102-Acres: Frequently Asked Questions

What is the 102-acre site?
The 102-acre site is a vacant parcel of land in South Sacramento, as shown in the map below. The City owns the land and is trying to decide how the site should be used in both the short- and long-term.

How did the City acquire the site?
The City purchased the site from the U.S. Department of Labor for $12.3 million in January 2022.

Why did the City purchase the site?
The City purchased the site because Council saw there was short-term potential for the site to provide for a safe parking site for unhoused neighbors in the short-term and a long-term potential to develop in a way that served the surrounding community.

Why is the City analyzing opportunities and constraints before the site is developed?
The City is conducting this site analysis to inform both the public and City Council about potential development options and constraints. Before City Council makes a decision, it is important to know as much about the site as possible. The analysis is meant to provide information about the existing conditions, a broad overview of potential ways to use the site, and what considerations Council would
need to keep in mind as they make their decisions. The goal for the analysis would be to provide enough information to help City Council answer two key questions:

1. How should the site be developed?
2. What are the general land uses to be developed at the site?

What was included in the opportunities and constraints analysis?
Analysis considered input on desired land uses from community listening sessions, and included:

1. Initial conditions assessment.
2. Site constraints (e.g. environmental, circulation, infrastructure).
4. Feasibility testing of land use scenarios.
5. Cost and revenue estimates.

What did the analysis discover about the initial conditions of the site?

1. Past users disturbed the site, having moved soil around to build a driving track for the California Highway Patrol and dug a stormwater catchment pond, both of which are present today.
2. While past users disturbed the site from a “natural” condition, the man-made stormwater pond and seasonal wetlands trigger State and/or federal oversight.
3. The site provides suitable habitat for some special status species, including Swainson’s hawk and vernal pool fairy shrimp, though it is unclear if these species are present at the site at this time.

Below are a few photos of the site showing the driving track and seasonal wetlands.

What are the results from the market study regarding feasible land uses that could be developed on the site?
The market study found that some uses had more demand than others, due to the site’s location and proximity to other existing and planned uses. Table 1, below, indicates the uses (with stars) that were included in the land use concepts for additional investigation.
Table 1 Land Use Market Study Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Income Housing</td>
<td>Strong demand for market-rate and below market-rate housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Mix of Housing and Other Uses</td>
<td>Could be supported depending on the mix of uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Store</td>
<td>The location of the site and proximity to customers could make it difficult to accommodate a full-size grocery store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational/Sports/Parks</td>
<td>There is local demand for some recreational uses, as well as some demand to provide for income-generating, tournament-level recreation uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>The Pannell Community Center is located just north of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Office market and site characteristics preclude standard office spaces; small neighborhood-serving medical office could be supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Unlikely to attract development interest from hotel developers or provide a sufficiently low level of risk to obtain financing due to site location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>A small amount of retail space could potentially be supported under right conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Homeless Support</td>
<td>Could be supported when the roadways and utilities are developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denotes land use type considered in land use concepts for analysis purposes.

What land use concepts were studied in more detail?

Based on community input on desirable land uses as well as a planning charrette and a market study, the following concepts were created.

1. Concept 1: All sports/recreation uses.
2. Concept 2a: A mix of sports/recreation, residential, and wetland preservation uses.
3. Concept 2b: A mix of sports/recreation and residential uses, but no wetland preservation.
4. Concept 3: All residential uses.

Please note that these concepts are not the only ones possible; however, the goal was to provide concepts that represented the most likely land use types as well as being conservative in terms of what scenarios would have the highest costs to the City. The proportion and placement of the land uses may change; however, due to State law regarding the sale or lease of City-owned land\(^1\) as well as the findings of the market study, it’s likely that the final use for the site would include one or more of the represented land uses: residential, sports/recreation, parks, and open space.

What assumptions did the analysis consider in order to evaluate the costs and revenues associated with each potential concept?

To calculate the potential costs and revenues, the analysis had to make certain assumptions. If any of these assumptions were to change, the costs and revenues would also change.

1. Development Process. The analysis assumed:
   a. City provides necessary approvals\(^2\) for a development plan before sale.
   b. City mitigates for environmental impacts.

---

\(^1\) The Surplus Land Act governs the process the City must follow if it is to sell or lease City-owned property. This law also provides guidance for what uses the City must prioritize when selling or leasing property. Housing and parks/recreation/open space are both uses that are prioritized under this law.

\(^2\) Commonly referred to as “entitlements.”
c. City develops the main (backbone) infrastructure, such as key roadways, sewer and water mains, and detention basins.
d. City develops and operates a sports/recreation complex or a neighborhood park.

2. Costs. The analysis assumed:
   a. One-time development costs, including backbone infrastructure, mitigation costs, and construction of public amenities.
   b. Cost sharing of off-site infrastructure with adjacent developments.
   c. Ongoing operations and maintenance over a 30-year period.

3. Revenues. The analysis included:
   a. One-time land sale of residential.
   b. Sports/recreation complex revenue from Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT), sales tax, and use fees over a 30-year period.

What are the results for costs and revenues for each concept and how should these findings be interpreted?

1. Concept 1: All sports/recreation uses results in negative net revenue.
2. Concept 2a: A mix of sports/recreation, residential, and wetland preservation uses results in negative net revenue; however, this would be less negative than Concept 1.
3. Concept 2b: A mix of sports/recreation and residential uses, but no wetland preservation results in negative net revenue; however, this would be less negative than either Concept 1 or Concept 2a.
4. Concept 3: All residential uses results in positive net revenue.

Concepts 1, 2a, and 2b assume the City would develop and operate a sports/recreation complex, whereas Concept 3 assumes the City would develop and maintain a neighborhood park. If the size of the complex was different or if there were a private developer or operator, the costs and revenues could change substantially.

What are the estimated costs and revenues for each concept?

Depending on the land use scenario, the following costs and revenues were estimated (in 2023 dollars):

1. The estimated costs for on-site development\(^3\) range from approximately $40 million to $123 million depending on the mix of land uses and the intensity of their infrastructure demands. Residential uses require more infrastructure than sports and recreation uses.
2. The estimated costs for off-site utilities, roadways, and storm drainage range from approximately $4 million to $13 million depending on the mix of land uses and the intensity of their infrastructure demands. Residential uses require more infrastructure than sports and recreation uses.
3. The estimated revenue over 30 years from a City-owned and -operated sports/recreation complex ranges from approximately $3 million to $8 million, depending on the size of the complex.
4. The estimated revenue from the sale of entitled residential land ranges from approximately $23 million to $86 million, depending on the amount of residential land.

---

\(^3\) Includes on-site infrastructure, environmental mitigation costs, and development of a sports/recreation complex or neighborhood park.
5. The overall net revenue over 30 years is estimated to range from a loss of approximately $120 million to a gain of up to $34 million depending on whether there is a sports complex, the size of the sports complex, and the amount of residential land.

**What will the site be used for?**
The site could include homes, parks and recreation, businesses, open space, trails, or other uses, guided by City Council’s direction on the general types of uses; however, the specific uses that end up on the site will depend on several factors, including policy direction from City Council, market feasibility, and available funding.

The City is responsible for regulating private development, determining the general types of uses, such as residential, commercial, and parks, on a site and providing a framework for what specific types of uses would be allowed. The City may build infrastructure and community amenities, such as parks or community centers. The City may encourage or incentivize specific uses on the site.

**How much time will development take?**
Development of a large site with environmental constraints and lack of infrastructure and roadways takes many years. The 102-acre site is anticipated to take at least six years. At minimum, the following steps would need to occur:

1. Council decision on the types of uses allowed on the site and the preferred development process.
2. Planning and entitlement of the site (at least two years). This means figuring out exactly how the site would be designed and making sure that all the necessary requirements are completed.
3. Reviewing the potential impact on the environment related to the governmental decisions for the site (at least one year but could happen during Step 2).
4. Council approval on the plan for the site.
5. Obtaining permission from the State and/or federal government to work in areas that are protected by environmental laws (at least two years).
6. Constructing infrastructure and buildings (at least two years).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Entitlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Permitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Complex Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depending on the development process, the City may sell the entire property at one time or sell portions of the property to private developers at different times. Each time there is a sale, additional time would be needed to negotiate how the development would address community priorities.
I noticed that the site does not have any roadways to it. How will the development be accessed?
The site is surrounded by federally owned property to the north. No permanent roadway access is available through the federal property. To the east, there are a few potential locations for pedestrian and bicycle access, and potentially for emergency vehicle access. To the south, is a planned development called Stone Beetland, which includes a plan for an east-west roadway that could potentially connect the 102-acre site through north-south roadways. Lastly, to the west, the planned development called Delta Shores that is expected to include a north-south extension of 24th Street, could provide a potential connection point to the 102-acre site, assuming that an east-west connection is established with Delta Shores.

Will the site provide shelter space for people experiencing homelessness?
Immediately after purchasing the site, City staff investigated how the site could be used in the near term to provide a safe parking location for unhoused residents. After initial investigations, it was found that the cost to build temporary access, grade the site, and provide other basic features for a safe parking site was estimated to be greater than $11 million. This cost does not account for environmental review, which would likely be required prior to use of the site and could add up to two years to the timeline.

The site may be able to be used in an emergency situation; however, legal access and a method to provide safe and sanitary temporary housing remain concerns. At a minimum, a suitable site for safe and sanitary temporary housing should have roadway access, utilities, and other necessary infrastructure, such as ADA standards and lighting.

It is possible that the site could accommodate temporary housing after basic infrastructure is developed and before the site is fully developed.

Are there any restrictions on the sale or use of the site?
The City must comply with the Surplus Land Act if it sells or leases the land. Under the Surplus Land Act, the City must prioritize housing and/or parks/recreation/open space uses.

While there are no deed restrictions on the property, it is likely that the City would negotiate use restrictions in any future sale or lease agreements. In addition, any future development on the site would need to be consistent with the City’s general plan, zoning regulations, and other applicable regulations.

What are the immediate next steps for the site?
Based on the findings of the opportunities and constraints analysis and community feedback, City staff anticipates providing a recommendation for Council’s consideration in late Summer of 2024. This recommendation will include potential answers to:

1. What is a feasible development process for the site?
2. What are the broad land uses that should be considered for the site based on community priorities and available resources?

Once Council has made a decision, it is likely that staff will be asked to use Council’s guidance to further investigate what is possible for the site based on the community priorities, resources available, and market conditions.
What can residents do to express their needs/wants related to the development of the site?

Advocate to City Council to support the priorities that are most important to you—housing, inclusive economic development opportunities, community amenities, services/shelter for unhoused neighbors, and/or other priorities. You can do that by:

- Providing a comment through the website: https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/community-development/planning/major-projects/102-acre-site.
- Signing up for our email list to get notifications about upcoming meetings, including City Council through the website: https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/community-development/planning/major-projects/102-acre-site.

Ultimately, City Council, informed by resident input, will decide the future direction of the site’s development and will need to determine what kind of resources, including funding, are available to realize their direction for the site.