



12.2

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
DEPARTMENT  
PLANNING DIVISION

CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
CALIFORNIA

1231 ... 300  
SACRAMENTO, CA  
95814-2998

PLANNING  
916-264-5381  
FAX: 916-264-5328

**July 22, 2004**

City Council  
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

**SUBJECT: REPORT BACK ON DISCUSSIONS ABOUT A POSSIBLE NATOMAS BALLOT MEASURE (M04-056)**

**LOCATION AND COUNCIL DISTRICT:** Unincorporated Portion of the Natomas Basin, within Sacramento County: D-All

**RECOMMENDATION:** This item is for council information.

**CONTACT PERSON:** Gary Stonehouse, Planning Director, 264-5567

**FOR COUNCIL MEETING OF:** July 22, 2004 (evening)

**SUMMARY:** Staff recommends that based on the feedback from the stakeholders it is not the right time to proceed with a Natomas ballot measure to establish an urban limit line.

**COMMISSION ACTION:** This item was presented to the Planning Commission on July 15th for review and recommendation. Staff will provide an update of the Commission's action at the council meeting.

**BACKGROUND:** In December 2002, the City and County of Sacramento approved a MOU regarding principles of land use and revenue sharing for the Natomas area. This has come to be known as the Joint Vision for Natomas. In a separate action, the City Council approved a map showing conceptual areas for possible future urbanization by the city and areas to be retained in permanent open space by the County. In September 2003, the Council approved the work program for the General Plan amendments and EIR necessary to implement the MOU. On June 29, 2004, the City Council directed staff to discuss the possible Ballot measure concerning the Joint Vision area in Natomas with stakeholders and report back on July 22, 2004. Council also directed staff to include phasing and trigger language to support the infill strategy and North Natomas Community Plan.

The purpose of the ballot measure would be to limit the extension of urban services and potential annexations to the proposed future northern city limit line as shown on the attached map. The ballot measure does not replace or avoid the planning and CEQA review required for adoption of the General Plan Amendment, subsequent land use plans, LAFCO Sphere of Influence amendments or annexations, or development of an HCP which complies with federal

City Council  
July 22, 2004

RE: PROPOSED BALLOT MEASURE - THE JOINT VISION URBAN LIMIT LINE

Page 2

and state law. That work is still required. The proposed urban limit boundary is conceptual and provides for a one-mile buffer from the Sacramento River and a one-mile buffer from the Sutter-Sacramento county line for a community separator. Some flexibility will be needed to adjust the line to address sound planning principles or environmental considerations.

In the Cities of Roseville, Folsom, and perhaps Elk Grove, initiatives have been proposed and in some cases qualified for the ballot that would require a vote of the people to allow the jurisdiction to expand its urban boundary.

Staff drafted ballot language that would allow the City to ask the people of the City to amend the City's General Plan to establish a future and ultimate service boundary of the City, and therefore of urban expansion, generally consistent with the Joint Vision and with the requirement that the line cannot be changed without an additional vote of the people of the city. The date for the Council to take action to put items on the November ballot is July 22.

Based on the community outreach meetings, it appears that landowners and environmental groups are interested in continuing to work with the city and county on the joint vision and a potential Natomas ballot measure. We will report back on the status of this cooperative effort after the first of the new year. Based on the feedback from the stakeholders, this is not the right time to proceed with a ballot measure.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS:** The City has completed preparation of a Negative Declaration for the project. The comment period is from July 2, 2004 to July 22, 2004. The City Council should adopt the final Negative Declaration for the project. No action on the Negative Declaration is required at this time.

**FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:** None

**POLICY CONSIDERATIONS:** The measure is consistent with the city's adopted Smart Growth Principles including creation of a Smart Growth Regional Vision and Plan with neighboring counties and other governmental entities so that regional strategies can be implemented to discourage urban sprawl and address transportation, air quality, housing and loss of agricultural lands and open space.

**ESBD CONSIDERATIONS:** None

Respectfully submitted:



GARY STONEHOUSE  
Planning Director



MICHAEL MEDEMA  
Interim Director of Development Services

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED:



ROBERT P. THOMAS  
City Manager