

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

VOTING RECORD LEGEND:

VOTING RECORD REFLECTS FINAL
VOTE OF COUNCIL.

MOV: MOVED	ABST: ABSTAIN
SEC: SECOND	ABS: ABSENT
M -- MAYOR RUDIN	D5 -- SERNA
D1 -- SHORE	D6 -- SMALLMAN
D2 -- JOHNSON	D7 -- KASTANIS
D3 -- POPE	D8 -- ROBIE
D4 -- CHINN	

Special Joint Meeting of the Sacramento City Council and the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors

Meeting Date: December 10, 1984: 2:00 P.M.

Location: Board of Supervisors' Chamber, 700 H Street, Suite 1450

JOINT CITY/COUNTY URBAN DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE WORKSHOP

1. Where Next? Testimony presented on the feasibility of consolidating various functions and departments.

COUNCIL ACTION:

REQUEST REPORT RE JOBS-HOUSING POLICY FOR CITY (RUDIN)

PRIORITIES ESTABLISHED ARE TRANSPORTATION/
TRANSIT, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND
INFRASTRUCTURE

INVESTIGATE FEASIBILITY OF A JOINT CITY/
COUNTY POLICY PLANNING COMMISSION AND
STAFFING (SHEEDY)

VOTING RECORD:

BY CONSENSUS



CITY OF SACRAMENTO
CITY PLANNING DIVISION

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

December 4, 1984

To: Members of the Joint City-County Urban Development Task Force

From: Walter Slipe, City Manager
Brian Richter, County Executive

Walter J. Slipe
B. Richter

Subject: WORKSHOP VI, WHERE NEXT?

This workshop is final one in the series of six originally proposed. The first five workshops served to identify issues of mutual interest and to hear testimony on them from interested individuals and groups. The purpose of this sixth workshop is to give direction to staff about which issues should be pursued further. The attached report has been prepared by the City and County Planning Departments to help summarize the issues which have been raised. Many pressing problems deserve further work, but limited staff resources dictate careful selection of the most important ones.

TCS:nkt

Attachment

Lorraine - all have been distributed to Council members.





CITY OF SACRAMENTO
CITY PLANNING DIVISION
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO



PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

The five workshops of the Joint City-County Urban Development Task Force have focused attention on issues of mutual concern. The results are simultaneously gratifying and intimidating: gratifying because differences between the City and County are relatively minor in both policy and implementation; intimidating because the challenges faced by both jurisdictions are very difficult ones.

The purpose of this workshop is to select issues of high priority which can benefit from joint efforts. Most of the issues raised are important; unfortunately, limited resources restrict the work that can be done, and it is necessary to choose carefully those topics for further work.

The immediately following pages list issues which the City and County Planning Departments recommend be considered for more work. Obviously, there is much more potential work than can be accomplished, and very few of the projects can actually be followed up. Beside each description is a list of agencies which would be expected to contribute to further study if the project is selected.

Staff recommends that the Joint Task Force members select the project or projects that are highest priority and direct that a work program with resource requirements be prepared by the affected agencies with a report back due in February. Some issues require substantial study, some require preparation of ordinances or policies, and some require simply implementation programs. It is apparent, however, that any significant work will require either additional staff or the delay or elimination of projects currently under way.

The list at the end of the report is simply a compilation from notes of issues raised in staff reports or comments by the public or Task Force members during the previous five workshops. Task Force members are free, of course, to select from this list as well as the staff recommended list.

RECOMMENDED POTENTIAL PROJECT LIST

AGENCIES INVOLVED

1. Facilities Finance

Schools (increased coordination among City, County, School Districts; increased lobbying of Legislature).

Planning Departments, School Districts, City Attorney, County Counsel

Roads/Transit
(urgent need for comprehensive regional transportation plan, annexational policy, potential gas tax proposals, fee system, ordinances for transit related minimum densities, value recapture, impaction fees, etc.)

Planning Departments, Public Works, City Engineer, RT, Finance Department, AFA, LAFCO, SACOG

Other Services
(more coordination at a minimum, possible funding mechanisms)

Planning Departments, Service Agencies, Finance, AFA

2. Directions of Growth

Agricultural preservation
(Identify level of importance balanced with other needs; identify means to create and maintain open space buffers; propose ordinances incorporating known protection methods such as TDR's, etc.; seek funding sources for acquisition and protection)

Planning Departments, Agricultural Commission, Parks and Recreation Agencies

Land Use Allocation
(consideration of coordinated allocation of new development to maximize service efficiencies and minimize impacts)

Planning Departments

Service Provision
(Coordinate or consolidate service providers in areas where greater efficiency results)

Planning Departments, Affected Agencies, LAFCO

3. Economic Development

Industrial Uses/Reduction of Unemployment.
(Potential policies or ordinances requiring training programs, local hiring preference, jobs-housing balance, etc.)

Planning Departments, Economic Development Agencies, Employment Assistance Agencies

Jobs-Housing Balance
(clearer definition; adoption of specific standard to measure performance to eliminate ad hoc application)

Planning Departments

RECOMMENDED POTENTIAL PROJECT LIST

AGENCIES INVOLVED

4. Policy Coordination

Water Policy

(conjunctive use policies in place;
some programs under way; need to
expand and continue progress)

Floodplain and natural streams
policy (coordination of Laguna/
Morrison Creek Floodplain work;
possible City natural streams program;
possible County expansion of natural
stream program to South Area)

Consolidation.

(potentially all functions; solid waste,
animal control, planning, business li-
censes specifically mentioned)

Transportation Planning and Air Quality
(overlaps previously mentioned work;
potential regional transportation plan,
road and transit coordination, station-
ary source emissions enforcement, ride-
sharing programs, more vigorous lobbying
of legislature)

Various water agencies

Planning Department, Public
Works, City Engineer, Recreation
Agencies

Affected agencies,
LAFCO

Planning Departments, RT,
APCD, Public Works, City Engineer,
SACOG, Caltrans

NOTES ON ISSUES RAISED:

Workshop I:

Consolidation - solid waste collection, planning, animal control, business licenses, and other
Policy differences - jobs--housing, "conditions subsequent"

Workshop II:

Inadequate assessment of cumulative impacts as projects interact in South Area
Tax base sharing
Coordinate school funding with Elk Grove, San Juan, Sacramento City Districts
Need consistent policy on service funding
Ease funding problems by land use coordination
Need comprehensive transportation study
Transit funding by Mello-Roos or AD's
Possible equity participation in redevelopment or new development areas
Lobby state for road funding
Solid waste disposal techniques, sites
Hazardous materials
Water quality concerns

Workshop III:

Define jobs-housing linkage concept better
How can new development aid economically disadvantaged areas?
Consider ordinances to require training or local hiring
Coordinate and monitor industrial development to reduce unemployment
Identify and reduce underemployment and misemployment

Workshop IV:

Consider Countywide mechanisms to fund
RT: tax, fees, etc.
SMUD take over RT?
Consider transit-related minimum-density, value recapture, fee ordinances, development exactions
Clarify downtown parking policies
Consider parking disincentives
Coordinate better among City, County, RT, State
Lobby state for transit and road funding
Improve jobs-housing balance
Press for annual instead of biannual I & M
Pursue stationary source emissions

Workshop V:

Coordinate open space policies
City should adopt County's Natural Streams approach
County should do Natural Stream Study in South Area
Establish "natural areas division" in parks department
Establish policies on buffers
Develop funding mechanisms to protect or acquire open space and buffers
Enforce General Plans
Protect Metro Airport