. This amendment is consistent with financing plan goals for North Natomas that pertain to the equitable participation in these financing mechanisms that fund essential infrastructure and requirements for these guarantees via development agreements. These amendments amend these new mechanisms which are part of all current development agreements.*

**Economic Impacts:** Not applicable.

**Environmental Consideration:** The current proposal requests amending the Development Agreements to incorporate new procedure for adjusting the amount of the Public Facilities Fees as approved by Council on May 26, 2009. The Community Development Department, Environmental Planning Services Division has reviewed this project and determined that this is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The activity is covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects that have the potential to cause a significant effect on the environment. "Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA." (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15061(b)(3).)

**200-Year Flood Protection:** State Law (SB 5) and Planning and Development Code chapter 17.810 require that the City must make specific findings prior to approving certain entitlements for projects within a flood hazard zone. The purpose is to ensure that new development will have protection from a 200-year flood event or will achieve that protection by 2025. The project site is within a flood hazard zone and is an area covered by SAFCA's Improvements to the State Plan of Flood Control System, and specific findings related to the level of protection have been incorporated as part of this project. Even though the project site is within a flood hazard

zone, the local flood management agency, SAFCA, has made adequate progress on the construction of a flood protection system that will ensure protection from a 200-year flood event or will achieve that protection by 2025. This is based on the SAFCA Urban level of flood protection plan, adequate progress baseline report, and adequate progress toward an urban level of flood protection engineer's report that were accepted by City Council Resolution No. 2016-0226 on June 21, 2016 and the SAFCA 2019 Adequate Progress Annual Report accepted by City Council Resolution No.2019-0398 on October 22, 2019.

**Sustainability:** Not applicable.

**Commission/Committee Action:** On October 10, 2019, the Planning and Design Commission held a public hearing on the Parkview Project and Natomas Crossing Area 2 & 3 Project – Development Agreement Amendment project and passed a motion (10-0-2) to forward a recommendation of approval to City Council for all entitlements.

**Rationale for Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval for the subject amendments to these agreements between the City of Sacramento and Alleghany Properties, LLC. Staff finds that the proposed amendments are consistent with (1) the policies of the 1988 General Plan, the 2035 General Plan, and the North Natomas Community Plan; and (2) the provisions of the 2008 North Natomas Finance Plan update in that it ensures that developers benefit from changes made to the Finance Plan approved in 2009.

**Financial Considerations:** There is no impact to the general fund. The North Natomas Public Facilities Fee (PFF) is paid by landowners and developers. The amendment to the agreements will authorize the city to collect a PFF that is appropriate to costs, land uses, and need.

**Local Business Enterprise (LBE):** No goods or services are being purchased under this report.

Figure 1 – Map of Parcels Affected by Amendments to Development Agreements No. 97-100 and 2002-041



## **Background Information**

On May 22, 1997, the Planning Commission approved the Tentative Master Parcel Map and Tentative Map for the Natomas Crossing PUD areas and forwarded recommendation of approval to the City Council for a Development Agreement, a General Plan Amendment, a Community Plan Amendment, a Rezone, and PUD Designation for development associated with the project (P96-083).

On June 24, 1997, the City Council approved City Agreement No. 97-100 (Ordinance 97-040) for the North Natomas Development Agreement between the City of Sacramento and Alleghany Properties, Inc. (succeeded by Alleghany Properties, LLC) that involves land designated under Natomas Crossing PUD (Areas 2 and 3).

On March 7, 2002, the City Council approved City Agreement No. 2002-041 (Ordinance 2002-006) for the North Natomas Development Agreement between the City of Sacramento and Alleghany Properties, Inc. (succeeded by Alleghany Properties, LLC) that involves land designated under the Parkview/Riverview PUD.

Alleghany Properties, LLC (property owners) are requesting to amend Agreement No. 97-100 and Agreement 2002-041 to vest the 2008 North Natomas Financing Plan Update and Process (Resolution No. 2009-341), which accomplished the following: Established a new procedure for adjusting the amount of the Public Facilities Fee in North Natomas, revised procedures for changing the mix of public improvements financed by these fees, and limited the increase of the North Natomas Development Fee to a maximum of 15%.

This request includes a Third Amendment to City Agreement No. 97-100 to the Development Agreement for parcels owned by Alleghany Properties, LLC, and a Fourth Amendment to City Agreement No. 2002-041 to the Development Agreement for parcels owned by Alleghany Properties, LLC. All subject parcels involved in these amendments are currently undeveloped. Refer to Figure 1 for a map of parcels affected by these amendments.

### *North Natomas Financing Plan Background*

On May 3, 1994, the City Council approved the North Natomas Community Plan, under Resolution No. 94-259. The North Natomas Community Plan required that Council adopt a financing plan which identified the nature and cost of all items of public infrastructure needed for development in the plan area. On August 9, 1994, the City Council approved and adopted the North Natomas Financing Plan (Financing Plan) under Resolution No. 94-495. On October 31, 1995, the City Council approved the North Natomas Nexus Study (Nexus Study). The Financing Plan and the Nexus Study are key components of the North Natomas Development Fee Program which establishes fees that support infrastructure needed to develop the land uses envisioned in the North Natomas Community Plan

On May 26, 2009, the City Council approved the North Natomas Financing Plan 2008 Update (Resolution 2009-341). This update included an increase in the development impact fees for public facilities and established a process for updating fees. The approval also included an amendment to the standard-form North Natomas Development Agreement to implement the new process for updating the facilities fees and the mix of public facilities financed by that fee. The purpose of the update was to ensure the development fees funded future facilities.

This update provided the City and community with more reliability in the revenue adjustment and certainty that facilities such as roads, community parks, and fire stations will be funded in the future. It also provides the development community with certainty as to which fees will be charged in the future.

**CEQA Exemption – Agreements No. 97-100 and 2002-041– Draft Resolution**

**RESOLUTION NO. 2019-**

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

November 19, 2019

**DETERMINING PROJECT EXEMPT FROM REVIEW UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (P19-050)**

**BACKGROUND**

- A. On October 10, 2019, the City Planning and Design Commission conducted a public hearing on, and forwarded to the City Council, a recommendation to approve amendments to City Agreement No. 97-100 and City Agreement No. 2002-041.
- B. On November 19, 2019, the City Council conducted a public hearing, for which notice was given under Sacramento City Code Section 17.812.010(2)(b), the City Council conducted a public hearing on the Project.

**BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:**

- Section 1. Based on the determination and recommendation of the City's Environmental Planning Services Manager and the oral and documentary evidence received at the hearing on the Project, the Planning and Design Commission finds that the Project is exempt from review under Section 15061(b)(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines as follows: "The activity is covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects [that] have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA." (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14 § 15061(b)(3).)

**ORDINANCE NO. 2019-**

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council November 19, 2019

**APPROVING A THIRD AMENDMENT TO CITY AGREEMENT NO. 97-100 BETWEEN THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO AND ALLEGHANY PROPERTIES, LLC**

**(APN: 225- 1870-025-0000, 225-1870-026-0000, 225-0140-073-0000, 225-0140-074-0000, 225-0140-075-0000, 225-0140-076-0000, 225-0140-077-0000, 225-0140-078-0000, 225-2300-012-0000, 225-2300-013-0000, 225-1250-048-0000, 225-2970-001-0000, 225-2970-002-0000, 225-2970-003-0000, 225-2970-004-0000, 225-2970-005-0000, 225-2970-006-0000, 225-2970-007-0000, 225-2970-009-0000, 225-0150-031-0000, 225-0150-033-0000, 225-0150-043-0000, 225-0150-044-0000, 225-0150-053-0000, 225-0180-039-0000, 225-0180-059-0000) (P19-050)**

BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO:

**Section 1. Incorporation of Agreement.**

This ordinance incorporates the Third Amendment to City Agreement No. 97-100 between the City of Sacramento and Alleghany Properties, LLC (“**Landowner**”), a copy of which is attached to this ordinance as Exhibit A.

**Section 2. Hearing before the Planning and Design Commission.**

On October 10, 2019, in accordance with Government Code section 65867, Sacramento City Code chapter 18.16, and City of Sacramento Ordinance 95-012, the Planning and Design Commission conducted a noticed public hearing on an application to amend City Agreement No. 97-100 (the "**Original Agreement**"). During the hearing, the Planning and Design Commission received and considered evidence and testimony.

After the hearing concluded, the Planning and Design Commission forwarded to the City Council a recommendation to approve the proposed amendment.

**Section 3. Hearing before the City Council; Findings.**

On November 19, 2019, in accordance with Government Code section 65867, Sacramento City Code chapter 18.16, and City of Sacramento Ordinance 95-012, the City Council conducted a noticed public hearing on an application to amend the Original Agreement. During the hearing, the City Council received and considered evidence and testimony concerning the proposed amendment. Based on the information in the application and the evidence and testimony received at the hearing, the City Council finds as follows:

- (a) The proposed amendment to the Original Agreement is consistent with the City’s general plan and the goals, policies, standards, and objectives of the North Natomas Community Plan.

- (b) The proposed amendment will facilitate Landowner's development of the property subject to the amendment, which should be encouraged in order to meet important economic, social, environmental, or planning goals of the North Natomas Community Plan.
- (c) Without the amendment, Landowner would be unlikely to proceed with development of the property subject to the amendment in the manner proposed.
- (d) Landowner will incur substantial costs to provide public improvements, facilities, or services from which the general public will benefit.
- (e) Landowner will participate in all programs established or required under the general plan or any applicable specific or community plan and all of its approving resolutions (including any mitigation-monitoring plan) and has agreed to the financial participation required under the applicable financing plan and its implementation measures, all of which will accrue to the benefit of the public.
- (f) Landowner has made commitments to a high standard of quality and has agreed to all applicable land-use and development regulations.
- (g) The property subject to the amendment is within an area for which the local flood-management agency has made adequate progress (as defined in California Government Code section 65007) on the construction of a flood-protection system that, for the area intended to be protected by the system, will result in flood protection equal to or greater than the urban level of flood protection in urban areas for property located within a flood-hazard zone, as demonstrated by the *SAFCA Urban Level of Flood Protection Plan and Adequate Progress Baseline Report* and the *SAFCA Adequate Progress Toward an Urban Level of Flood Protection Engineer's Report*, each accepted by the City Council on June 21, 2016 (Resolution No. 2016-0226), and the *SAFCA 2019 Adequate Progress Annual Report* accepted by the City Council on October 22, 2019 (Resolution No. 2019-0398).

#### **Section 4. Approval and Authorization.**

The City Council hereby approves the Third Amendment to City Agreement No. 97-100, a copy of which is attached to this ordinance as Exhibit A. The City Council hereby authorizes the Mayor to sign on the City's behalf, on or after the effective date of this ordinance, the Third Amendment to City Agreement No. 97-100.

#### **Table of Contents:**

Exhibit A: Third Amendment to City Agreement No. 97-100

No fee required, as recording benefits the City of Sacramento, a governmental entity (Gov. Code, §§ 6103 & 27383).

**Recording requested by, and when recorded return to—**

City Clerk  
City of Sacramento  
915 "I" Street, Fifth Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

## Exhibit A: Third Amendment to City Agreement No. 97-100

SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE FOR RECORDER'S USE ONLY

### Third Amendment to City Agreement No. 97-100 North Natomas Development Agreement for Area 2 & 3 Project

This amendatory agreement, dated August 1, 2019, for purposes of identification, is between the CITY OF SACRAMENTO, a California municipal corporation and charter city (the "**City**"); and ALLEGHANY PROPERTIES LLC, a Delaware limited-liability company (the "**Landowner**") and the successor of Alleghany Properties, Inc. a Delaware corporation.

#### Background

In 1997 the City and the Landowner's predecessor, Alleghany Properties, Inc., entered into a North Natomas Development Agreement designated as City Agreement No. 97-100 and recorded with the Sacramento County Clerk/Recorder as Document No. 199709080383. City Agreement No. 97-100 has been amended twice:

- by City Agreement No. 97-100-1\*, which is recorded with the Sacramento County Clerk/Recorder at Page 0975 of Book 20020911; and
- by City Agreement No. 97-100-2, which is recorded with the Sacramento County Clerk/Recorder at Page 0664 of Book 20170428.

Under City Agreement No. 97-100 as amended (the "**Original Agreement**"), the Landowner agrees to participate in, and to faithfully and timely comply with, the North Natomas Finance Plan as it is amended from time to time (the "**Finance Plan**").

On May 26, 2009, the Sacramento City Council approved the *North Natomas Nexus Study and Financing Plan 2008 Update*, which among other things establishes a new procedure for adjusting the amount of the Public Facilities Fee established by Sacramento City Code section 18.24.050. By entering into this amendatory agreement, the parties incorporate the new procedure into the Original Agreement.

***With these background facts in mind, the City and the Landowner agree as follows:***

1. **Amendment to Definition of "North Natomas Finance Plan."** The definition of "North Natomas Finance Plan" in article I of the Original Agreement is amended to read as follows in its entirety:

**North Natomas Finance Plan:** the plan, as it may be amended from time to time, that establishes methods for financing Infrastructure through a combination of land transfers, dedications, contributions, fees, assessment districts, community facilities districts, and other measures. As to the Public Facilities Fee, the North Natomas Finance Plan, as amended from

\* Because City Agreement No. 97-100-1 amended not just City Agreement No. 97-100 but also City Agreement No. 2002-041, it is also designated as City Agreement No. 2002-041-1.

time to time, will provide for adjusting the amount of the Public Facilities Fee in accordance with the principles set forth in the procedure attached hereto as Exhibit I and incorporated herein by reference.

2. **Addition of New Exhibit I.** The procedure for adjusting the Public Facilities Fee that is attached to this amendatory agreement as an exhibit is hereby added to, and made part of, the Original Agreement as Exhibit I.
3. **All Other Terms Remain in Force.** Except as amended by sections 1 and 2 above, all terms and conditions of the Original Agreement remain in full force.
4. **Effective Date.** This amendatory agreement takes effect on the effective date of the ordinance that approves it (Gov. Code, § 65868; Sacramento City Code, §§ 18.16.120 & 18.16.130).
5. **Recording.** Either party may record this amendatory agreement with the Sacramento County Clerk/Recorder.
6. **Counterparts.** The parties may execute this amendatory agreement in counterparts, each of which will be considered an original, but all of which will constitute the same agreement.
7. **Entire Agreement.** This amendatory agreement sets forth the parties' entire understanding regarding the matters set forth above. It supersedes all prior or contemporaneous agreements, representations, and negotiations regarding those matters (whether written, oral, express, or implied) and may be modified only by another written agreement signed by all parties. This amendatory agreement will control if any conflict arises between it and the Original Agreement.

*(Signature Page Follows)*

**City of Sacramento**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Darrell Steinberg, Mayor  
City of Sacramento  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_, 2019

Attest  
Sacramento City Clerk

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Approved as to Form  
Sacramento City Attorney

By: J Cerullo  
Joseph Cerullo  
Senior Deputy City Attorney

**Alleghany Properties LLC**

By: David J. Bugatto  
David J. Bugatto  
President and CEO  
Date: November 12, 2019

Approved as to Form  
Law Offices of Gregory D. Thatch

By: Ryan M. Hooper  
Ryan M. Hooper  
Attorneys for Alleghany Properties LLC

[Attach Certificate of Acknowledgment – Civil Code § 1189]

**CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

**CIVIL CODE § 1189**



A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California )  
County of **Sacramento** )

On 11/12/19 before me, Diane Mason, Notary Public,  
*Date Here Insert Name and Title of the Officer*

personally appeared David J. Bugatto  
*Name(s) of Signer(s)*

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.



Signature [Signature]  
*Signature of Notary Public*

*Place Notary Seal Above*

**OPTIONAL**

*Though this section is optional, completing this information can deter alteration of the document or fraudulent reattachment of this form to an unintended document.*

**Description of Attached Document**

Title or Type of Document: \_\_\_\_\_ Document Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of Pages: \_\_\_\_\_ Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: \_\_\_\_\_

**Capacity(ies) Claimed by Signer(s)**

Signer's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signer's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Corporate Officer — Title(s): \_\_\_\_\_  Corporate Officer — Title(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Partner —  Limited  General  Partner —  Limited  General  
 Individual  Attorney in Fact  Individual  Attorney in Fact  
 Trustee  Guardian or Conservator  Trustee  Guardian or Conservator  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_  Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signer Is Representing: \_\_\_\_\_ Signer Is Representing: \_\_\_\_\_

**EXHIBIT I**

**Procedure for Adjusting the Public Facilities Fee and Revising the Inventory of Remaining Infrastructure to be Financed by that Fee**

When amending the North Natomas Finance Plan, the City shall set the amount of the Public Facilities Fee (subsection A.1 in Sacramento City Code section 18.24.050) in accordance with the following procedure by using the estimated cost of the remaining facilities to be financed:

**1. Definitions.**

- (a) "Agreement" means the development agreement to which this Exhibit I is attached.
- (b) "Aggregate Costs" means the aggregate PFF Shares of PFF Facilities remaining to be completed, calculated using the then-current year's cost estimate, plus the cost to pay the administrative component of the PFF as specified in the Finance Plan.
- (c) "CalTrans Index" means the Quarterly California Highway Construction Cost Index (Price Index for Selected Highway Construction Items) published by the California Department of Transportation, Division of Engineering Services – Office Engineer.
- (d) "CEQA Mitigation Measure" means a requirement proposed, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, to eliminate or substantially lessen the significant effects on the environment from the City's approval of a project on the Property.
- (e) "Effective Date of this Exhibit" means the effective date of the amendatory agreement that adds this Exhibit I to the Agreement.
- (f) "ENR Index" means the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index for San Francisco.
- (g) "Finance Plan" means the North Natomas Finance Plan, as amended.
- (h) "Non-PFF Sources" means any funding for a Schedule One or Schedule Two Facility other than PFF funding. It includes but is not limited to federal funding, state funding, regional funding, grants, gifts, contributions, fees, reimbursements, the City's general fund, the City's Major Street Construction Tax, private funds, payments from the Greenbriar area, and payments from the Panhandle area upon annexation to the City. It does not include conditions of approval or CEQA Mitigation Measures imposed on any project the Landowner proposes for the Property, except as otherwise provided in section 7(b).
- (i) "Funding Requirement" means the amount of the PFF that must be generated from remaining development so that the City will have adequate funding to construct the PFF Facilities remaining to be completed and to administer the PFF program. It is calculated as follows: *first*, calculate the Aggregate Costs; *second*, from the Aggregate Costs, subtract both the PFF revenues then available to complete the uncompleted PFF Facilities (including any

interest earned on those PFF revenues) and the amount of any reduction under section 9; and *third*, add the amount of outstanding PFF credits.

- (j) "PFF" means the Public Facilities Fee established by subsection A.1 of Sacramento City Code section 18.24.050, as amended.
- (k) "PFF Funding Obligation" means the maximum funding obligation of the PFF in a given year, determined in accordance with subsection 5 below.
- (l) "PFF Share" means the portion of a PFF Facility's cost that is funded, in whole or part, by the PFF.
- (m) "Property" means the real property identified in Exhibit A to the Agreement.
- (n) "Schedule One" means the list of public improvements and segments of public improvements that is attached to, and made part of, this Exhibit I.
- (o) "Schedule One Facility" means a public improvement or segment of a public improvement that is listed on Schedule One.
- (p) "Schedule Two" means the list of public improvements and segments of public improvements that is attached to, and made part of, this Exhibit I.
- (q) "Schedule Two Facility" means a public improvement or segment of a public improvement that is listed on Schedule Two.
- (r) "Schedule Three" means the diagram of the "Boot" area that is attached to, and made part of, this Exhibit I.
- (s) "Scope" means the location or physical description, or both, of a Schedule One Facility or a Schedule Two Facility, but not the PFF funding set forth for the facility in Schedule One or Schedule Two (the actual PFF funding for a facility or portion of a facility may be higher or lower than the dollar amount set forth in Schedule One or Schedule Two).
- (t) "Transportation Facilities" means all public improvements and segments of public improvements listed in Schedule One other than the police substation, second fire station, library, freeway landscaping, and community center.
- (u) "2008 Update" means the North Natomas Nexus Study and Financing Plan 2008 Update that the Sacramento City Council approved on May 26, 2009, by adopting Resolution No. 2009-341.

2. **Annual PFF Adjustment for Schedule One Facilities.**

(a) Each July 1, the City shall adjust the PFF in accordance with the difference between—

- (1) the Funding Requirement for the then-current year; and
- (2) the funding that would be available, after deducting revenue on hand (which includes interest and any reductions under section 9) and adding outstanding PFF credits, if the then-existing PFF were applied to remaining development.

In other words, the City shall adjust the PFF in accordance with the difference between the then-current year’s cost estimate and an amount calculated by applying the then-existing PFF to remaining development.

(b) Example of an annual PFF adjustment for Schedule One Facilities:

As of April 1, 2010	Percentage Cost Changes		
	+3.257%	−6.000%	+6.000%
<b>Costs Comparison</b>			
Remaining Costs from April 1, 2009, Estimate	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000
Aggregate Costs and Administration	206,514,000	188,000,000	212,000,000
	+3.257%	−6.000%	+6.000%
<b>Funding Requirement Calculation</b>			
Aggregate Costs and Administration	206,514,000	188,000,000	212,000,000
Less Cash on Hand April 1, 2010	−30,000,000	−30,000,000	−30,000,000
Plus Credits Outstanding April 1, 2010	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
2010 Funding Requirement	201,514,000	183,000,000	207,000,000
<b>Existing Fee Calculation</b>			
Revenue From Remaining Development Using 2009 Fees	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000
Less Cash on Hand April 1, 2010	−30,000,000	−30,000,000	−30,000,000
Plus Credits Outstanding April 1, 2010	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Resources Based with 2009 Fees	195,000,000	195,000,000	195,000,000
<b>Fee Change Effective July 1, 2010</b>			
Resources Based on 2009 Fees	195,000,000	195,000,000	195,000,000
2010 Funding Requirement	201,514,000	183,000,000	207,000,000
Fee Change \$	+6,514,000	−12,000,000	+12,000,000
Fee Change %	+3.341%	−6.154%	+6.154%

(c) Unless the City determines that prevailing market conditions do not justify doing so (e.g., if development is lacking or the remaining development is limited), at least once every three years the City shall perform a comprehensive review and nexus study for the PFF, using the cost-adjustment procedures in subsections 3 and 4 to reallocate costs to remaining undeveloped land uses in accordance with Finance Plan policies and principles.

3. **Procedure for Adjusting Costs of Uncompleted Transportation Facilities.** The City shall use the following procedure to adjust the PFF Shares for all uncompleted Transportation Facilities:

(a) *Method of Adjustment.* Each year, the City shall determine the cost adjustment for uncompleted Transportation Facilities using either the Benchmark Change determined under subsection 3(b) or the percentage change in the index selected under subsection 3(c). If, for the year in question, the difference between the Benchmark Change and the percentage change in the selected index is five or more percentage points, then the City shall use the Benchmark Change to adjust costs for uncompleted Transportation Facilities. Otherwise, the City shall adjust costs for those facilities using the percentage change in the selected index.

(b) *Determination of Benchmark Change.* The City shall follow the following steps to determine the “Benchmark Change” for each year:

(1) *Step 1.* Before April 1, have a third-party professional engineering consultant who is under contract to the City estimate the cost to construct all uncompleted Transportation Facilities. The cost estimate will anticipate cost changes to the next July 1.

(2) *Step 2.* Determine the “Benchmark Estimate” of the cost to construct all uncompleted Transportation Facilities by adding an estimated contingency to the cost estimate from Step 1. The estimated contingency may not exceed 26% of the cost estimate.

(3) *Step 3.* Divide the Benchmark Estimate from Step 2 by the previous year’s adjusted cost estimate for uncompleted Transportation Facilities (which was determined in accordance with this section 3) and express the resulting quotient as a decimal.

**Illustration:** If, for example, the Benchmark Estimate from Step 2 is \$206,514,000 and the previous year’s cost estimate for uncompleted Transportation Facilities is \$188,275,000, then the resulting quotient (to nine decimal places) is 1.094258842 (i.e.,  $\$206,514,000 \div \$188,275,000 = 1.094258842$ ).

(4) *Step 4.* Subtract 1.0 from the resulting quotient in Step 3.

**Illustration:** If, for example, the quotient from Step 3 is 1.094258842, then subtracting 1.0 from that quotient yields a difference of 0.094258842 (i.e.,  $1.094258842 - 1.0 = 0.094258842$ ).

(5) *Step 5.* Express the difference from Step 4 as a percentage by multiplying it by 100 and adding a percentage sign, and then round the percentage to the nearest thousandth. This rounded percentage is the Benchmark Change for the year.

**Illustration:** If, for example, the difference from Step 4 is 0.094258842, then multiplying that difference by 100 and rounding the product to the nearest thousandth yields a Benchmark Change of 9.426%.

- (c) *Selection of Index.* Each year, the City shall adjust the cost of the Transportation Facilities remaining to be completed by using either the percentage change in the ENR Index or the percentage change in the CalTrans Index, according to the following criteria:
- (1) If both indexes are positive on March 1 of the year in question, then the City shall adjust the cost of the remaining Transportation Facilities using the index with the greater percentage change.
  - (2) If the change in one index is positive and the change in the other is negative on March 1 of the year in question, then the City shall adjust the cost of the remaining Transportation Facilities using the index with the positive change.
  - (3) If the change for both indexes is negative on March 1 of the year in question, then the City shall adjust the cost of the remaining Transportation Facilities using the index with the negative change that is closer to zero.
  - (4) Measurement of Percentage Change in an Index.
    - (A) The percentage change in the ENR Index is the year-over-year change as of each March.
    - (B) The percentage change in the CalTrans Index is the change between the 12-quarter average through quarter 1 of the then-current year and the 12-quarter average through quarter 1 of the prior year.
- (d) *Precision.* The City shall carry out all calculations to three decimal places.
- (e) *Sample Cost Adjustments for Uncompleted Transportation Facilities:*

**Sample #1**

Benchmark change of + 4.000%  
 ENR Index change of + 2.000%  
 CalTrans Index change of + 3.100%  
**Adjustment: plus 3.100%**

**Sample #2**

Benchmark change of + 4.500%  
 ENR Index change of + 1.000%  
 CalTrans Index change of – 1.000%  
**Adjustment: plus 1.000%**

**Sample #3**

Benchmark change of – 4.000%  
 ENR Index change of – 0.500%  
 CalTrans Index change of – 1.000%  
**Adjustment: minus 0.500%**

**Sample #4**

Benchmark change of – 5.000%  
 ENR change of + 0.500%  
 Cal Trans Index change of + 0.000%  
**Adjustment: minus 5.000%**

**Sample #5**

Benchmark change of +6.000%  
 ENR Index change of +1.000%  
 CalTrans Index change of –1.000%  
**Adjustment: plus 6.000%**

**Sample #6**

Benchmark change of +6.000%  
 ENR change of +3.500%  
 CalTrans Index change of +7.000%  
**Adjustment: plus 7.000%**

- 4. Cost Adjustment for Police Substation, Second Fire Station, Library, Freeway Landscaping, and Community Center.** The PFF Shares of the police substation, second fire station, library, freeway landscaping, and community center listed in Schedule One will not exceed the amount established in the 2008 Update, except as follows: the City shall adjust the PFF Shares for the police substation, second fire station, library, freeway landscaping, and community center by using only the positive change in the ENR Index from March to March, effective each July 1. If, however, there are two consecutive years of decreases in the ENR Index, then, beginning with the second year of the decrease, the City shall decrease the PFF Shares for the police substation, second fire station, library, freeway landscaping, and community center by an amount equal to the decrease in the ENR Index for that second year.
- 5. Annual Determination of the PFF Funding Obligation.** The Finance Plan shows for each Schedule One Facility not just its estimated cost but also its PFF Share. Each year, after adjusting costs in accordance with sections 2 through 4 above, the City shall determine the aggregate PFF share for all PFF Facilities, and that aggregate amount will be the PFF Funding Obligation for that year.
- 6. Reduction of PFF Shares.**
- (a) The City may reduce the PFF Share of a Schedule One Facility only if one of the following events occurs:
    - (1) The PFF Share of the estimated cost to construct the facility, as set forth in Schedule One, decreases as a result of the procedure in subsection 3 or 4.
    - (2) The PFF Share of the actual cost to construct the facility is less than the PFF Share set forth for the facility in Schedule One, adjusted in accordance with the procedure in subsection 3 or 4.
    - (3) The City secures and appropriates, from Non-PFF Sources, funding to replace all or part of the facility's PFF Share.
  - (b) If the City reduces a PFF Share in accordance with subsection 6(a)(1) or 6(a)(2), then the City may use the reduced portion only to decrease the Funding Requirement.
  - (c) If the City reduces a PFF Share in accordance with subsection 6(a)(3) and the reduction does not result from payments the City receives from the Greenbriar area or the Panhandle area, then the City shall use the reduced portion of the PFF Share as follows:
    - (1) First, if there is an actual cost overrun on a completed Schedule One Facility when the PFF share is reduced, then the City shall use the reduced portion of the PFF share to reduce the cost overrun on that facility.
    - (2) Second, if a Schedule One Facility is under construction when the PFF share is reduced and the City anticipates that the actual cost to construct that facility will exceed the facility's PFF Share shown on Schedule One (as the PFF Share has been adjusted from

year to year), then the City shall use the reduced portion of the PFF share to reduce the anticipated cost overrun on that facility.

(3) Third, if there are no actual or anticipated cost overruns on a Schedule One Facility when the PFF Share is reduced, then the City may use the reduced portion of the PFF Share either—

(A) to fund or to increase the Scope of Schedule One or Schedule Two Facilities; or

(B) to reduce the Funding Requirement.

(d) The City shall determine the reduced amount of a PFF Share in accordance with subsection 3 or 4 above, as appropriate.

## **7. Funding for Schedule Two Facilities.**

(a) Except as provided in subsection 7(b), the only funding available for Schedule Two Facilities is—

(1) PFF funding available under subsection 6(c)(3)(A);

(2) funding from Non-PFF Sources; and

(3) fee revenues available under subsections 8(a) and 8(b).

(b) If, when approving a project on the Property, the City requires the construction or funding of a Schedule Two Facility, in whole or part, as a CEQA Mitigation Measure or a condition of approval, then the City shall timely construct or fund that facility at no cost to the Landowner, subject to the following: the City may require, as a CEQA Mitigation Measure or a condition of approval, that the Landowner construct or fund the overcrossing for Snowy Egret Way described in Schedule Two if—

(1) the Property consists of one or more of Sacramento County APNs 225-0070-059, 225-0070-060, 225-0070-063, 225-0070-067, and 225-0070-076; and

(2) the mitigated negative declaration, the environmental impact report, or any other relevant environmental document prepared for the Landowner's project proposes the construction or funding of the Snowy Egret Way as mitigation for the traffic impacts that will result from approval of the project

## 8. Funding from Greenbriar and the Panhandle.

- (a) When the City begins to receive development-impact fees collected under the Panhandle Finance Plan to offset the cost of PFF-funded facilities that benefit the Panhandle area, the City may use those fees to fund or to increase the Scope of Schedule One Facilities and Schedule Two Facilities.
- (b) When the City begins to receive development-impact fees collected under the Greenbriar Finance Plan to offset the cost of PFF-funded facilities that benefit the Greenbriar area, the City may use those fees to fund or to increase the Scope of Schedule One Facilities and Schedule Two Facilities.

## 9. Reduction of Funding Requirement.

- (a) The City, in its discretion, may reduce the Funding Requirement in accordance with subsection 6(c)(3)(B).
- (b) If the land-use designation for Sacramento County APN 225-0070-059, 225-0070-060, 225-0070-063, or 225-0070-067 (each, an “Arco Arena Parcel”) is changed to allow uses different from the uses permitted for the Arco Arena Parcel under the North Natomas Community Plan as it existed on the effective date of the Agreement, then each year the City shall reduce the Funding Requirement by an amount equal to the increased portion of PFF that the City collects from the affected Arco Arena Parcel.

**10. Scope of Schedule One and Schedule Two Facilities.** The Scope of each Schedule One Facility is as described in Schedule One and the Finance Plan. The City may not revise the Scope except as provided in subsections 10(a), 10(b), and 10(c), or as required to comply with federal or state law. With respect to freeway overcrossings (unless sufficient PFF funding has been allocated already), the physical appearance, design enhancements, and landscaping must be substantially comparable to the freeway overcrossings and freeway interchanges at Truxel Road and Interstate 80, Arena Boulevard and Interstate 5, and Del Paso Road and Interstate 5 as they existed on the Effective Date of this Exhibit. With respect to other public roadways and streets, the scope must be based on the City’s street-design standards that apply to the roadway or street under the Agreement.

- (a) The City may increase the Scope of a Schedule One Facility in accordance with subsections 6(c)(3)(A), 8(a), and 8(b).
- (b) The City may increase the Scope of a Schedule Two Facility in accordance with subsections 6(c)(3)(A), 7(a), 8(a), and 8(b).
- (c) If the City receives development-impact fees collected under the Panhandle Finance Plan to offset the cost of PFF-funded facilities that benefit the Panhandle area, or if the City receives development-impact fees collected under the Greenbriar Finance Plan to offset the cost of PFF-funded facilities that benefit the Greenbriar area, then the City may use those fees and

any other Non-PFF Sources to fund in full a change in the Scope of a Schedule One Facility or a Schedule Two Facility.

**11. Adequate Funding for Schedule One Facilities.** The City may not cite, as a reason for increasing the amount of the PFF Funding Obligation, the loss of potential funding from Non-PFF Sources identified in the 2008 Update.

**12. Change in PFF Share for West El Camino/Interstate 80 Interchange Improvements.** The PFF Share for the West El Camino/Interstate 80 Interchange Improvements (the “Interchange Improvements”) was determined to be 9% based upon an assumption in the City’s traffic study that the area of Natomas commonly known as the “Boot,” as shown on Schedule Three, would be developed with urban uses. If all urban development in the Boot ever becomes permanently prohibited by law, such as by the recording of perpetual open-space or conservation easements, then the following will apply notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Exhibit I:

- (a) The City shall increase the entire Finance Plan area’s share of the Interchange Improvements from 9% to 37% of the cost of the interchange as determined by the consultant under subsection 3(b), above.
- (b) The City shall adjust the PFF Share for the Interchange Improvements to reflect the increase to 37%, taking into account the development that has already taken place in the entire Finance Plan area, so that remaining development in the Finance Plan area pays only its fair share of the entire Finance Plan area’s new 37% share of the cost of the Interchange Improvements.
- (c) To illustrate the adjustment described in subsections 12(a) and 12(b), the following example shows how the adjustment would be calculated if urban development becomes permanently prohibited in the Boot when the Finance Plan area is 60% built out:

		Current Finance Plan Share Scenario	Revised Finance Plan Share Scenario (if Development of the Boot is Prohibited)	
a	Interchange Cost	\$22,465,000	\$22,465,000	
b	Finance Plan Fair Share	9%	37%	
c	PFF Allocated Share of Cost	\$2,021,850	\$8,312,050	(a*b)
d	Base Share	\$2,021,850	\$2,021,850	
e	Incremental Share	N/A	\$6,290,200	(c-d)
f	% Development Remaining	N/A	40%	
g	Incremental Adjusted Share	N/A	\$2,516,080	(e*f)
h	PFF Funding Obligation	\$2,021,850	\$4,537,930	(d+g)

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
<b>Bridges:</b>							
B1	C	Bridge Cross Drive Over East Drain Canal (6)	Bridge Completed	\$ 741,529	\$ 741,529		\$ -
B2	C	Club Center Drive at East Drain Canal (6)	Bridge Completed	\$ 1,241,682	\$ 1,241,682		\$ -
B3	C	North Bend Drive Over East Drain Canal (6)	Bridge Completed	\$ 731,657	\$ 731,657		\$ -
B4		Terracina Drive Over East Drain Canal (7)	Two (2) lane bridge 50 ft wide by 80 ft length. Bridge to include (2) 12' lanes, (2) 6' bike lanes, and (2) 5' sidewalks and a 4' painted median.	\$ 1,172,093			\$ 1,172,093
B5		Del Paso Road Over East Drain Canal	Six (6) lane bridge, 98 ft wide by 80 ft length. Bridge to include (6) 12' lanes, (2) 6' bike lanes and, (2) 5' sidewalks and a 4' painted median.	\$ 1,541,030			\$ 1,541,030
B6		Elkhorn Boulevard Over East Drain Canal	Six (6) lane bridge, 98 ft wide by 80 ft length. Bridge to include (6) 12' lanes, (2) 6' bike lanes and, (2) 5' sidewalks and a 4' painted median.	\$ 1,541,030			\$ 1,541,030
B7		Gateway Park Boulevard Over C-1 Canal	Four (4) lane bridge, 74 ft wide by 80 ft length. Bridge to include (4) 12' lanes, (2) 6' bike lanes and, (2) 5' sidewalks and a 4' painted median.	\$ 1,953,488			\$ 1,953,488
B8		El Centro Road Over West Drain Canal	Four (4) lane bridge, 74 ft wide by 80 ft length. Bridge to include (4) 12' lanes, (2) 6' bike lanes and, (2) 5' sidewalks and a 4' painted median.	\$ 1,163,635			\$ 1,163,635
		<b>Subtotal Bridges:</b>		<b>\$ 10,086,145</b>	<b>\$ 2,714,868</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 7,371,277</b>
<b>Interchanges:</b>							
	P	Truxel	Truxel Interchange overcrossing, auxiliary lanes between Truxel and Northgate, and a two (2) lane Eastbound exit at Northgate completed. PFF funding is 33.2% of the total cost for the overcrossing and 100% for the auxiliary lanes.	\$ 8,907,217		\$ 7,206,227	\$ 1,700,990
	C	Arena	Arena Interchange, auxiliary lane I-5 at Del Paso to I-80, a two (2) lane Southbound exit from I-5, and striping for Northbound exit for two (2) lanes completed. PFF funding is 100% of the total cost.	\$ 22,817,789		\$ 22,817,789	\$ -
	P	Del Paso	Del Paso Interchange.	\$ 861,460			\$ 861,460
	P	Del Paso Interchange Auxiliary Lane	Construct an auxiliary lane at the south bound loop on-ramp to Interstate 80 and signalization. PFF funding is 100% of the total cost.	\$ 1,665,294		\$ 60,000	\$ 1,605,294
		Elkhorn/SR 99 Interchange	Expand interchange to a 6 lane interchange to accommodate widening of Elkhorn Blvd from 2 to 6 lanes. PFF funding is 34.0% of the total cost.	\$ 4,399,000			\$ 4,399,000
	P	W. El Camino/I-80 Interchange	Widen overcrossing to four (4) lanes. PFF funding share was determined with 2008 PFF update. PFF funding is 9.0% of the total cost.	\$ 2,022,000		\$ 538,975	\$ 1,483,025
		<b>Subtotal Interchanges:</b>		<b>\$ 40,672,760</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 30,622,991</b>	<b>\$ 10,049,769</b>
<b>Overcrossings:</b>							
		El Centro	PFF funding is 100% of the total cost to construct a 2 lane, 52 ft wide overcrossing over Interstate 5 to include approaches from Bayou Road to East Commerce Way. This overcrossing assumes a 52' right of way with two 12' lanes, two 8' bike lanes/shoulders, and two 6' sidewalks with barriers.	\$ 7,692,000			\$ 7,692,000

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
	P	Meister Way - w/ LRT Lanes	PFF funding is 17.5% of the total cost to construct a 2 lane overcrossing, 69 ft total width, over Highway 99 to include approaches from East Commerce Way to proposed east boundary of the Greenbriar development project. This overcrossing assumes a 69' right of way with two 12' vehicle lanes, 10' striped median, two 9' bike lanes/shoulders and two 6' sidewalks with barriers. Light rail tracks to be placed on separate overcrossing structure. Funding share determined with 2008 PFF update.	\$ 1,412,456		\$ 916,677	\$ 495,779
<b>Subtotal Overcrossings:</b>				<b>\$ 9,104,456</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 916,677</b>	<b>\$ 8,187,779</b>
<b>Total of Interchanges and Overcrossings (Freeways)</b>				<b>\$ 49,777,216</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 31,539,668</b>	<b>\$ 18,237,548</b>
<b>Bikeways</b>							
1	C	NORTHPOINTE SOUTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 5,367 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 263,845	\$ 263,845		\$ -
2	C	TOSCARO TRAIL (4)	Bikeway constructed.	\$ -			\$ -
3		ELKHORN BOULEVARD	12 feet wide for a distance of 15,371 feet.	\$ 998,800			\$ 998,800
4	C	EAST SIDE OF EAST DRAIN CANAL - SOUTH OF ELKHORN BLVD	12 feet wide for a distance of 7,224 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 329,831	\$ 329,831		\$ -
5	C	NORTHPOINTE NORTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 4,850 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 315,200	\$ 144,017	\$ 171,183	\$ -
6	C	NORTHPOINTE SOUTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 4,763 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 309,500	\$ 35,636	\$ 273,864	\$ -
7	C	EAST DRAIN CANAL DEL PASO RD TO BASIN 5	12 feet wide for a distance of 1,217 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 79,100		\$ 79,100	\$ -
8		EAST DRAIN CANAL AT BASIN 5	12 feet wide for a distance of 1,076 feet.	\$ 69,900			\$ 69,900
9		EAST DRAIN CANAL TRUXEL - ARENA	12 feet wide for a distance of 2,554 feet.	\$ 166,000			\$ 166,000
10	P	EAST DRAIN CANAL TRUXEL - SJ	12 feet wide for a distance of 6,048 feet.	\$ 393,000		\$ 259,300	\$ 133,700
11		C1 CANAL WEST CITY	12 feet wide for a distance of 4,056 feet.	\$ 263,600			\$ 263,600
12		C1 CANAL COUNTY	12 feet wide for a distance of 5,077 feet.	\$ 329,900			\$ 329,900
13		C1 CANAL EAST CITY	12 feet wide for a distance of 252 feet.	\$ 16,400			\$ 16,400
14		WEST DRAIN CANAL SOUTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 3,298 feet.	\$ 214,300			\$ 214,300
15		WEST DRAIN CANAL	12 feet wide for a distance of 5,047 feet.	\$ 328,000			\$ 328,000
16	P	WESTLAKE - EAST/WEST	12 feet wide for a distance of 2,882 feet. Bikeway partially constructed.	\$ 187,300		\$ 124,782	\$ 62,518
17	P	NORTH PARK DRIVE IN REGIONAL PARK	12 feet wide for a distance of 2,950 feet. Bikeway partially constructed.	\$ 191,700	\$ 82,184		\$ 109,516
18	P	FISHERMAN'S LAKE	12 feet wide for a distance of 6,696 feet.	\$ 435,100		\$ 287,100	\$ 148,000
19	P	EAST SIDE - STATE ROUTE 99	12 feet wide for an original distance of 8,644 feet. Bikeway partially constructed.	\$ 561,700	\$ 55,809		\$ 505,891
20	P	SCHUMACHER, NORTH	12 feet wide for an original distance of 4,312 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 280,200	\$ 176,715	\$ 17,970	\$ 85,515
21		EAST DRAIN CANAL, PARK PLACE	12 feet wide for a distance of 3,370 feet.	\$ 219,000			\$ 219,000
22	P	PARK 4A TRAIL	12 feet wide for a distance of 2,592 feet.	\$ 168,400		\$ 129,826	\$ 38,574
23	C	NORTHBOROUGH I @ II	Bikeway constructed.	\$ 165,133	\$ 165,133		\$ -
24	C	REGIONAL PARK NORTH/SOUTH	Bikeway constructed.	\$ 168,700		\$ 168,700	\$ -
25	C	REGIONAL PARK EAST/WEST	Bikeway constructed.	\$ 212,000		\$ 212,000	\$ -
26	C	REGIONAL PARK, NATOMAS BLVD	Bikeway constructed.	\$ 70,400		\$ 70,400	\$ -
27	P	REGIONAL PARK AQUATIC CENTER	12 feet wide for a distance of 850 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 55,200		\$ 42,847	\$ 12,353
28		NATOMAS CROSSING EAST/WEST	12 feet wide for a distance of 485 feet.	\$ 31,500			\$ 31,500
29		GOLDENLAND SOUTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 1,084 feet.	\$ 70,400			\$ 70,400
30		GOLDENLAND NORTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 1,213 feet.	\$ 78,800			\$ 78,800

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
31		RIVERVIEW BASIN 7A NORTH/SOUTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 704 feet.	\$ 45,700			\$ 45,700
32		RIVERVIEW BASIN 7A EAST/WEST	12 feet wide for a distance of 1,029 feet.	\$ 66,900			\$ 66,900
33		WESTLAKE, NORTH/SOUTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 2,385 feet.	\$ 155,000			\$ 155,000
34		EAST SIDE TRUXEL ROAD - Arena Boulevard to Natomas Crossing Drive	8 feet wide for a distance of 2,523 feet.	\$ 111,600			\$ 111,600
34a	C	EAST SIDE TRUXEL ROAD - Del Paso Road to Arena Boulevard	8 feet wide for a distance of 3,453 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 93,269			\$ 93,269
35	P	NORTHPOINTE - EAST SIDE	12 feet wide for a distance of 5,300 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 344,400	\$ 246,221		\$ 98,179
<b>Subtotal Bikeways:</b>				<b>\$ 7,789,779</b>	<b>\$ 1,499,392</b>	<b>\$ 1,837,072</b>	<b>\$ 4,453,314</b>
<b>Shuttles</b>		<b>Shuttle Cost</b>	Contribution to funding of North Natomas Transportation Management Association Shuttles. Shuttles are ADA equipped and can hold 10-12 passengers.	<b>\$ 1,341,144</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 892,476</b>	<b>\$ 448,668</b>
<b>Total Bikes and Shuttles</b>				<b>\$ 9,130,923</b>	<b>\$ 1,499,392</b>	<b>\$ 2,729,548</b>	<b>\$ 4,901,982</b>
<b>Road Segments</b>							
2	C	Club Center Drive	Segment completed	\$ 555,555	\$ 555,555		\$ -
3	P	DEL PASO ROAD	Roadway Segment 3 from the City Limits on the West to El Centro Road. Widen a segment of Del Paso Road from the city limits on the West to El Centro Road to a 4 lane roadway (Roadway Segment 3). Roadway segment length of 3,042 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A".	\$ 4,052,093	\$ 1,872,261		\$ 2,179,832
4	C	DEL PASO ROAD	Roadway Segment 4 from El Centro Road to I-5 SB Off-Ramp. Widen a segment of Del Paso Road to a six (6) roadway from El Centro Road to the Southbound Off-ramp of Interstate 5 (Roadway Segment 4). Roadway segment length of 650 feet; roadway width of 136 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 1,489,429		\$ 1,489,429	\$ -
5	C	DEL PASO ROAD - NORTH SIDE	Roadway Segment 5a from NB I-5 Off-Ramp to Truxel Road. A six (6) lane roadway segment of Del Paso Road from the northbound Interstate 5 off-ramp to the Truxel Road intersection. Roadway segment length of 2,815 feet; roadway width of 81 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 4,558,621	\$ 613,831	\$ 3,944,790	\$ -
5	P	DEL PASO ROAD - NORTH SIDE	Roadway Segment 5b from NB I-5 Off-Ramp to Truxel Road. A six (6) lane roadway segment of Del Paso Road from the northbound Interstate 5 off-ramp to the Truxel Road intersection. Roadway segment length of 4,035 feet roadway width of 81 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 3,684,550	\$ 155,069		\$ 3,529,481
6	P	DEL PASO ROAD	Roadway Segment 6 from Truxel Road to East Drain Canal. A six (6) lane roadway segment of Del Paso Road from the intersection of Truxel Road to the East Drain Canal. Roadway segment length of 1,360 feet; roadway width of 136 feet. City landscape quality level "A". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 1,866,901	\$ 498,109		\$ 1,368,792
7a	C	DEL PASO ROAD - NORTH SIDE	Segment completed	\$ 2,643,318	\$ 2,643,318		\$ -

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
7b		DEL PASO ROAD - NORTH SIDE	Roadway Segment 7b from 300' West of City Limit on the East to the City Limit on the East. A six (6) lane roadway segment of Del Paso Road from 300 feet West of the east city limit to the east city limit. Roadway segment length of 300 feet; roadway width of 55 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 154,313			\$ 154,313
7c	P	DEL PASO ROAD - SOUTH SIDE	Roadway Segment 7c from the East Drain Canal to the City Limit on the East. A six (6) lane roadway segment of the southside of Del Paso Road from the East Drain Canal to the city limit on the east. Roadway segment length of 4,110 feet; roadway width of 14 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 456,424	\$ 91,536		\$ 364,888
8	P	EAST COMMERCE WAY	Roadway Segment 8 from Elkhorn Blvd to Club Center Drive. A four (4) lane roadway segment of East Commerce Way from Elkhorn Boulevard to the Club Center Drive intersection. Roadway segment length of 5,690 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A". Partially complete.	\$ 6,026,665	\$ 2,866,893		\$ 3,159,771
9	P	EAST COMMERCE WAY	Roadway Segment 9 from Club Center Drive to Del Paso Road. A six (6) lane roadway segment of East Commerce Way from its intersect with Club Center Drive to its intersection with Del Paso Road. Roadway segment length of 6,560 feet; roadway width of 136 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B". Partially complete.	\$ 8,142,228	\$ 4,095,206		\$ 4,047,022
10		EAST COMMERCE WAY	Roadway Segment 10 from Arena Blvd to Natomas Crossing Drive. A six (6) lane roadway segment of East Commerce Way from Arena Boulevard to Natomas Crossing Drive. Roadway segment length of 2,770 feet; roadway width of 136 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B". Partially complete.	\$ 3,329,327			\$ 3,329,327
11		EAST COMMERCE WAY	Roadway Segment 11 from Natomas Crossing Drive to San Juan Road. A six (6) lane roadway segment of East Commerce Way from Natomas Crossing Drive to San Juan Road. Roadway segment length of 3,120 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A". Partially complete.	\$ 3,302,398			\$ 3,302,398
12		EL CENTRO ROAD	Roadway Segment 12 from Del Paso Road to Arena Blvd. A four (4) lane roadway segment of El Centro Road from East Commerce Way to Arena Boulevard. Roadway segment length of 4,580 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A". Partially complete.	\$ 6,331,029			\$ 6,331,029
14a		ELKHORN BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 14a from SR-99 to East Commerce Way & Natomas Blvd to City Limit on East. A six (6) lane roadway segment of Elkhorn Boulevard from its intersection with State Route 99 to East Commerce Way and then from Natomas Boulevard to the City limits on the east. Roadway segment length of 5,550 feet; roadway width of 121 feet. City landscape quality level "C". Roadway section type "B". Funding revised by 2017 NNFP Update to reflect fair share.	\$ 1,784,642			\$ 1,784,642

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
14b		ELKHORN BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 14b from East Commerce Way to Natomas Blvd. A four (4) lane roadway segment of Elkhorn Boulevard from East Commerce Way to its intersection Natomas Boulevard. Roadway segment length of 6,600 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "C". Roadway section type "A". Funding revised by 2017 NNFP Update to reflect fair share.	\$ 2,642,427			\$ 2,642,427
15	P	GATEWAY PARK BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 15 from Del Paso Rd to Arena Blvd. A four (4) lane roadway segment of Gateway Park Boulevard from Del Paso Road to Arena Boulevard. Roadway segment length of 3,470 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A".	\$ 3,657,397	\$ 1,404,808		\$ 2,252,589
16a	P	GATEWAY PARK DRIVE	Roadway Segment 16a from Arena Blvd to Truxel Road. A four (4) lane roadway segment of Gateway Park Boulevard from Arena Boulevard to Truxel Road. Roadway segment length of 2,494 feet; roadway width of 57 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A".	\$ 1,699,638	\$ 1,055,390		\$ 644,248
19	C	NATOMAS CROSSING DRIVE <sup>6</sup>	Segment completed	\$ 610,766	\$ 610,766		\$ -
20	C	ARENA BOULEVARD	Segment completed	\$ 1,714,776	\$ 1,714,776		\$ -
21		ARENA BOULEVARD	Landscaping for Roadway Segment 21 from Duckhorn Drive to I-5. Landscaping a portion of a six (6) lane roadway segment of Arena Boulevard from Duckhorn Drive to Interstate 5 complete. Roadway segment length of 1,000 feet; roadway width of 136 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B". Roadway costs for this segment are included as part of the Arena Boulevard interchange cost.	\$ 353,585			\$ 353,585
22		ARENA BOULEVARD	Landscaping for Roadway Segment 22 from I-5 to East Commerce Way. Landscaping a portion of an eight (8) lane roadway segment of Arena Boulevard from Interstate 5 to East Commerce Way complete. Roadway segment length of 1,000 feet; roadway width of 158 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "C". Roadway costs for this segment are included as part of the Arena Blvd Interchange cost.	\$ 353,585			\$ 353,585
23a	C	NATOMAS BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 23a from Elkhorn Blvd to 650' North of Club Center Dr. Frontage improvements for a four (4) lane roadway segment of Natomas Boulevard from Elkhorn Boulevard to 650 feet North of Club Center Drive complete. Roadway segment length of 4,640 feet; roadway width of 42 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "D".	\$ 3,593,709	\$ 3,593,709		\$ -
23b	P	NATOMAS BOULEVARD - FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS	Roadway Segment 23b from Elkhorn Blvd to 650' North of Club Center Dr. The frontage improvements for a four (4) lane roadway segment of Natomas Boulevard from Elkhorn Boulevard to 650 feet North of Club Center Drive. Roadway segment length of 4,640 feet; roadway width of 50 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "D".	\$ 2,779,756	\$ 1,376,303		\$ 1,403,453
23c	P	NATOMAS BOULEVARD	Segment completed	\$ 443,004	\$ 443,004		\$ -

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
23d	P	NATOMAS BOULEVARD - FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS	Roadway Segment 23d from 650' North of Club Center Dr. to Club Center Dr. The frontage improvements for a four (4) lane roadway segment of Natomas Boulevard from 650 feet North of Club Center Drive to Club Center Drive. Roadway segment length of 650 feet; roadway width of 21 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "D".	\$ 192,869	\$ 112,157		\$ 80,711
24b	P	NATOMAS BOULEVARD - FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS	Roadway Segment 24b from Club Center Dr. to North Park Dr. The frontage improvements for a six (6) lane roadway segment of Natomas Boulevard from Club Center Drive to North Park Drive. Roadway segment length of 2,000 feet; roadway width of 32 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "E".	\$ 501,827	\$ 282,968		\$ 218,859
25a	C	NATOMAS BOULEVARD	Segment completed	\$ 3,944,308	\$ 3,944,308		\$ -
25b	C	NATOMAS BOULEVARD - FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS	Roadway Segment 25b from North Park Dr. to 600' North of Del Paso Rd. The frontage improvements for a six (6) lane roadway segment of Natomas Boulevard from North Park Drive to 600 feet North of Del Paso Road. Roadway segment length of 3,790 feet; roadway width of 62 feet. City landscape quality level "A". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 2,525,477	\$ 367,477	\$ 2,158,000	\$ -
33		LIBRARY STREET <sup>4</sup>	Roadway Segment 33 from Del Paso Rd. to New Market Dr. A two (2) lane roadway segment of Library Street from Del Paso Road to New Market Drive. Roadway segment length of 990 feet; roadway width of 88 feet. No landscaping.	\$ 1,207,243			\$ 1,207,243
39	P	EL CENTRO ROAD	Roadway Segment 39 from Del Paso Rd to Bayou Rd. A four (4) lane roadway segment of El Centro Road from Del Paso Road to Bayou Road. Roadway segment length of 2,300 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "A".	\$ 2,388,681	\$ 1,073,757		\$ 1,314,924
40	C	Interstate 5 Water Main Crossing	Segment completed	\$ 1,499,480	\$ 1,499,480		\$ -
16b	P	GATEWAY PARK BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 16b from Truxel Rd to N. Freeway Blvd. Six (6) lane roadway segment of Gateway Park Boulevard from Truxel Road to North Freeway Boulevard for a length of 896 feet complete. Roadway width of 93 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 803,355	\$ 657,974		\$ 145,381
41	P	Between Gateway Park Blvd. And West Promenade Circle	Roadway Segment 41 from Gateway Park Blvd to West Promenade Circle. Six (6) lane roadway segment of North Freeway Boulevard from Gateway Park Boulevard to West Promenade Circle for a length of 803 feet complete. Roadway width of 136 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 975,579	\$ 809,651		\$ 165,928
42	P	West Promenade Circle and East Promenade Circle	Roadway Segment 42 from W. Promenade Cir. To E. Promenade Cir. Four (4) lane roadway segment of North Freeway Boulevard from West Promenade Circle to East Promenade Circle for a length of 1,247 feet complete. Roadway width of 100 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "A".	\$ 1,331,815	\$ 1,118,200		\$ 213,615

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
18		NATOMAS CROSSING DRIVE	Segment 18 from I-5 to East Commerce Way. Landscaping a portion of Natomas Crossing Drive from Interstate 5 to East Commerce Way. Roadway segment length is 880 feet; width is 70 feet. City landscaping quality level "B".	\$ 107,110			\$ 107,110
34	C	Landscaping at East Drain Canal	Segment completed	\$ 230,634	\$ 230,634		\$ -
	C	Del Paso Road - South Side	Segment completed	\$ 5,125,843	\$ 5,125,843		\$ -
	C	East Commerce Way	Segment completed	\$ 5,478,968	\$ 5,478,968		\$ -
35	P	EAST COMMERCE WAY	Segment 35 from Del Paso Rd. to Arena Blvd. Landscaping the six (6) lane roadway segment of East Commerce Way from Del Paso Road to Arena Boulevard. Roadway segment length is 5,000 feet; roadway width is 136 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 1,767,925	\$ 106,308		\$ 1,661,617
	C	GATEWAY PARK BOULEVARD (HALF-SECTION BUILT)	Segment completed	\$ 1,230,967	\$ 1,230,967		\$ -
	C	ARENA BOULEVARD	Segment completed	\$ 5,013,104	\$ 5,013,104		\$ -
36	P	ARENA BOULEVARD	Segment 36 from East Commerce way to City Limits on East. Landscaping for a six (6) lane segment of Arena Boulevard from East Commerce Way to the eastern city limit. Roadway segment length of 5,500 feet; roadway width of 136 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 1,944,717		\$ 355,000	\$ 1,589,717
	C	Truxel Road	Segment completed	\$ 9,690,289	\$ 9,690,289		\$ -
37	P	TRUXEL ROAD	Segment 37 from Del Paso Rd. to Gateway Park Blvd (minus 1900'). Landscaping for an eight (8) lane roadway segment of Truxel Road from Del Paso Road to Gateway Park Boulevard, minus 1,900 feet. Roadway segment length of 5,600 feet; roadway width of 158 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "C".	\$ 1,980,076		\$ 268,767	\$ 1,711,309
38		NATOMAS CROSSING DRIVE	Segment 38 from Duckhorn Drive to Interstate 5. Landscaping the roadway segment of Natomas Crossing Drive from Duckhorn Drive to Interstate 5 for a length of 1,100 feet. Roadway width of 100 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "A".	\$ 274,183			\$ 274,183
<b>Subtotal Roadways:</b>				<b>\$ 114,440,582</b>	<b>\$ 60,332,618</b>	<b>\$ 8,215,986</b>	<b>\$ 45,891,978</b>
<b>Freeway Landscaping</b>			Includes freeway and drainage landscaping. Landscaping costs for road segments are included along with construction costs in the road segments PFF Funding amounts, unless otherwise noted in the facility's Description/Scope.	<b>\$ 8,324,270</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,114,196</b>	<b>\$ 7,210,074</b>
<b>Total Roadways and Freeway Landscaping:</b>				<b>\$ 122,764,852</b>	<b>\$ 60,332,618</b>	<b>\$ 9,330,182</b>	<b>\$ 53,102,052</b>
<b>Fully Funded Signals:</b>							
<b>2-Lane x 6-Lane</b>							
2		Northbound SR-99 Off-Ramp and Elkhorn Boulevard	Traffic signal for 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Remaining portion of total cost being funded by Panhandle area. PFF share is currently estimated at 92.3% of the total estimated cost. Partially funded by Panhandle.	\$ 814,351			\$ 814,351
<b>4-Lane x 4-Lane</b>							

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
6	C	El Centro Road and Del Paso Road	Traffic signal for a 2+-Lane x 8-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 162,793	\$ 162,793		\$ -
<b>4-Lane x 4-Lane</b>							
7	P	El Centro Road and Del Paso Road	Traffic signal for a 4-Lane x 4-Lane intersection. Traffic signal partially constructed.	\$ 400,465	\$ 205,292		\$ 195,173
8		El Centro Road and Snowy Egret Way	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 4-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 400,465			\$ 400,465
9	P	El Centro Road and Arena Boulevard (6)	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 4-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed. Signal to be phased.	\$ 437,795		\$ 168,454	\$ 269,341
11	C	Gateway Park Boulevard and Arena Boulevard	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 4-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 876,009		\$ 876,009	\$ -
<b>4-Lane x 6-Lane</b>							
12	P	East Commerce Way and Elkhorn Boulevard (5)	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Signal to be phased. Partially complete.	\$ 461,766			\$ 461,766
13	C	Natomas Boulevard and Elkhorn Boulevard	Traffic signal constructed.	\$ -			\$ -
14	C	Gateway Park Boulevard and Del Paso Road	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 181,390	\$ 181,390		\$ -
15	C	Snowy Egret Way and East Commerce Way	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 214,941		\$ 214,941	\$ -
16	C	Northgate Boulevard and Del Paso Road	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 241,000		\$ 241,000	\$ -
17		Natomas Crossing Drive and East Commerce Way	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 341,860			\$ 341,860
<b>4-Lane x 8-Lane</b>							
18	C	Natomas Crossing Drive and Truxel Road	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 307,148	\$ 307,148		\$ -
19	C	Gateway Park Boulevard and Truxel Road	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 8-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 256,513	\$ 256,513		\$ -
<b>6-Lane x 6-Lane</b>							
20	C	Del Paso Road and East Commerce Way	Traffic signal at a 6-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 269,010	\$ 269,010		\$ -
32	C	Gateway Park Boulevard and North Freeway Boulevard (2+x4)	Traffic signal at a 6-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 172,655	\$ 172,655		\$ -
<b>6-Lane x 8-Lane</b>							
21	C	Del Paso Road and Truxel Road	Traffic signal at a 6-Lane x 8-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 253,685	\$ 253,685		\$ -
<b>Total Fully Funded Signals</b>				<b>\$ 5,791,846</b>	<b>\$ 1,808,486</b>	<b>\$ 1,500,404</b>	<b>\$ 2,482,956</b>
<b>2-Lane x 6-Lane</b>							
40	C	Northborough Drive and Elkhorn Boulevard (2+x6)	Partial funding of traffic signal at a 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 34,114	\$ 34,114		\$ -
41	C	Elkhorn Boulevard and Sageview Drive (2x6)	Partial funding of traffic signal at a 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 33,768	\$ 33,768		\$ -

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
42		Club Center Drive and East Commerce Way (2+x6)	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of Club Center Drive and East Commerce Way. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 47,300			\$ 47,300
43	C	Natomas Blvd and Club Center Drive (2+x6)	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of Natomas Blvd and Club Center Drive. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 33,768	\$ 33,768		\$ -
44		East Commerce Way and North Park Drive (2+/2x6) (8)	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of East Commerce Way and North Park Drive. Traffic signal partially constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 51,300			\$ 51,300
45	C	Natomas Blvd and North Park Drive	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of Natomas Blvd and North Park Drive. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 33,912	\$ 33,912		\$ -
46	C	Natomas Blvd and North Bend Drive	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of Natomas Blvd and North Bend Drive. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 33,912	\$ 33,912		\$ -
47	P	Natomas Blvd and New Market Drive	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of Natomas Boulevard and New Market Drive. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 47,300	\$ 22,895		\$ 24,405
48	C	Del Paso Road and Northborough Drive (2+x6)	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of Del Paso Road and Northborough Drive. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 33,778	\$ 33,778		\$ -
49		Del Paso Road and North East Stadium Entrance	Partial funding for traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 47,300	\$ -		\$ 47,300
50	P	Black Rock Drive and Del Paso Road (2+x6)	Partial funding for traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection at Black Rock Drive and Del Paso Road. Traffic signal partially constructed - North leg of intersection not yet constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals	\$ 31,800	\$ 25,328		\$ 6,472
51	C	Arena Boulevard and Duckhorn Drive(2+x6) (9)	Included in the cost for Arena Boulevard Overcrossing	\$ -			\$ -
52		East Commerce Way and Arena Entrance (2+x6)	Partial funding for traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection at East Commerce Way and Arena Entrance. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 47,300			\$ 47,300
53		Arena Boulevard and Innovator Drive (2-/2x6)	Partial funding for traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection at Arena Blvd and Innovator Drive. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 31,800			\$ 31,800
		Signal Contingency		\$ 47,300			\$ 47,300
<b>2-Lane x 8-Lane</b>							
54		Truxel Road and Terracina Drive (2+/2x8)	Partial funding for traffic signal at 2-Lane x 8-Lane intersection at Truxel Road and Terracina Drive. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 20% is being funded for 2-Lane x 8-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 49,900			\$ 49,900
55		Truxel Road and Prosper Street (2x8)	Partial funding for traffic signal at 2-Lane x 8-Lane intersection at Truxel Road and Prosper Street. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 20% is being funded for 2-Lane x 8-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 49,900			\$ 49,900
<b>Total Partially Funded Signals</b>				<b>\$ 654,452</b>	<b>\$ 251,475</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 402,977</b>
<b>Total Signals</b>				<b>\$ 6,446,298</b>	<b>\$ 2,059,960</b>	<b>\$ 1,500,404</b>	<b>\$ 2,885,933</b>

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
<b>Public Facilities</b>							
	C	Fire Station 1	Fire station is complete. Funding also includes apparatus necessary for outfitting the fire station.	\$ 7,687,049		\$ 2,034,466	\$ 5,652,583
		Fire Station 2	Located at Westside of I-5/North Natomas. Provide funding contribution for a second fire station with a minimum building square footage of 8,000 square feet. Funding contribution also includes one ladder truck and one fire engine.	\$ 9,600,000			\$ 9,600,000
	P	Library	Located at Del Paso Road. Funding contribution for the North Natomas share (12,000 square feet) of 21,000 square foot total community library, including a share for library materials.	\$ 10,126,271		\$ 4,427,244	\$ 5,699,027
		Community Center	Provide a funding contribution for the construction of one community center. Funding is not being provided for the costs of land acquisition, operation and maintenance, or ongoing utilities.	\$ 13,427,033			\$ 13,427,033
		<b>Subtotal Public Facilities</b>		<b>\$ 40,840,353</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 6,461,710</b>	<b>\$ 34,378,643</b>
<b>Planning Studies</b>				<b>\$ 17,231,226</b>	<b>\$ 12,166,419</b>	<b>\$ 5,064,807</b>	<b>\$ (0)</b>
<b>Total:</b>				<b>\$ 256,277,012</b>	<b>\$ 78,773,258</b>	<b>\$ 56,626,319</b>	<b>\$ 120,877,436</b>

Note: P Denotes a partially completed project, C is a completed project

end of schedule

# Schedule Two

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Removed Facilities

Item	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost (2008\$)
<b>Natomas Crossing Boulevard Elements:</b>						
<b>Funding from the PFF is prohibited for the Natomas Crossing Drive improvements listed below unless the improvement is established as a CEQA Mitigation Measure or a condition of approval, after which PFF may be used as provided for all other Schedule 2 facilities under this agreement.</b>						
	Overcrossing - Natomas Crossing Boulevard	PFF funding is 100% of the total cost to construct a 2 lane, 52 ft wide overcrossing over Interstate 5 to include approaches from East Commerce Way to Duckhorn Drive. This overcrossing assumes a 52' right of way with two 12' lanes, two 8' bike lanes/shoulders, and two 6' sidewalks with barriers.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
B10	Bridge - Natomas Crossing Drive Over West Drain Canal	Four (4) lane bridge, 74 ft wide by 80 ft length. Bridge to include (4) 12' lanes, (2) 6' bike lanes and, (2) 5' sidewalks and a 4' painted median. Funding is 0% unless other facilities are permanently removed in whole or part from PFF funding and the displaced funding is applied to the bridge.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

17	Roadway - Natomas Crossing Drive	Roadway Segment 17 from Duckhorn Drive to El Centro Road. A two (2) lane roadway segment. Roadway segment length of 4,180 feet; roadway width of 70 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A". Funding is 0% unless other facilities are permanently removed in whole or part from PFF funding and the displaced funding is applied to the roadway.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10	Signal - El Centro Road and Natomas Crossing Drive	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 4-Lane intersection. Funding is 0% unless other facilities are permanently removed in whole or part from PFF funding and the displaced funding is applied to the signal.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
end of Natomas Crossing Drive items						

**Other Facilities**

**Overcrossings:**

	Snowy Egret Way	PFF funding is 0% of the total cost to construct a 4 lane, 85 ft wide overcrossing over Interstate 5 to include approaches from East Commerce Way to El Centro Road. This overcrossing assumes an 85' right of way with (4) 12' lanes, 12' striped median, (2) 6' bike lanes/shoulders and (2) 6' sidewalks with barriers. Funding is 0% unless other facilities are permanently removed in whole or part from PFF funding and the displaced funding is applied to the Snowy Egret Overcrossing.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
--	-----------------	--	------	------	------	------

**Road Segments**


13	EL CENTRO ROAD	Roadway Segment 13 from Arena Blvd to San Juan Road. A four (4) lane roadway segment of El Centro Road from Arena Boulevard to San Juan Road. Roadway segment length of 5,690 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "C". Roadway section type "A". Complete. Balance of funding removed in the 2017 NNFP Update.	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -
14a	ELKHORN BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 14a from SR-99 to East Commerce Way & Natomas Blvd to City Limit on East. A six (6) lane roadway segment of Elkhorn Boulevard from its intersection with State Route 99 to East Commerce Way and then from Natomas Boulevard to the City limits on the east. Roadway segment length of 5,550 feet; roadway width of 121 feet. City landscape quality level "C". Roadway section type "B". Schedule One funding revised by 2017 NNFP Update to reflect fair share. Schedule 2 is the balance of costs in 2008 dollars.	\$ 5,288,924			\$ 5,288,924
14b	ELKHORN BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 14b from East Commerce Way to Natomas Blvd. A four (4) lane roadway segment of Elkhorn Boulevard from East Commerce Way to its intersection Natomas Boulevard. Roadway segment length of 6,600 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "C". Roadway section type "A". Schedule One funding revised by 2017 NNFP Update to reflect fair share. Schedule 2 is the balance of costs in 2008 dollars.	\$ 4,577,319			\$ 4,577,319

**Public Facilities**

Police Substation City of Sacramento	Removed from the PFF Program	\$ -			\$ -
---	------------------------------	------	--	--	------

# Schedule Three

## The "Boot" Area



**ORDINANCE NO. 2019-**

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council November 19, 2019

**APPROVING A FOURTH AMENDMENT TO CITY AGREEMENT NO. 2002-041 BETWEEN THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO AND ALLEGHANY PROPERTIES, LLC (APN: 225-1870-025-0000, 225-1870-026-0000, 225-0140-073-0000, 225-0140-074-0000, 225-0140-075-0000, 225-0140-076-0000, 225-0140-077-0000, 225-0140-078-0000, 225-2300-012-0000, 225-2300-013-0000, 225-1250-048-0000, 225-2970-001-0000, 225-2970-002-0000, 225-2970-003-0000, 225-2970-004-0000, 225-2970-005-0000, 225-2970-006-0000, 225-2970-007-0000, 225-2970-009-0000, 225-0150-031-0000, 225-0150-033-0000, 225-0150-043-0000, 225-0150-044-0000, 225-0150-053-0000, 225-0180-039-0000, 225-0180-059-0000) (P19-050)**

BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO:

**Section 1. Incorporation of Agreement.**

This ordinance incorporates the Third Amendment to City Agreement No. 2002-041 between the City of Sacramento and Alleghany Properties, LLC (“**Landowner**”), a copy of which is attached to this ordinance as Exhibit A.

**Section 2. Hearing before the Planning and Design Commission.**

On October 10, 2019, in accordance with Government Code section 65867, Sacramento City Code chapter 18.16, and City of Sacramento Ordinance 95-012, the Planning and Design Commission conducted a noticed public hearing on an application to amend City Agreement No. 2002-041 (the "**Original Agreement**"). During the hearing, the Planning and Design Commission received and considered evidence and testimony. After the hearing concluded, the Planning and Design Commission forwarded to the City Council a recommendation to approve the proposed amendment.

**Section 3. Hearing before the City Council; Findings.**

On November 19, 2019, in accordance with Government Code section 65867, Sacramento City Code chapter 18.16, and City of Sacramento Ordinance 95-012, the City Council conducted a noticed public hearing on an application to amend the Original Agreement. During the hearing, the City Council received and considered evidence and testimony concerning the proposed amendment. Based on the information in the application and the evidence and testimony received at the hearing, the City Council finds as follows:

- (a) The proposed amendment to the Original Agreement is consistent with the City’s general plan and the goals, policies, standards, and objectives of the North Natomas Community Plan.

- (b) The proposed amendment will facilitate Landowner's development of the property subject to the amendment, which should be encouraged in order to meet important economic, social, environmental, or planning goals of the North Natomas Community Plan.
- (c) Without the amendment, Landowner would be unlikely to proceed with development of the property subject to the amendment in the manner proposed.
- (d) Landowner will incur substantial costs to provide public improvements, facilities, or services from which the general public will benefit.
- (e) Landowner will participate in all programs established or required under the general plan or any applicable specific or community plan and all of its approving resolutions (including any mitigation-monitoring plan) and has agreed to the financial participation required under the applicable financing plan and its implementation measures, all of which will accrue to the benefit of the public.
- (f) Landowner has made commitments to a high standard of quality and has agreed to all applicable land-use and development regulations.
- (g) The property subject to the amendment is within an area for which the local flood-management agency has made adequate progress (as defined in California Government Code section 65007) on the construction of a flood-protection system that, for the area intended to be protected by the system, will result in flood protection equal to or greater than the urban level of flood protection in urban areas for property located within a flood-hazard zone, as demonstrated by the *SAFCA Urban Level of Flood Protection Plan and Adequate Progress Baseline Report* and the *SAFCA Adequate Progress Toward an Urban Level of Flood Protection Engineer's Report*, each accepted by the City Council on June 21, 2016 (Resolution No. 2016-0226), and the *SAFCA 2019 Adequate Progress Annual Report* accepted by the City Council on October 22, 2019 (Resolution No. 2019-0398).

#### **Section 4. Approval and Authorization.**

The City Council hereby approves the Fourth Amendment to City Agreement No. 2002-041, a copy of which is attached to this ordinance as Exhibit A. The City Council hereby authorizes the Mayor to sign on the City's behalf, on or after the effective date of this ordinance, the Fourth Amendment to City Agreement No. 2002-041.

#### **Table of Contents:**

Exhibit A: Fourth Amendment to City Agreement No. 2002-041

No fee required, as recording benefits the City of Sacramento, a governmental entity (Gov. Code, §§ 6103 & 27383).

**Recording requested by, and when recorded return to—**

City Clerk  
City of Sacramento  
915 "I" Street, Fifth Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

## Exhibit A: Fourth Amendment to City Agreement No. 2002-041

SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE FOR RECORDER'S USE ONLY

### Fourth Amendment to City Agreement No. 2002-041 North Natomas Development Agreement for the Parkview Project

This amendatory agreement, dated August 1, 2019, for purposes of identification, is between the CITY OF SACRAMENTO, a California municipal corporation and charter city (the "**City**"); and ALLEGHANY PROPERTIES LLC, a Delaware limited-liability company ("**Alleghany**") and the successor of Alleghany Properties, Inc. a Delaware corporation.

#### Background

In 2002 the City, Gateway West LLC ("**Gateway**"), and Alleghany's predecessor, Alleghany Properties, Inc., entered into a North Natomas Development Agreement designated as City Agreement No. 2002-041 and recorded with the Sacramento County Clerk/Recorder at Page 0431 of Book 20020408. City Agreement No. 2002-041 has been amended three times:

- by City Agreement No. 2002-041-1\*, which is between the City and Alleghany's predecessor (but not Gateway) and is recorded with the Sacramento County Clerk/Recorder at Page 0975 of Book 20020911;
- by City Agreement No. 97-100-2†, which is between the City and Alleghany (but not Gateway) and is recorded with the Sacramento County Clerk/Recorder at Page 0664 of Book 20170428; and
- by City Agreement No. 2002-041-2, which is between the City and Gateway (but not Alleghany or its predecessor) and is recorded with the Sacramento County Clerk/Recorder as Document No. 201801110978 (although titled "second amendment," this is really the *third* amendment to City Agreement No. 2002-041).

Under City Agreement No. 2002-041 as amended by City Agreement Nos. 2002-041-1 and 97-100-2 (the "**Original Agreement**"), Alleghany agrees to participate in, and to faithfully and timely comply with, the North Natomas Finance Plan as it is amended from time to time (the "**Finance Plan**").

On May 26, 2009, the Sacramento City Council approved the *North Natomas Nexus Study and Financing Plan 2008 Update*, which among other things establishes a new procedure for adjusting the amount of the Public Facilities Fee established by Sacramento City Code section 18.24.050. By

\* Because City Agreement No. 2002-041-1 amended not just City Agreement No. 2002-041 but also City Agreement No. 97-100, it is also designated as City Agreement No. 97-100-1.

† City Agreement No. 97-100-2 amended City Agreement No. 2002-041 as well as City Agreement No. 97-100, so it also should have been designated as City Agreement No. 2002-041-2.

entering into this amendatory agreement, the City and Alleghany incorporate the new procedure into the Original Agreement.

***With these background facts in mind, the City and Alleghany agree as follows:***

- 1. Amendment to Definition of “North Natomas Finance Plan.”** The definition of “North Natomas Finance Plan” in article I of the Original Agreement is amended to read as follows in its entirety:  
  
**North Natomas Finance Plan:** the plan, as it may be amended from time to time, that establishes methods for financing Infrastructure through a combination of land transfers, dedications, contributions, fees, assessment districts, community facilities districts, and other measures. As to the Public Facilities Fee, the North Natomas Finance Plan, as amended from time to time, will provide for adjusting the amount of the Public Facilities Fee in accordance with the principles set forth in the procedure attached hereto as Exhibit I and incorporated herein by reference.
- 2. Addition of New Exhibit I.** The procedure for adjusting the Public Facilities Fee that is attached to this amendatory agreement as an exhibit is hereby added to, and made part of, the Original Agreement as Exhibit I.
- 3. All Other Terms Remain in Force.** Except as amended by sections 1 and 2 above, all terms and conditions of the Original Agreement remain in full force.
- 4. Effective Date.** This amendatory agreement takes effect on the effective date of the ordinance that approves it (Gov. Code, § 65868; Sacramento City Code, §§ 18.16.120 & 18.16.130).
- 5. Recording.** Either party may record this amendatory agreement with the Sacramento County Clerk/Recorder.
- 6. Counterparts.** The parties may execute this amendatory agreement in counterparts, each of which will be considered an original, but all of which will constitute the same agreement.
- 7. Entire Agreement.** This amendatory agreement sets forth the parties’ entire understanding regarding the matters set forth above. It supersedes all prior or contemporaneous agreements, representations, and negotiations regarding those matters (whether written, oral, express, or implied) and may be modified only by another written agreement signed by all parties. This amendatory agreement will control if any conflict arises between it and the Original Agreement.

*(Signature Page Follows)*

**City of Sacramento**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Darrell Steinberg, Mayor  
City of Sacramento  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_, 2019

Attest  
Sacramento City Clerk

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Approved as to Form  
Sacramento City Attorney

By: Joseph Cerullo  
Joseph Cerullo  
Senior Deputy City Attorney

**Alleghany Properties LLC**

By: David J. Bugatto  
David J. Bugatto  
President and CEO  
Date: NOVEMBER 12, 2019

Approved as to Form  
Law Offices of Gregory D. Thatch

By: Ryan M. Hooper  
Ryan M. Hooper  
Attorneys for Alleghany Properties LLC

[Attach Certificate of Acknowledgment – Civil Code § 1189]

**CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

**CIVIL CODE § 1189**

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California )  
County of Sacramento )

On 11/12/19 before me, Diane Mason, Notary Public  
Date Here Insert Name and Title of the Officer

personally appeared David J. Bugatto  
Name(s) of Signer(s)

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.



Signature [Signature]  
Signature of Notary Public

Place Notary Seal Above

**OPTIONAL**

Though this section is optional, completing this information can deter alteration of the document or fraudulent reattachment of this form to an unintended document.

**Description of Attached Document**

Title or Type of Document: \_\_\_\_\_ Document Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of Pages: \_\_\_\_\_ Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: \_\_\_\_\_

**Capacity(ies) Claimed by Signer(s)**

Signer's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Corporate Officer — Title(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Partner —  Limited  General  
 Individual  Attorney in Fact  
 Trustee  Guardian or Conservator  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signer Is Representing: \_\_\_\_\_

Signer's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Corporate Officer — Title(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Partner —  Limited  General  
 Individual  Attorney in Fact  
 Trustee  Guardian or Conservator  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signer Is Representing: \_\_\_\_\_

**EXHIBIT I**

**Procedure for Adjusting the Public Facilities Fee and Revising the Inventory of Remaining Infrastructure to be Financed by that Fee**

When amending the North Natomas Finance Plan, the City shall set the amount of the Public Facilities Fee (subsection A.1 in Sacramento City Code section 18.24.050) in accordance with the following procedure by using the estimated cost of the remaining facilities to be financed:

**1. Definitions.**

- (a) "Agreement" means the development agreement to which this Exhibit I is attached.
- (b) "Aggregate Costs" means the aggregate PFF Shares of PFF Facilities remaining to be completed, calculated using the then-current year's cost estimate, plus the cost to pay the administrative component of the PFF as specified in the Finance Plan.
- (c) "CalTrans Index" means the Quarterly California Highway Construction Cost Index (Price Index for Selected Highway Construction Items) published by the California Department of Transportation, Division of Engineering Services – Office Engineer.
- (d) "CEQA Mitigation Measure" means a requirement proposed, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, to eliminate or substantially lessen the significant effects on the environment from the City's approval of a project on the Property.
- (e) "Effective Date of this Exhibit" means the effective date of the amendatory agreement that adds this Exhibit I to the Agreement.
- (f) "ENR Index" means the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index for San Francisco.
- (g) "Finance Plan" means the North Natomas Finance Plan, as amended.
- (h) "Landowner" means Alleghany Properties LLC, a Delaware limited-liability company and the successor of Alleghany Properties, Inc.
- (i) "Non-PFF Sources" means any funding for a Schedule One or Schedule Two Facility other than PFF funding. It includes but is not limited to federal funding, state funding, regional funding, grants, gifts, contributions, fees, reimbursements, the City's general fund, the City's Major Street Construction Tax, private funds, payments from the Greenbriar area, and payments from the Panhandle area upon annexation to the City. It does not include conditions of approval or CEQA Mitigation Measures imposed on any project the Landowner proposes for the Property, except as otherwise provided in section 7(b).
- (j) "Funding Requirement" means the amount of the PFF that must be generated from remaining development so that the City will have adequate funding to construct the PFF

Facilities remaining to be completed and to administer the PFF program. It is calculated as follows: *first*, calculate the Aggregate Costs; *second*, from the Aggregate Costs, subtract both the PFF revenues then available to complete the uncompleted PFF Facilities (including any interest earned on those PFF revenues) and the amount of any reduction under section 9; and *third*, add the amount of outstanding PFF credits.

- (j) "PFF" means the Public Facilities Fee established by subsection A.1 of Sacramento City Code section 18.24.050, as amended.
- (k) "PFF Funding Obligation" means the maximum funding obligation of the PFF in a given year, determined in accordance with subsection 5 below.
- (l) "PFF Share" means the portion of a PFF Facility's cost that is funded, in whole or part, by the PFF.
- (m) "Property" means the real property identified in Exhibit A to the Agreement.
- (n) "Schedule One" means the list of public improvements and segments of public improvements that is attached to, and made part of, this Exhibit I.
- (o) "Schedule One Facility" means a public improvement or segment of a public improvement that is listed on Schedule One.
- (p) "Schedule Two" means the list of public improvements and segments of public improvements that is attached to, and made part of, this Exhibit I.
- (q) "Schedule Two Facility" means a public improvement or segment of a public improvement that is listed on Schedule Two.
- (r) "Schedule Three" means the diagram of the "Boot" area that is attached to, and made part of, this Exhibit I.
- (s) "Scope" means the location or physical description, or both, of a Schedule One Facility or a Schedule Two Facility, but not the PFF funding set forth for the facility in Schedule One or Schedule Two (the actual PFF funding for a facility or portion of a facility may be higher or lower than the dollar amount set forth in Schedule One or Schedule Two).
- (t) "Transportation Facilities" means all public improvements and segments of public improvements listed in Schedule One other than the police substation, second fire station, library, freeway landscaping, and community center.
- (u) "2008 Update" means the North Natomas Nexus Study and Financing Plan 2008 Update that the Sacramento City Council approved on May 26, 2009, by adopting Resolution No. 2009-341.

2. **Annual PFF Adjustment for Schedule One Facilities.**

(a) Each July 1, the City shall adjust the PFF in accordance with the difference between—

- (1) the Funding Requirement for the then-current year; and
- (2) the funding that would be available, after deducting revenue on hand (which includes interest and any reductions under section 9) and adding outstanding PFF credits, if the then-existing PFF were applied to remaining development.

In other words, the City shall adjust the PFF in accordance with the difference between the then-current year’s cost estimate and an amount calculated by applying the then-existing PFF to remaining development.

(b) Example of an annual PFF adjustment for Schedule One Facilities:

As of April 1, 2010	Percentage Cost Changes		
	+3.257%	−6.000%	+6.000%
<b>Costs Comparison</b>			
Remaining Costs from April 1, 2009, Estimate	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000
Aggregate Costs and Administration	206,514,000	188,000,000	212,000,000
	+3.257%	−6.000%	+6.000%
<b>Funding Requirement Calculation</b>			
Aggregate Costs and Administration	206,514,000	188,000,000	212,000,000
Less Cash on Hand April 1, 2010	−30,000,000	−30,000,000	−30,000,000
Plus Credits Outstanding April 1, 2010	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
2010 Funding Requirement	201,514,000	183,000,000	207,000,000
<b>Existing Fee Calculation</b>			
Revenue From Remaining Development Using 2009 Fees	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000
Less Cash on Hand April 1, 2010	−30,000,000	−30,000,000	−30,000,000
Plus Credits Outstanding April 1, 2010	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Resources Based with 2009 Fees	195,000,000	195,000,000	195,000,000
<b>Fee Change Effective July 1, 2010</b>			
Resources Based on 2009 Fees	195,000,000	195,000,000	195,000,000
2010 Funding Requirement	201,514,000	183,000,000	207,000,000
Fee Change \$	+6,514,000	−12,000,000	+12,000,000
Fee Change %	+3.341%	−6.154%	+6.154%

(c) Unless the City determines that prevailing market conditions do not justify doing so (e.g., if development is lacking or the remaining development is limited), at least once every three years the City shall perform a comprehensive review and nexus study for the PFF, using the cost-adjustment procedures in subsections 3 and 4 to reallocate costs to remaining undeveloped land uses in accordance with Finance Plan policies and principles.

3. **Procedure for Adjusting Costs of Uncompleted Transportation Facilities.** The City shall use the following procedure to adjust the PFF Shares for all uncompleted Transportation Facilities:

(a) *Method of Adjustment.* Each year, the City shall determine the cost adjustment for uncompleted Transportation Facilities using either the Benchmark Change determined under subsection 3(b) or the percentage change in the index selected under subsection 3(c). If, for the year in question, the difference between the Benchmark Change and the percentage change in the selected index is five or more percentage points, then the City shall use the Benchmark Change to adjust costs for uncompleted Transportation Facilities. Otherwise, the City shall adjust costs for those facilities using the percentage change in the selected index.

(b) *Determination of Benchmark Change.* The City shall follow the following steps to determine the “Benchmark Change” for each year:

(1) *Step 1.* Before April 1, have a third-party professional engineering consultant who is under contract to the City estimate the cost to construct all uncompleted Transportation Facilities. The cost estimate will anticipate cost changes to the next July 1.

(2) *Step 2.* Determine the “Benchmark Estimate” of the cost to construct all uncompleted Transportation Facilities by adding an estimated contingency to the cost estimate from Step 1. The estimated contingency may not exceed 26% of the cost estimate.

(3) *Step 3.* Divide the Benchmark Estimate from Step 2 by the previous year’s adjusted cost estimate for uncompleted Transportation Facilities (which was determined in accordance with this section 3) and express the resulting quotient as a decimal.

**Illustration:** If, for example, the Benchmark Estimate from Step 2 is \$206,514,000 and the previous year’s cost estimate for uncompleted Transportation Facilities is \$188,275,000, then the resulting quotient (to nine decimal places) is 1.094258842 (i.e.,  $\$206,514,000 \div \$188,275,000 = 1.094258842$ ).

(4) *Step 4.* Subtract 1.0 from the resulting quotient in Step 3.

**Illustration:** If, for example, the quotient from Step 3 is 1.094258842, then subtracting 1.0 from that quotient yields a difference of 0.094258842 (i.e.,  $1.094258842 - 1.0 = 0.094258842$ ).

(5) *Step 5.* Express the difference from Step 4 as a percentage by multiplying it by 100 and adding a percentage sign, and then round the percentage to the nearest thousandth. This rounded percentage is the Benchmark Change for the year.

**Illustration:** If, for example, the difference from Step 4 is 0.094258842, then multiplying that difference by 100 and rounding the product to the nearest thousandth yields a Benchmark Change of 9.426%.

- (c) *Selection of Index.* Each year, the City shall adjust the cost of the Transportation Facilities remaining to be completed by using either the percentage change in the ENR Index or the percentage change in the CalTrans Index, according to the following criteria:
- (1) If both indexes are positive on March 1 of the year in question, then the City shall adjust the cost of the remaining Transportation Facilities using the index with the greater percentage change.
  - (2) If the change in one index is positive and the change in the other is negative on March 1 of the year in question, then the City shall adjust the cost of the remaining Transportation Facilities using the index with the positive change.
  - (3) If the change for both indexes is negative on March 1 of the year in question, then the City shall adjust the cost of the remaining Transportation Facilities using the index with the negative change that is closer to zero.
  - (4) Measurement of Percentage Change in an Index.
    - (A) The percentage change in the ENR Index is the year-over-year change as of each March.
    - (B) The percentage change in the CalTrans Index is the change between the 12-quarter average through quarter 1 of the then-current year and the 12-quarter average through quarter 1 of the prior year.
- (d) *Precision.* The City shall carry out all calculations to three decimal places.
- (e) *Sample Cost Adjustments for Uncompleted Transportation Facilities:*

**Sample #1**

Benchmark change of + 4.000%  
 ENR Index change of + 2.000%  
 CalTrans Index change of + 3.100%  
**Adjustment: plus 3.100%**

**Sample #2**

Benchmark change of + 4.500%  
 ENR Index change of + 1.000%  
 CalTrans Index change of – 1.000%  
**Adjustment: plus 1.000%**

**Sample #3**

Benchmark change of – 4.000%  
 ENR Index change of – 0.500%  
 CalTrans Index change of – 1.000%  
**Adjustment: minus 0.500%**

**Sample #4**

Benchmark change of – 5.000%  
 ENR change of + 0.500%  
 Cal Trans Index change of + 0.000%  
**Adjustment: minus 5.000%**

**Sample #5**

Benchmark change of +6.000%  
 ENR Index change of +1.000%  
 CalTrans Index change of –1.000%  
**Adjustment: plus 6.000%**

**Sample #6**

Benchmark change of +6.000%  
 ENR change of +3.500%  
 CalTrans Index change of +7.000%  
**Adjustment: plus 7.000%**

4. **Cost Adjustment for Police Substation, Second Fire Station, Library, Freeway Landscaping, and Community Center.** The PFF Shares of the police substation, second fire station, library, freeway landscaping, and community center listed in Schedule One will not exceed the amount established in the 2008 Update, except as follows: the City shall adjust the PFF Shares for the police substation, second fire station, library, freeway landscaping, and community center by using only the positive change in the ENR Index from March to March, effective each July 1. If, however, there are two consecutive years of decreases in the ENR Index, then, beginning with the second year of the decrease, the City shall decrease the PFF Shares for the police substation, second fire station, library, freeway landscaping, and community center by an amount equal to the decrease in the ENR Index for that second year.
5. **Annual Determination of the PFF Funding Obligation.** The Finance Plan shows for each Schedule One Facility not just its estimated cost but also its PFF Share. Each year, after adjusting costs in accordance with sections 2 through 4 above, the City shall determine the aggregate PFF share for all PFF Facilities, and that aggregate amount will be the PFF Funding Obligation for that year.
6. **Reduction of PFF Shares.**
  - (a) The City may reduce the PFF Share of a Schedule One Facility only if one of the following events occurs:
    - (1) The PFF Share of the estimated cost to construct the facility, as set forth in Schedule One, decreases as a result of the procedure in subsection 3 or 4.
    - (2) The PFF Share of the actual cost to construct the facility is less than the PFF Share set forth for the facility in Schedule One, adjusted in accordance with the procedure in subsection 3 or 4.
    - (3) The City secures and appropriates, from Non-PFF Sources, funding to replace all or part of the facility's PFF Share.
  - (b) If the City reduces a PFF Share in accordance with subsection 6(a)(1) or 6(a)(2), then the City may use the reduced portion only to decrease the Funding Requirement.
  - (c) If the City reduces a PFF Share in accordance with subsection 6(a)(3) and the reduction does not result from payments the City receives from the Greenbriar area or the Panhandle area, then the City shall use the reduced portion of the PFF Share as follows:
    - (1) First, if there is an actual cost overrun on a completed Schedule One Facility when the PFF share is reduced, then the City shall use the reduced portion of the PFF share to reduce the cost overrun on that facility.
    - (2) Second, if a Schedule One Facility is under construction when the PFF share is reduced and the City anticipates that the actual cost to construct that facility will exceed the facility's PFF Share shown on Schedule One (as the PFF Share has been adjusted from

year to year), then the City shall use the reduced portion of the PFF share to reduce the anticipated cost overrun on that facility.

(3) Third, if there are no actual or anticipated cost overruns on a Schedule One Facility when the PFF Share is reduced, then the City may use the reduced portion of the PFF Share either—

(A) to fund or to increase the Scope of Schedule One or Schedule Two Facilities; or

(B) to reduce the Funding Requirement.

(d) The City shall determine the reduced amount of a PFF Share in accordance with subsection 3 or 4 above, as appropriate.

## **7. Funding for Schedule Two Facilities.**

(a) Except as provided in subsection 7(b), the only funding available for Schedule Two Facilities is—

(1) PFF funding available under subsection 6(c)(3)(A);

(2) funding from Non-PFF Sources; and

(3) fee revenues available under subsections 8(a) and 8(b).

(b) If, when approving a project on the Property, the City requires the construction or funding of a Schedule Two Facility, in whole or part, as a CEQA Mitigation Measure or a condition of approval, then the City shall timely construct or fund that facility at no cost to the Landowner, subject to the following: the City may require, as a CEQA Mitigation Measure or a condition of approval, that the Landowner construct or fund the overcrossing for Snowy Egret Way described in Schedule Two if—

(1) the Property consists of one or more of Sacramento County APNs 225-0070-059, 225-0070-060, 225-0070-063, 225-0070-067, and 225-0070-076; and

(2) the mitigated negative declaration, the environmental impact report, or any other relevant environmental document prepared for the Landowner's project proposes the construction or funding of the Snowy Egret Way as mitigation for the traffic impacts that will result from approval of the project

## **8. Funding from Greenbriar and the Panhandle.**

- (a) When the City begins to receive development-impact fees collected under the Panhandle Finance Plan to offset the cost of PFF-funded facilities that benefit the Panhandle area, the City may use those fees to fund or to increase the Scope of Schedule One Facilities and Schedule Two Facilities.
- (b) When the City begins to receive development-impact fees collected under the Greenbriar Finance Plan to offset the cost of PFF-funded facilities that benefit the Greenbriar area, the City may use those fees to fund or to increase the Scope of Schedule One Facilities and Schedule Two Facilities.

## **9. Reduction of Funding Requirement.**

- (a) The City, in its discretion, may reduce the Funding Requirement in accordance with subsection 6(c)(3)(B).
- (b) If the land-use designation for Sacramento County APN 225-0070-059, 225-0070-060, 225-0070-063, or 225-0070-067 (each, an “Arco Arena Parcel”) is changed to allow uses different from the uses permitted for the Arco Arena Parcel under the North Natomas Community Plan as it existed on the effective date of the Agreement, then each year the City shall reduce the Funding Requirement by an amount equal to the increased portion of PFF that the City collects from the affected Arco Arena Parcel.

**10. Scope of Schedule One and Schedule Two Facilities.** The Scope of each Schedule One Facility is as described in Schedule One and the Finance Plan. The City may not revise the Scope except as provided in subsections 10(a), 10(b), and 10(c), or as required to comply with federal or state law. With respect to freeway overcrossings (unless sufficient PFF funding has been allocated already), the physical appearance, design enhancements, and landscaping must be substantially comparable to the freeway overcrossings and freeway interchanges at Truxel Road and Interstate 80, Arena Boulevard and Interstate 5, and Del Paso Road and Interstate 5 as they existed on the Effective Date of this Exhibit. With respect to other public roadways and streets, the scope must be based on the City’s street-design standards that apply to the roadway or street under the Agreement.

- (a) The City may increase the Scope of a Schedule One Facility in accordance with subsections 6(c)(3)(A), 8(a), and 8(b).
- (b) The City may increase the Scope of a Schedule Two Facility in accordance with subsections 6(c)(3)(A), 7(a), 8(a), and 8(b).
- (c) If the City receives development-impact fees collected under the Panhandle Finance Plan to offset the cost of PFF-funded facilities that benefit the Panhandle area, or if the City receives development-impact fees collected under the Greenbriar Finance Plan to offset the cost of PFF-funded facilities that benefit the Greenbriar area, then the City may use those fees and

any other Non-PFF Sources to fund in full a change in the Scope of a Schedule One Facility or a Schedule Two Facility.

**11. Adequate Funding for Schedule One Facilities.** The City may not cite, as a reason for increasing the amount of the PFF Funding Obligation, the loss of potential funding from Non-PFF Sources identified in the 2008 Update.

**12. Change in PFF Share for West El Camino/Interstate 80 Interchange Improvements.** The PFF Share for the West El Camino/Interstate 80 Interchange Improvements (the “Interchange Improvements”) was determined to be 9% based upon an assumption in the City’s traffic study that the area of Natomas commonly known as the “Boot,” as shown on Schedule Three, would be developed with urban uses. If all urban development in the Boot ever becomes permanently prohibited by law, such as by the recording of perpetual open-space or conservation easements, then the following will apply notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Exhibit I:

- (a) The City shall increase the entire Finance Plan area’s share of the Interchange Improvements from 9% to 37% of the cost of the interchange as determined by the consultant under subsection 3(b), above.
- (b) The City shall adjust the PFF Share for the Interchange Improvements to reflect the increase to 37%, taking into account the development that has already taken place in the entire Finance Plan area, so that remaining development in the Finance Plan area pays only its fair share of the entire Finance Plan area’s new 37% share of the cost of the Interchange Improvements.
- (c) To illustrate the adjustment described in subsections 12(a) and 12(b), the following example shows how the adjustment would be calculated if urban development becomes permanently prohibited in the Boot when the Finance Plan area is 60% built out:

		Current Finance Plan Share Scenario	Revised Finance Plan Share Scenario (if Development of the Boot is Prohibited)	
a	Interchange Cost	\$22,465,000	\$22,465,000	
b	Finance Plan Fair Share	9%	37%	
c	PFF Allocated Share of Cost	\$2,021,850	\$8,312,050	(a*b)
d	Base Share	\$2,021,850	\$2,021,850	
e	Incremental Share	N/A	\$6,290,200	(c-d)
f	% Development Remaining	N/A	40%	
g	Incremental Adjusted Share	N/A	\$2,516,080	(e*f)
h	PFF Funding Obligation	\$2,021,850	\$4,537,930	(d+g)

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
<b>Bridges:</b>							
B1	C	Bridge Cross Drive Over East Drain Canal (6)	Bridge Completed	\$ 741,529	\$ 741,529		\$ -
B2	C	Club Center Drive at East Drain Canal (6)	Bridge Completed	\$ 1,241,682	\$ 1,241,682		\$ -
B3	C	North Bend Drive Over East Drain Canal (6)	Bridge Completed	\$ 731,657	\$ 731,657		\$ -
B4		Terracina Drive Over East Drain Canal (7)	Two (2) lane bridge 50 ft wide by 80 ft length. Bridge to include (2) 12' lanes, (2) 6' bike lanes, and (2) 5' sidewalks and a 4' painted median.	\$ 1,172,093			\$ 1,172,093
B5		Del Paso Road Over East Drain Canal	Six (6) lane bridge, 98 ft wide by 80 ft length. Bridge to include (6) 12' lanes, (2) 6' bike lanes and, (2) 5' sidewalks and a 4' painted median.	\$ 1,541,030			\$ 1,541,030
B6		Elkhorn Boulevard Over East Drain Canal	Six (6) lane bridge, 98 ft wide by 80 ft length. Bridge to include (6) 12' lanes, (2) 6' bike lanes and, (2) 5' sidewalks and a 4' painted median.	\$ 1,541,030			\$ 1,541,030
B7		Gateway Park Boulevard Over C-1 Canal	Four (4) lane bridge, 74 ft wide by 80 ft length. Bridge to include (4) 12' lanes, (2) 6' bike lanes and, (2) 5' sidewalks and a 4' painted median.	\$ 1,953,488			\$ 1,953,488
B8		El Centro Road Over West Drain Canal	Four (4) lane bridge, 74 ft wide by 80 ft length. Bridge to include (4) 12' lanes, (2) 6' bike lanes and, (2) 5' sidewalks and a 4' painted median.	\$ 1,163,635			\$ 1,163,635
		<b>Subtotal Bridges:</b>		<b>\$ 10,086,145</b>	<b>\$ 2,714,868</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 7,371,277</b>
<b>Interchanges:</b>							
	P	Truxel	Truxel Interchange overcrossing, auxiliary lanes between Truxel and Northgate, and a two (2) lane Eastbound exit at Northgate completed. PFF funding is 33.2% of the total cost for the overcrossing and 100% for the auxiliary lanes.	\$ 8,907,217		\$ 7,206,227	\$ 1,700,990
	C	Arena	Arena Interchange, auxiliary lane I-5 at Del Paso to I-80, a two (2) lane Southbound exit from I-5, and striping for Northbound exit for two (2) lanes completed. PFF funding is 100% of the total cost.	\$ 22,817,789		\$ 22,817,789	\$ -
	P	Del Paso	Del Paso Interchange.	\$ 861,460			\$ 861,460
	P	Del Paso Interchange Auxiliary Lane	Construct an auxiliary lane at the south bound loop on-ramp to Interstate 80 and signalization. PFF funding is 100% of the total cost.	\$ 1,665,294		\$ 60,000	\$ 1,605,294
		Elkhorn/SR 99 Interchange	Expand interchange to a 6 lane interchange to accommodate widening of Elkhorn Blvd from 2 to 6 lanes. PFF funding is 34.0% of the total cost.	\$ 4,399,000			\$ 4,399,000
	P	W. El Camino/I-80 Interchange	Widen overcrossing to four (4) lanes. PFF funding share was determined with 2008 PFF update. PFF funding is 9.0% of the total cost.	\$ 2,022,000		\$ 538,975	\$ 1,483,025
		<b>Subtotal Interchanges:</b>		<b>\$ 40,672,760</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 30,622,991</b>	<b>\$ 10,049,769</b>
<b>Overcrossings:</b>							
		El Centro	PFF funding is 100% of the total cost to construct a 2 lane, 52 ft wide overcrossing over Interstate 5 to include approaches from Bayou Road to East Commerce Way. This overcrossing assumes a 52' right of way with two 12' lanes, two 8' bike lanes/shoulders, and two 6' sidewalks with barriers.	\$ 7,692,000			\$ 7,692,000

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
	P	Meister Way - w/ LRT Lanes	PFF funding is 17.5% of the total cost to construct a 2 lane overcrossing, 69 ft total width, over Highway 99 to include approaches from East Commerce Way to proposed east boundary of the Greenbriar development project. This overcrossing assumes a 69' right of way with two 12' vehicle lanes, 10' striped median, two 9' bike lanes/shoulders and two 6' sidewalks with barriers. Light rail tracks to be placed on separate overcrossing structure. Funding share determined with 2008 PFF update.	\$ 1,412,456		\$ 916,677	\$ 495,779
<b>Subtotal Overcrossings:</b>				<b>\$ 9,104,456</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 916,677</b>	<b>\$ 8,187,779</b>
<b>Total of Interchanges and Overcrossings (Freeways)</b>				<b>\$ 49,777,216</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 31,539,668</b>	<b>\$ 18,237,548</b>
<b>Bikeways</b>							
1	C	NORTHPOINTE SOUTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 5,367 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 263,845	\$ 263,845		\$ -
2	C	TOSCARO TRAIL (4)	Bikeway constructed.	\$ -			\$ -
3		ELKHORN BOULEVARD	12 feet wide for a distance of 15,371 feet.	\$ 998,800			\$ 998,800
4	C	EAST SIDE OF EAST DRAIN CANAL - SOUTH OF ELKHORN BLVD	12 feet wide for a distance of 7,224 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 329,831	\$ 329,831		\$ -
5	C	NORTHPOINTE NORTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 4,850 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 315,200	\$ 144,017	\$ 171,183	\$ -
6	C	NORTHPOINTE SOUTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 4,763 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 309,500	\$ 35,636	\$ 273,864	\$ -
7	C	EAST DRAIN CANAL DEL PASO RD TO BASIN 5	12 feet wide for a distance of 1,217 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 79,100		\$ 79,100	\$ -
8		EAST DRAIN CANAL AT BASIN 5	12 feet wide for a distance of 1,076 feet.	\$ 69,900			\$ 69,900
9		EAST DRAIN CANAL TRUXEL - ARENA	12 feet wide for a distance of 2,554 feet.	\$ 166,000			\$ 166,000
10	P	EAST DRAIN CANAL TRUXEL - SJ	12 feet wide for a distance of 6,048 feet.	\$ 393,000		\$ 259,300	\$ 133,700
11		C1 CANAL WEST CITY	12 feet wide for a distance of 4,056 feet.	\$ 263,600			\$ 263,600
12		C1 CANAL COUNTY	12 feet wide for a distance of 5,077 feet.	\$ 329,900			\$ 329,900
13		C1 CANAL EAST CITY	12 feet wide for a distance of 252 feet.	\$ 16,400			\$ 16,400
14		WEST DRAIN CANAL SOUTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 3,298 feet.	\$ 214,300			\$ 214,300
15		WEST DRAIN CANAL	12 feet wide for a distance of 5,047 feet.	\$ 328,000			\$ 328,000
16	P	WESTLAKE - EAST/WEST	12 feet wide for a distance of 2,882 feet. Bikeway partially constructed.	\$ 187,300		\$ 124,782	\$ 62,518
17	P	NORTH PARK DRIVE IN REGIONAL PARK	12 feet wide for a distance of 2,950 feet. Bikeway partially constructed.	\$ 191,700	\$ 82,184		\$ 109,516
18	P	FISHERMAN'S LAKE	12 feet wide for a distance of 6,696 feet.	\$ 435,100		\$ 287,100	\$ 148,000
19	P	EAST SIDE - STATE ROUTE 99	12 feet wide for an original distance of 8,644 feet. Bikeway partially constructed.	\$ 561,700	\$ 55,809		\$ 505,891
20	P	SCHUMACHER, NORTH	12 feet wide for an original distance of 4,312 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 280,200	\$ 176,715	\$ 17,970	\$ 85,515
21		EAST DRAIN CANAL, PARK PLACE	12 feet wide for a distance of 3,370 feet.	\$ 219,000			\$ 219,000
22	P	PARK 4A TRAIL	12 feet wide for a distance of 2,592 feet.	\$ 168,400		\$ 129,826	\$ 38,574
23	C	NORTHBOROUGH I @ II	Bikeway constructed.	\$ 165,133	\$ 165,133		\$ -
24	C	REGIONAL PARK NORTH/SOUTH	Bikeway constructed.	\$ 168,700		\$ 168,700	\$ -
25	C	REGIONAL PARK EAST/WEST	Bikeway constructed.	\$ 212,000		\$ 212,000	\$ -
26	C	REGIONAL PARK, NATOMAS BLVD	Bikeway constructed.	\$ 70,400		\$ 70,400	\$ -
27	P	REGIONAL PARK AQUATIC CENTER	12 feet wide for a distance of 850 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 55,200		\$ 42,847	\$ 12,353
28		NATOMAS CROSSING EAST/WEST	12 feet wide for a distance of 485 feet.	\$ 31,500			\$ 31,500
29		GOLDENLAND SOUTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 1,084 feet.	\$ 70,400			\$ 70,400
30		GOLDENLAND NORTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 1,213 feet.	\$ 78,800			\$ 78,800

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
31		RIVERVIEW BASIN 7A NORTH/SOUTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 704 feet.	\$ 45,700			\$ 45,700
32		RIVERVIEW BASIN 7A EAST/WEST	12 feet wide for a distance of 1,029 feet.	\$ 66,900			\$ 66,900
33		WESTLAKE, NORTH/SOUTH	12 feet wide for a distance of 2,385 feet.	\$ 155,000			\$ 155,000
34		EAST SIDE TRUXEL ROAD - Arena Boulevard to Natomas Crossing Drive	8 feet wide for a distance of 2,523 feet.	\$ 111,600			\$ 111,600
34a	C	EAST SIDE TRUXEL ROAD - Del Paso Road to Arena Boulevard	8 feet wide for a distance of 3,453 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 93,269			\$ 93,269
35	P	NORTHPOINTE - EAST SIDE	12 feet wide for a distance of 5,300 feet. Bikeway constructed.	\$ 344,400	\$ 246,221		\$ 98,179
<b>Subtotal Bikeways:</b>				<b>\$ 7,789,779</b>	<b>\$ 1,499,392</b>	<b>\$ 1,837,072</b>	<b>\$ 4,453,314</b>
<b>Shuttles</b>		<b>Shuttle Cost</b>	Contribution to funding of North Natomas Transportation Management Association Shuttles. Shuttles are ADA equipped and can hold 10-12 passengers.	<b>\$ 1,341,144</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 892,476</b>	<b>\$ 448,668</b>
<b>Total Bikes and Shuttles</b>				<b>\$ 9,130,923</b>	<b>\$ 1,499,392</b>	<b>\$ 2,729,548</b>	<b>\$ 4,901,982</b>
<b>Road Segments</b>							
2	C	Club Center Drive	Segment completed	\$ 555,555	\$ 555,555		\$ -
3	P	DEL PASO ROAD	Roadway Segment 3 from the City Limits on the West to El Centro Road. Widen a segment of Del Paso Road from the city limits on the West to El Centro Road to a 4 lane roadway (Roadway Segment 3). Roadway segment length of 3,042 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A".	\$ 4,052,093	\$ 1,872,261		\$ 2,179,832
4	C	DEL PASO ROAD	Roadway Segment 4 from El Centro Road to I-5 SB Off-Ramp. Widen a segment of Del Paso Road to a six (6) roadway from El Centro Road to the Southbound Off-ramp of Interstate 5 (Roadway Segment 4). Roadway segment length of 650 feet; roadway width of 136 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 1,489,429		\$ 1,489,429	\$ -
5	C	DEL PASO ROAD - NORTH SIDE	Roadway Segment 5a from NB I-5 Off-Ramp to Truxel Road. A six (6) lane roadway segment of Del Paso Road from the northbound Interstate 5 off-ramp to the Truxel Road intersection. Roadway segment length of 2,815 feet; roadway width of 81 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 4,558,621	\$ 613,831	\$ 3,944,790	\$ -
5	P	DEL PASO ROAD - NORTH SIDE	Roadway Segment 5b from NB I-5 Off-Ramp to Truxel Road. A six (6) lane roadway segment of Del Paso Road from the northbound Interstate 5 off-ramp to the Truxel Road intersection. Roadway segment length of 4,035 feet roadway width of 81 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 3,684,550	\$ 155,069		\$ 3,529,481
6	P	DEL PASO ROAD	Roadway Segment 6 from Truxel Road to East Drain Canal. A six (6) lane roadway segment of Del Paso Road from the intersection of Truxel Road to the East Drain Canal. Roadway segment length of 1,360 feet; roadway width of 136 feet. City landscape quality level "A". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 1,866,901	\$ 498,109		\$ 1,368,792
7a	C	DEL PASO ROAD - NORTH SIDE	Segment completed	\$ 2,643,318	\$ 2,643,318		\$ -

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
7b		DEL PASO ROAD - NORTH SIDE	Roadway Segment 7b from 300' West of City Limit on the East to the City Limit on the East. A six (6) lane roadway segment of Del Paso Road from 300 feet West of the east city limit to the east city limit. Roadway segment length of 300 feet; roadway width of 55 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 154,313			\$ 154,313
7c	P	DEL PASO ROAD - SOUTH SIDE	Roadway Segment 7c from the East Drain Canal to the City Limit on the East. A six (6) lane roadway segment of the southside of Del Paso Road from the East Drain Canal to the city limit on the east. Roadway segment length of 4,110 feet; roadway width of 14 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 456,424	\$ 91,536		\$ 364,888
8	P	EAST COMMERCE WAY	Roadway Segment 8 from Elkhorn Blvd to Club Center Drive. A four (4) lane roadway segment of East Commerce Way from Elkhorn Boulevard to the Club Center Drive intersection. Roadway segment length of 5,690 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A". Partially complete.	\$ 6,026,665	\$ 2,866,893		\$ 3,159,771
9	P	EAST COMMERCE WAY	Roadway Segment 9 from Club Center Drive to Del Paso Road. A six (6) lane roadway segment of East Commerce Way from its intersect with Club Center Drive to its intersection with Del Paso Road. Roadway segment length of 6,560 feet; roadway width of 136 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B". Partially complete.	\$ 8,142,228	\$ 4,095,206		\$ 4,047,022
10		EAST COMMERCE WAY	Roadway Segment 10 from Arena Blvd to Natomas Crossing Drive. A six (6) lane roadway segment of East Commerce Way from Arena Boulevard to Natomas Crossing Drive. Roadway segment length of 2,770 feet; roadway width of 136 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B". Partially complete.	\$ 3,329,327			\$ 3,329,327
11		EAST COMMERCE WAY	Roadway Segment 11 from Natomas Crossing Drive to San Juan Road. A six (6) lane roadway segment of East Commerce Way from Natomas Crossing Drive to San Juan Road. Roadway segment length of 3,120 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A". Partially complete.	\$ 3,302,398			\$ 3,302,398
12		EL CENTRO ROAD	Roadway Segment 12 from Del Paso Road to Arena Blvd. A four (4) lane roadway segment of El Centro Road from East Commerce Way to Arena Boulevard. Roadway segment length of 4,580 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A". Partially complete.	\$ 6,331,029			\$ 6,331,029
14a		ELKHORN BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 14a from SR-99 to East Commerce Way & Natomas Blvd to City Limit on East. A six (6) lane roadway segment of Elkhorn Boulevard from its intersection with State Route 99 to East Commerce Way and then from Natomas Boulevard to the City limits on the east. Roadway segment length of 5,550 feet; roadway width of 121 feet. City landscape quality level "C". Roadway section type "B". Funding revised by 2017 NNFP Update to reflect fair share.	\$ 1,784,642			\$ 1,784,642

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
14b		ELKHORN BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 14b from East Commerce Way to Natomas Blvd. A four (4) lane roadway segment of Elkhorn Boulevard from East Commerce Way to its intersection Natomas Boulevard. Roadway segment length of 6,600 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "C". Roadway section type "A". Funding revised by 2017 NNFP Update to reflect fair share.	\$ 2,642,427			\$ 2,642,427
15	P	GATEWAY PARK BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 15 from Del Paso Rd to Arena Blvd. A four (4) lane roadway segment of Gateway Park Boulevard from Del Paso Road to Arena Boulevard. Roadway segment length of 3,470 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A".	\$ 3,657,397	\$ 1,404,808		\$ 2,252,589
16a	P	GATEWAY PARK DRIVE	Roadway Segment 16a from Arena Blvd to Truxel Road. A four (4) lane roadway segment of Gateway Park Boulevard from Arena Boulevard to Truxel Road. Roadway segment length of 2,494 feet; roadway width of 57 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A".	\$ 1,699,638	\$ 1,055,390		\$ 644,248
19	C	NATOMAS CROSSING DRIVE <sup>6</sup>	Segment completed	\$ 610,766	\$ 610,766		\$ -
20	C	ARENA BOULEVARD	Segment completed	\$ 1,714,776	\$ 1,714,776		\$ -
21		ARENA BOULEVARD	Landscaping for Roadway Segment 21 from Duckhorn Drive to I-5. Landscaping a portion of a six (6) lane roadway segment of Arena Boulevard from Duckhorn Drive to Interstate 5 complete. Roadway segment length of 1,000 feet; roadway width of 136 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "B". Roadway costs for this segment are included as part of the Arena Boulevard interchange cost.	\$ 353,585			\$ 353,585
22		ARENA BOULEVARD	Landscaping for Roadway Segment 22 from I-5 to East Commerce Way. Landscaping a portion of an eight (8) lane roadway segment of Arena Boulevard from Interstate 5 to East Commerce Way complete. Roadway segment length of 1,000 feet; roadway width of 158 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "C". Roadway costs for this segment are included as part of the Arena Blvd Interchange cost.	\$ 353,585			\$ 353,585
23a	C	NATOMAS BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 23a from Elkhorn Blvd to 650' North of Club Center Dr. Frontage improvements for a four (4) lane roadway segment of Natomas Boulevard from Elkhorn Boulevard to 650 feet North of Club Center Drive complete. Roadway segment length of 4,640 feet; roadway width of 42 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "D".	\$ 3,593,709	\$ 3,593,709		\$ -
23b	P	NATOMAS BOULEVARD - FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS	Roadway Segment 23b from Elkhorn Blvd to 650' North of Club Center Dr. The frontage improvements for a four (4) lane roadway segment of Natomas Boulevard from Elkhorn Boulevard to 650 feet North of Club Center Drive. Roadway segment length of 4,640 feet; roadway width of 50 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "D".	\$ 2,779,756	\$ 1,376,303		\$ 1,403,453
23c	P	NATOMAS BOULEVARD	Segment completed	\$ 443,004	\$ 443,004		\$ -

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
23d	P	NATOMAS BOULEVARD - FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS	Roadway Segment 23d from 650' North of Club Center Dr. to Club Center Dr. The frontage improvements for a four (4) lane roadway segment of Natomas Boulevard from 650 feet North of Club Center Drive to Club Center Drive. Roadway segment length of 650 feet; roadway width of 21 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "D".	\$ 192,869	\$ 112,157		\$ 80,711
24b	P	NATOMAS BOULEVARD - FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS	Roadway Segment 24b from Club Center Dr. to North Park Dr. The frontage improvements for a six (6) lane roadway segment of Natomas Boulevard from Club Center Drive to North Park Drive. Roadway segment length of 2,000 feet; roadway width of 32 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "E".	\$ 501,827	\$ 282,968		\$ 218,859
25a	C	NATOMAS BOULEVARD	Segment completed	\$ 3,944,308	\$ 3,944,308		\$ -
25b	C	NATOMAS BOULEVARD - FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS	Roadway Segment 25b from North Park Dr. to 600' North of Del Paso Rd. The frontage improvements for a six (6) lane roadway segment of Natomas Boulevard from North Park Drive to 600 feet North of Del Paso Road. Roadway segment length of 3,790 feet; roadway width of 62 feet. City landscape quality level "A". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 2,525,477	\$ 367,477	\$ 2,158,000	\$ -
33		LIBRARY STREET <sup>4</sup>	Roadway Segment 33 from Del Paso Rd. to New Market Dr. A two (2) lane roadway segment of Library Street from Del Paso Road to New Market Drive. Roadway segment length of 990 feet; roadway width of 88 feet. No landscaping.	\$ 1,207,243			\$ 1,207,243
39	P	EL CENTRO ROAD	Roadway Segment 39 from Del Paso Rd to Bayou Rd. A four (4) lane roadway segment of El Centro Road from Del Paso Road to Bayou Road. Roadway segment length of 2,300 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "A".	\$ 2,388,681	\$ 1,073,757		\$ 1,314,924
40	C	Interstate 5 Water Main Crossing	Segment completed	\$ 1,499,480	\$ 1,499,480		\$ -
16b	P	GATEWAY PARK BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 16b from Truxel Rd to N. Freeway Blvd. Six (6) lane roadway segment of Gateway Park Boulevard from Truxel Road to North Freeway Boulevard for a length of 896 feet complete. Roadway width of 93 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 803,355	\$ 657,974		\$ 145,381
41	P	Between Gateway Park Blvd. And West Promenade Circle	Roadway Segment 41 from Gateway Park Blvd to West Promenade Circle. Six (6) lane roadway segment of North Freeway Boulevard from Gateway Park Boulevard to West Promenade Circle for a length of 803 feet complete. Roadway width of 136 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 975,579	\$ 809,651		\$ 165,928
42	P	West Promenade Circle and East Promenade Circle	Roadway Segment 42 from W. Promenade Cir. To E. Promenade Cir. Four (4) lane roadway segment of North Freeway Boulevard from West Promenade Circle to East Promenade Circle for a length of 1,247 feet complete. Roadway width of 100 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "A".	\$ 1,331,815	\$ 1,118,200		\$ 213,615

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
18		NATOMAS CROSSING DRIVE	Segment 18 from I-5 to East Commerce Way. Landscaping a portion of Natomas Crossing Drive from Interstate 5 to East Commerce Way. Roadway segment length is 880 feet; width is 70 feet. City landscaping quality level "B".	\$ 107,110			\$ 107,110
34	C	Landscaping at East Drain Canal	Segment completed	\$ 230,634	\$ 230,634		\$ -
	C	Del Paso Road - South Side	Segment completed	\$ 5,125,843	\$ 5,125,843		\$ -
	C	East Commerce Way	Segment completed	\$ 5,478,968	\$ 5,478,968		\$ -
35	P	EAST COMMERCE WAY	Segment 35 from Del Paso Rd. to Arena Blvd. Landscaping the six (6) lane roadway segment of East Commerce Way from Del Paso Road to Arena Boulevard. Roadway segment length is 5,000 feet; roadway width is 136 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 1,767,925	\$ 106,308		\$ 1,661,617
	C	GATEWAY PARK BOULEVARD (HALF-SECTION BUILT)	Segment completed	\$ 1,230,967	\$ 1,230,967		\$ -
	C	ARENA BOULEVARD	Segment completed	\$ 5,013,104	\$ 5,013,104		\$ -
36	P	ARENA BOULEVARD	Segment 36 from East Commerce way to City Limits on East. Landscaping for a six (6) lane segment of Arena Boulevard from East Commerce Way to the eastern city limit. Roadway segment length of 5,500 feet; roadway width of 136 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "B".	\$ 1,944,717		\$ 355,000	\$ 1,589,717
	C	Truxel Road	Segment completed	\$ 9,690,289	\$ 9,690,289		\$ -
37	P	TRUXEL ROAD	Segment 37 from Del Paso Rd. to Gateway Park Blvd (minus 1900'). Landscaping for an eight (8) lane roadway segment of Truxel Road from Del Paso Road to Gateway Park Boulevard, minus 1,900 feet. Roadway segment length of 5,600 feet; roadway width of 158 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "C".	\$ 1,980,076		\$ 268,767	\$ 1,711,309
38		NATOMAS CROSSING DRIVE	Segment 38 from Duckhorn Drive to Interstate 5. Landscaping the roadway segment of Natomas Crossing Drive from Duckhorn Drive to Interstate 5 for a length of 1,100 feet. Roadway width of 100 feet. City landscaping quality level "B". Roadway section type "A".	\$ 274,183			\$ 274,183
<b>Subtotal Roadways:</b>				<b>\$ 114,440,582</b>	<b>\$ 60,332,618</b>	<b>\$ 8,215,986</b>	<b>\$ 45,891,978</b>
<b>Freeway Landscaping</b>			Includes freeway and drainage landscaping. Landscaping costs for road segments are included along with construction costs in the road segments PFF Funding amounts, unless otherwise noted in the facility's Description/Scope.	<b>\$ 8,324,270</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,114,196</b>	<b>\$ 7,210,074</b>
<b>Total Roadways and Freeway Landscaping:</b>				<b>\$ 122,764,852</b>	<b>\$ 60,332,618</b>	<b>\$ 9,330,182</b>	<b>\$ 53,102,052</b>
<b>Fully Funded Signals:</b>							
<b>2-Lane x 6-Lane</b>							
2		Northbound SR-99 Off-Ramp and Elkhorn Boulevard	Traffic signal for 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Remaining portion of total cost being funded by Panhandle area. PFF share is currently estimated at 92.3% of the total estimated cost. Partially funded by Panhandle.	\$ 814,351			\$ 814,351
<b>4-Lane x 4-Lane</b>							

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
6	C	El Centro Road and Del Paso Road	Traffic signal for a 2+-Lane x 8-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 162,793	\$ 162,793		\$ -
<b>4-Lane x 4-Lane</b>							
7	P	El Centro Road and Del Paso Road	Traffic signal for a 4-Lane x 4-Lane intersection. Traffic signal partially constructed.	\$ 400,465	\$ 205,292		\$ 195,173
8		El Centro Road and Snowy Egret Way	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 4-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 400,465			\$ 400,465
9	P	El Centro Road and Arena Boulevard (6)	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 4-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed. Signal to be phased.	\$ 437,795		\$ 168,454	\$ 269,341
11	C	Gateway Park Boulevard and Arena Boulevard	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 4-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 876,009		\$ 876,009	\$ -
<b>4-Lane x 6-Lane</b>							
12	P	East Commerce Way and Elkhorn Boulevard (5)	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Signal to be phased. Partially complete.	\$ 461,766			\$ 461,766
13	C	Natomas Boulevard and Elkhorn Boulevard	Traffic signal constructed.	\$ -			\$ -
14	C	Gateway Park Boulevard and Del Paso Road	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 181,390	\$ 181,390		\$ -
15	C	Snowy Egret Way and East Commerce Way	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 214,941		\$ 214,941	\$ -
16	C	Northgate Boulevard and Del Paso Road	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 241,000		\$ 241,000	\$ -
17		Natomas Crossing Drive and East Commerce Way	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 341,860			\$ 341,860
<b>4-Lane x 8-Lane</b>							
18	C	Natomas Crossing Drive and Truxel Road	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 307,148	\$ 307,148		\$ -
19	C	Gateway Park Boulevard and Truxel Road	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 8-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 256,513	\$ 256,513		\$ -
<b>6-Lane x 6-Lane</b>							\$ -
20	C	Del Paso Road and East Commerce Way	Traffic signal at a 6-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 269,010	\$ 269,010		\$ -
32	C	Gateway Park Boulevard and North Freeway Boulevard (2+x4)	Traffic signal at a 6-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 172,655	\$ 172,655		\$ -
<b>6-Lane x 8-Lane</b>							
21	C	Del Paso Road and Truxel Road	Traffic signal at a 6-Lane x 8-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed.	\$ 253,685	\$ 253,685		\$ -
<b>Total Fully Funded Signals</b>				<b>\$ 5,791,846</b>	<b>\$ 1,808,486</b>	<b>\$ 1,500,404</b>	<b>\$ 2,482,956</b>
<b>2-Lane x 6-Lane</b>							
40	C	Northborough Drive and Elkhorn Boulevard (2+x6)	Partial funding of traffic signal at a 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 34,114	\$ 34,114		\$ -
41	C	Elkhorn Boulevard and Sageview Drive (2x6)	Partial funding of traffic signal at a 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 33,768	\$ 33,768		\$ -

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
42		Club Center Drive and East Commerce Way (2+x6)	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of Club Center Drive and East Commerce Way. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 47,300			\$ 47,300
43	C	Natomas Blvd and Club Center Drive (2+x6)	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of Natomas Blvd and Club Center Drive. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 33,768	\$ 33,768		\$ -
44		East Commerce Way and North Park Drive (2+/2x6) (8)	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of East Commerce Way and North Park Drive. Traffic signal partially constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 51,300			\$ 51,300
45	C	Natomas Blvd and North Park Drive	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of Natomas Blvd and North Park Drive. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 33,912	\$ 33,912		\$ -
46	C	Natomas Blvd and North Bend Drive	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of Natomas Blvd and North Bend Drive. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 33,912	\$ 33,912		\$ -
47	P	Natomas Blvd and New Market Drive	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of Natomas Boulevard and New Market Drive. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 47,300	\$ 22,895		\$ 24,405
48	C	Del Paso Road and Northborough Drive (2+x6)	Partial funding of traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection of Del Paso Road and Northborough Drive. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 33,778	\$ 33,778		\$ -
49		Del Paso Road and North East Stadium Entrance	Partial funding for traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 47,300	\$ -		\$ 47,300
50	P	Black Rock Drive and Del Paso Road (2+x6)	Partial funding for traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection at Black Rock Drive and Del Paso Road. Traffic signal partially constructed - North leg of intersection not yet constructed. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals	\$ 31,800	\$ 25,328		\$ 6,472
51	C	Arena Boulevard and Duckhorn Drive(2+x6) (9)	Included in the cost for Arena Boulevard Overcrossing	\$ -			\$ -
52		East Commerce Way and Arena Entrance (2+x6)	Partial funding for traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection at East Commerce Way and Arena Entrance. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 47,300			\$ 47,300
53		Arena Boulevard and Innovator Drive (2-/2x6)	Partial funding for traffic signal at 2-Lane x 6-Lane intersection at Arena Blvd and Innovator Drive. Currently 15% is being funded for 2-Lane x 6-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 31,800			\$ 31,800
		Signal Contingency		\$ 47,300			\$ 47,300
<b>2-Lane x 8-Lane</b>							
54		Truxel Road and Terracina Drive (2+/2x8)	Partial funding for traffic signal at 2-Lane x 8-Lane intersection at Truxel Road and Terracina Drive. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 20% is being funded for 2-Lane x 8-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 49,900			\$ 49,900
55		Truxel Road and Prosper Street (2x8)	Partial funding for traffic signal at 2-Lane x 8-Lane intersection at Truxel Road and Prosper Street. Traffic signal constructed. Currently 20% is being funded for 2-Lane x 8-Lane traffic signals.	\$ 49,900			\$ 49,900
<b>Total Partially Funded Signals</b>				<b>\$ 654,452</b>	<b>\$ 251,475</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 402,977</b>
<b>Total Signals</b>				<b>\$ 6,446,298</b>	<b>\$ 2,059,960</b>	<b>\$ 1,500,404</b>	<b>\$ 2,885,933</b>

# Schedule One

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Authorized Facilities

Item	Status	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost 2008 Dollars
<b>Public Facilities</b>							
	C	Fire Station 1	Fire station is complete. Funding also includes apparatus necessary for outfitting the fire station.	\$ 7,687,049		\$ 2,034,466	\$ 5,652,583
		Fire Station 2	Located at Westside of I-5/North Natomas. Provide funding contribution for a second fire station with a minimum building square footage of 8,000 square feet. Funding contribution also includes one ladder truck and one fire engine.	\$ 9,600,000			\$ 9,600,000
	P	Library	Located at Del Paso Road. Funding contribution for the North Natomas share (12,000 square feet) of 21,000 square foot total community library, including a share for library materials.	\$ 10,126,271		\$ 4,427,244	\$ 5,699,027
		Community Center	Provide a funding contribution for the construction of one community center. Funding is not being provided for the costs of land acquisition, operation and maintenance, or ongoing utilities.	\$ 13,427,033			\$ 13,427,033
		<b>Subtotal Public Facilities</b>		<b>\$ 40,840,353</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 6,461,710</b>	<b>\$ 34,378,643</b>
<b>Planning Studies</b>				<b>\$ 17,231,226</b>	<b>\$ 12,166,419</b>	<b>\$ 5,064,807</b>	<b>\$ (0)</b>
<b>Total:</b>				<b>\$ 256,277,012</b>	<b>\$ 78,773,258</b>	<b>\$ 56,626,319</b>	<b>\$ 120,877,436</b>

Note: P Denotes a partially completed project, C is a completed project

end of schedule

# Schedule Two

## Public Facility Fee (PFF) Removed Facilities

Item	Description	Project Scope	Total Cost	Reimb	City Expenditures	Remaining Cost (2008\$)
<b>Natomas Crossing Boulevard Elements:</b>						
<b>Funding from the PFF is prohibited for the Natomas Crossing Drive improvements listed below unless the improvement is established as a CEQA Mitigation Measure or a condition of approval, after which PFF may be used as provided for all other Schedule 2 facilities under this agreement.</b>						
	Overcrossing - Natomas Crossing Boulevard	PFF funding is 100% of the total cost to construct a 2 lane, 52 ft wide overcrossing over Interstate 5 to include approaches from East Commerce Way to Duckhorn Drive. This overcrossing assumes a 52' right of way with two 12' lanes, two 8' bike lanes/shoulders, and two 6' sidewalks with barriers.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
B10	Bridge - Natomas Crossing Drive Over West Drain Canal	Four (4) lane bridge, 74 ft wide by 80 ft length. Bridge to include (4) 12' lanes, (2) 6' bike lanes and, (2) 5' sidewalks and a 4' painted median. Funding is 0% unless other facilities are permanently removed in whole or part from PFF funding and the displaced funding is applied to the bridge.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

17	Roadway - Natomas Crossing Drive	Roadway Segment 17 from Duckhorn Drive to El Centro Road. A two (2) lane roadway segment. Roadway segment length of 4,180 feet; roadway width of 70 feet. City landscape quality level "B". Roadway section type "A". Funding is 0% unless other facilities are permanently removed in whole or part from PFF funding and the displaced funding is applied to the roadway.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10	Signal - El Centro Road and Natomas Crossing Drive	Traffic signal at a 4-Lane x 4-Lane intersection. Funding is 0% unless other facilities are permanently removed in whole or part from PFF funding and the displaced funding is applied to the signal.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
end of Natomas Crossing Drive items						

**Other Facilities**

**Overcrossings:**

	Snowy Egret Way	PFF funding is 0% of the total cost to construct a 4 lane, 85 ft wide overcrossing over Interstate 5 to include approaches from East Commerce Way to El Centro Road. This overcrossing assumes an 85' right of way with (4) 12' lanes, 12' striped median, (2) 6' bike lanes/shoulders and (2) 6' sidewalks with barriers. Funding is 0% unless other facilities are permanently removed in whole or part from PFF funding and the displaced funding is applied to the Snowy Egret Overcrossing.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
--	-----------------	--	------	------	------	------

**Road Segments**


13	EL CENTRO ROAD	Roadway Segment 13 from Arena Blvd to San Juan Road. A four (4) lane roadway segment of El Centro Road from Arena Boulevard to San Juan Road. Roadway segment length of 5,690 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "C". Roadway section type "A". Complete. Balance of funding removed in the 2017 NNFP Update.	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -
14a	ELKHORN BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 14a from SR-99 to East Commerce Way & Natomas Blvd to City Limit on East. A six (6) lane roadway segment of Elkhorn Boulevard from its intersection with State Route 99 to East Commerce Way and then from Natomas Boulevard to the City limits on the east. Roadway segment length of 5,550 feet; roadway width of 121 feet. City landscape quality level "C". Roadway section type "B". Schedule One funding revised by 2017 NNFP Update to reflect fair share. Schedule 2 is the balance of costs in 2008 dollars.	\$ 5,288,924			\$ 5,288,924
14b	ELKHORN BOULEVARD	Roadway Segment 14b from East Commerce Way to Natomas Blvd. A four (4) lane roadway segment of Elkhorn Boulevard from East Commerce Way to its intersection Natomas Boulevard. Roadway segment length of 6,600 feet; roadway width of 100 feet. City landscape quality level "C". Roadway section type "A". Schedule One funding revised by 2017 NNFP Update to reflect fair share. Schedule 2 is the balance of costs in 2008 dollars.	\$ 4,577,319			\$ 4,577,319



**Public Facilities**

Police Substation City of Sacramento	Removed from the PFF Program	\$ -			\$ -
---	------------------------------	------	--	--	------

# Schedule Three

## The "Boot" Area





**P19-050**  
**Parcels Impacted by Amendments to**  
**Agreements No. 97-100 & 2002-041**



**List of Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) Impacted by Amendments to Agreements No. 97-100 and No. 2002-041**

225-0140-073-0000  
225-0140-074-0000  
225-0140-075-0000  
225-0140-076-0000  
225-0140-077-0000  
225-0140-078-0000  
225-0150-031-0000  
225-0150-033-0000  
225-0150-043-0000  
225-0150-044-0000  
225-0150-053-0000  
225-0180-039-0000  
225-0180-059-0000  
225-1250-048-0000  
225-1870-025-0000  
225-1870-026-0000  
225-2300-012-0000  
225-2300-013-0000  
225-2970-001-0000  
225-2970-002-0000  
225-2970-003-0000  
225-2970-004-0000  
225-2970-005-0000  
225-2970-006-0000  
225-2970-007-0000  
225-2970-009-0000