

# COUNCIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

COMMITTEE NAME: LAW AND LEGISLATION  
MEETING DATE: FEBRUARY 20, 1996  
MEETING TIME: 12:00 P.M. (NOON)  
LOCATION: 915 I STREET, 2ND FLOOR, COUNCIL CHAMBER

The meeting was called to order at 12:10 p.m. by Deborah Ortiz, Chairperson.

PRESENT: Committee Members Ortiz, Fargo, Steinberg, Waters

ABSENT:

---

Committee Member Steinberg requested that Item 2.3, A and B, be put over to the next Law and Legislation Committee meeting (March 19, 1996).

VOTING RECORD: MOV: STEINBERG SEC: WATERS  
AYES: FARGO, STEINBERG, WATERS,  
ORTIZ

---

## 1.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

ALL ITEMS LISTED ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR ARE CONSIDERED AND ACTED UPON BY ONE MOTION. A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE OR STAFF MAY REQUEST AN ITEM TO BE REMOVED FOR SEPARATE CONSIDERATION.

---

## 2.0 STAFF REPORTS

### 2.1 Status of State Legislation of Concern to the City of Sacramento

Michael Coleman, Senior Management Analyst, presented report. He discussed legislation that has been acted upon, either signed into law, dropped or vetoed. Mr. Coleman answered questions of Committee Members.

Committee Member Ortiz put into the record that the City is opposed to SB 1066 (development: fees: school facilities).

### 2.2 Proposition 199: The Mobilehome Fairness and Rental Assistance Initiative

Michael Coleman, Senior Management Analyst, presented the report. Michael Coleman stated if this initiative passes on the March 1996 ballot, it will be a severe blow to rent control/rental assistance. Committee Member Ortiz stated that if enacted, no rent control would ever be imposed.

There were three public speakers in opposition to Proposition 199.

1. Jim Sands, 2515 Goldenrod Lane, Sacramento, stated that Proposition 199 is a definite threat to affordable housing. Proposition 199 only promises to provide rental assistance - not mandatory. You would have to go to court to get this resolved. He asked Committee to oppose Proposition 199.
2. Lloyd Logan, P.O. Box 535, Citrus Heights, is against Proposition 199, along with County Board of Supervisors, AARP, CSEA, City and County officials, Assembly people, senators, etc. Mr. Logan's main reason for opposition is that it is fraudulent misrepresentation. Why do you need a law to help someone?
3. Clayton Smith, 6 Pina Street, Sacramento, is opposed to Proposition 199. He gave handout(s) to Committee.

Committee Member Ortiz stated she is an advocate for affordable housing and requested this item get on full Council agenda.

RECOMMENDATION OF COMMITTEE:

SUPPORT STAFF RECOMMENDATION  
TO OPPOSE AND FORWARD TO CITY  
COUNCIL

VOTING RECORD:

MOV: STEINBERG SEC: FARGO  
AYES: FARGO, STEINBERG, WATERS,  
ORTIZ

### 2.3 Nuisance Abatement Ordinance

A. Ordinance Amending Title 61 of the Sacramento City Code relating to Nuisance Abatement - Continued to March 19, 1996

B. Ordinance Amending Title 61 of the Sacramento City Code relating to Nuisances - Continued to March 19, 1996

C. Ordinance Adding Title 61.17 to Title 61 of the Sacramento City Code relating to Fences

Brian Ramsey, Senior Nuisance Abatement Officer, presented report. This recommended ordinance addition does the following:

- allows Code Enforcement to regulate standards for materials used in constructing fences
- states the owner's responsibility in maintaining fences so as not to create a hazard, public nuisance or blight in the surrounding neighborhood
- defines nonconforming fence regulations
- allows Code Enforcement Manager to proceed with abatement of nonconforming fences, if they constitute a nuisance

- provide notice to owner(s) where nonconforming fence is found to constitute a nuisance, or, if the owner cannot be served by certified or personal service, then the Code Enforcement Manager may make service by publication
- gives the owner(s) 30 days to comply by removing the nonconforming fence or bring it into compliance
- upon expiration of the 30-day compliance period, the Code Enforcement Manager may issue a hearing notice and proceed with abatement procedures.

Committee Member Steinberg asked if there was a mechanism in place right now regarding maintenance of fences? Brian Ramsey told Committee that the present ordinance doesn't allow for maintenance of fence(s).

Committee Member Fargo questioned the 30-day notice to comply. It seems too short? Brian Ramsey stated that the 30 days is a basic time frame that gets the owner's attention. This will be extended if needed. On a case-by-case basis. Committee Member Waters agrees with the 30-day period.

RECOMMENDATION OF COMMITTEE: APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL


VOTING RECORD: MOV: FARGO SEC: STEINBERG  
 AYES: FARGO, STEINBERG, WATERS, ORTIZ

The meeting was adjourned at the hour of 12:50 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Deborah Ortiz, Chair

ATTEST:

  
 Leslie Oldridge, Secretary