

**COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO  
CALIFORNIA**

For the Agenda of:  
January 31, 2007  
Timed: 2:00 pm

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Department of Planning and Community Development

Subject: **WORKSHOP #21 ON THE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN UPDATE:  
DISCUSSION ON LAND USE & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT THEMES**

Contact: Surinder Singh (916) 874-5462  
David Defanti (916) 874-6155  
Lori Parrington (916) 874-8371

**Overview**

During the last Board Workshop, held on December 5, 2006, Planning staff presented key land use themes of the Public Review Draft General Plan 2030 (Draft Plan) to the Board of Supervisors. Staff highlighted five key themes: Jackson Highway Visioning, new growth management strategies, provision of limited urban services to Franklin and Freeport, land use/transportation linkage, and the new Land Use Diagram. Today, Planning staff will continue addressing these themes and will respond to questions and comments expressed by the Board during the previous workshop. In addition, staff will introduce key Economic Development themes of the Draft Plan. There are three additional workshops scheduled prior to the beginning of the environmental review process.

**Recommendations**

1. Consider the results of the public outreach program and additional public testimony during workshops on the Public Review Draft General Plan Update.
2. Direct Planning staff to transmit the draft updated General Plan to the Department of Environmental Review and Assessment for environmental analysis after the March 28<sup>th</sup> Workshop and direct the Department of Environmental Review and Assessment to initiate environmental review.
3. Adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment "D") to initiate a General Plan Amendment to the Land Use Element of the 1993 General Plan to allow the extension of limited urban services to the towns of Franklin and Freeport. Direct Planning staff to transmit this project to the Department of Environmental Review and Assessment (DERA) for preparation of environmental documentation.
4. Direct staff to implement a Visioning Program for the Jackson Highway Area ("Jackson Area Vision"), as shown in Attachment "G".
5. Adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment "H") that authorizes the Planning Director to contract for consultant services for the Jackson Area Vision program in an amount not to exceed \$150,000 and in a form approved by County Counsel.

6. Approve the Economic Development Fund (ED Fund) as the appropriate source of funding for this project and direct the Planning and Community Development Department to seek reimbursement from the Department of Economic Development.

### **Measures/Evaluation**

Economic Development Fund (ED Fund) monies are available on a competitive basis much like a competitive grant program. Each of the projects and activities and/or organizations eligible for funding are required to make a proposal, compete for funding, and if awarded funding by your Board, accept performance measures and be evaluated accordingly.

The Jackson Area Vision program will lead to a better understanding of the potential for Jackson Planning Area, and how development in this area relates to the area outside of the UPA. In addition, the resulting Vision will guide future master planning efforts and allow for more informed decisions regarding a number of strategic planning considerations relating to the Area, including development potential at full build out, phasing of development, location and conceptual layout of land uses, economic development opportunities, environmental issues, and public facilities and infrastructure.

### **Fiscal Impact**

The Economic Development Fund is appropriate as the source to fund the Jackson Area Vision program. The request is consistent with the goal, objectives and criteria that the Board established for funding projects from the ED Fund in January 2006. As proposed, the subject request will decrease the ED fund by \$150,000. The remaining uncommitted fund balance of the ED fund will be \$759,150. There are no impacts to the General Fund.

### **BACKGROUND:**

During the last Board Workshop, held on December 5, 2006, Planning staff presented the key land use themes of the Public Review Draft General Plan 2030 (Draft Plan) to the Board of Supervisors. Staff highlighted five key themes: Jackson Highway Visioning, new growth management strategies, provision of limited urban services to Franklin and Freeport, land use/transportation linkage, and the new Land Use Diagram. The Board provided numerous comments and posed questions regarding these themes, including:

- Consider including the area east of Grantline Road in the Jackson Area Visioning process. Identify constraints to growth in the area and the “pros and cons” of including this area in the study.
- Look at creating a “Natomas Joint Vision” designation on the Land Use Diagram.
- Look at creating a new designation for areas outside the current UPA that are logical extensions of existing and/or planned communities that should not be lumped together with the Jackson Highway UPA expansion area (for example: the “Elbow Area” between Bradshaw Road and Excelsior Road, south of Elder Creek Road).
- Explore cost, scope, length and feasibility of fast-tracking the draft Franklin/Freeport urban services policy (LU-78 of the Draft Land Use Element) via a County-initiated General Plan Amendment.

- Evaluate Regional Transit’s comments regarding draft General Plan policy LU-33 and report back to Board with suggested changes.
- Indicate hard-rock mining and other activities underway in the East County.
- Reevaluate how the infill strategy is described in the Land Use Element. The draft Element currently refers to it as an “assumption” based strategy, thereby giving an impression that the County is not proactively encouraging infill development, which is incorrect.
- Were any of the East County Study’s recommendations included in the Draft General Plan?

Today, Planning staff will respond to questions and comments expressed by the Board during the previous workshop. In addition, Economic Development staff will walk through a new chapter for the Board of Supervisors’ Workbook (Attachment “A”) to present the key Economic Development themes in the Draft Plan.

### **DISCUSSION:**

#### 1) RESPONSE TO BOARD COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS RE: LAND USE THEMES

##### *Including Area East of Grantline in Visioning Process*

During the last workshop, Supervisor Nottoli asked Planning staff to identify the “pros and cons” of including the area east of Grantline in the Jackson Visioning effort. Staff concluded that there are essentially no negative aspects related to studying this area in the Vision, besides a nominal increase in time and resources necessary to accomplish the effort due to added complexity and additional stakeholders. However, the only real “pro” identified to including this area in the Vision process would be to set the stage for new growth in this area during the 2030 planning period. Should the Board decide to include this area in the UPA, there are a number of potential pitfalls, the greatest being the potential for a larger Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and affordable housing obligation than the County may be willing to accept. In addition, there are a number of environmental and infrastructure constraints to growth in this area that make it a much more complicated area to develop. Finally, given the size and development potential of the Jackson Planning Area, there is no need to consider other new growth areas for the 2030 planning period. These three key points are described in greater detail below.

##### Area East of Grantline and the County’s Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA)

Sacramento County’s next RHNA will be based on a number of factors, including the size and growth accommodation potential of new growth areas identified in the County’s General Plan. It is safe to assume that the more acreage identified by the County as a new growth area, the larger the County’s RHNA and low income housing allocation will be.

While accommodating the Blueprint assumption is completely voluntary, state law *requires* that certain measures be taken to accommodate the RHNA and its associated low income housing obligation. If the state is not satisfied with steps taken to accommodate this allocation, a number of negative actions may result, including decertification or conditional certification of the

Housing Element, a partial or total building moratorium, or requirements to rezone additional acreage to accommodate higher-density residential development. Unfortunately, Sacramento County has experienced all of these painful scenarios to some degree in the past. Therefore, in order to avoid these consequences in the future, it is important to refrain from identifying too much land as new growth areas so that the County is not issued a RHNA and an affordable housing obligation greater than it is willing to accept and/or capable of achieving.

If the area east of Grantline is ultimately studied as a new growth area, the County's RHNA will most likely be increased accordingly. While studying this area as part of the Vision process may not trigger an increase, its actual affect on the RHNA is unknown at this time. Planning staff is coordinating with SACOG on the methodology used to create the RHNAs for each jurisdiction, but has yet to discuss in great detail what other factors are taken into account when creating individual allocations.

### Land Use History and Constraints to Urbanization

Prior to the 1993 General Plan, the area east of Grantline was predominantly designated for General Agriculture (80 acre minimum), with some land designated for Extensive Industrial to the west and south of the Prairie City OHV Park. The 1993 General Plan included the area within the USB and changed the designation around the OHV park from Industrial to General Agriculture. While the area's land use designation and predominant uses have not changed since the 1993 General Plan, knowledge of the natural resources located within the area has increased dramatically.

In the years since the 1993 General Plan was adopted, environmental analysis conducted in connection with the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) has identified two significant environmental constraints to development in this area. First, the area features a large number of dense, high quality vernal pool complexes that are home to a number of endangered species, including Fairy Shrimp and Tadpole Shrimp. Second, there are two known occurrences of Sacramento Orcutt grass in this area that must be preserved; only a handful of such occurrences exist in the world.

Successful implementation of the SSHCP will require that a large portion of this area be permanently protected (a minimum of 1,500 acres) including the establishment of a core preserve (1,000+ acres.) This will result in a minimum of 20% of the total area being constrained from any type of development. Since most of the vernal pools are located adjacent to Grantline Road, these preserves will ultimately constrain much of the land that would otherwise be the most desirable place for urban development – the area adjacent to Rancho Cordova and Grantline Road. Even if the remainder of this area is ultimately developed, the amount and location of the developable land will most likely result in low density development, such as estate-type residential or agriculture residential, since this land is located on the urban fringe next to the USB. As such, the area will provide little opportunity for retail or employment uses, transit-oriented development, affordable housing, or residential growth accommodation in general.

Other key timing issues have been discussed at length in previous staff reports. Some of these

constraints include:

*Provision of Sewer Service*

The area east of Grantline will be served by the Deer Creek Interceptor, scheduled for construction between 2023 and 2033. This Interceptor is one of the very last projects planned for in Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District's (SRCSD) Interceptor System Master Plan 2000. In fact, the Master Plan assumes that the area east of Grantline is *the* last place planned to receive sewer service within the USB, representing a very significant constraint to urbanization within this area during the 2005-2030 planning period.

*Provision of Public Water*

This area is not well positioned for water service provision during the 2030 planning period. It is not included in the Sacramento County Water Agency 2030 Study Area for Zone 40, is not adjacent to existing water infrastructure, and is poorly situated for the supply of recycled wastewater and/or remediated groundwater. Scarce groundwater is available there because of its proximity to groundwater contamination and the characteristics of the local aquifer. Therefore, the likely source of water for this area would be unknown surface supplies that would be politically, environmentally, and institutionally challenging to secure.

*Transportation Infrastructure and Traffic*

There is currently no transportation infrastructure in place in the area east of Grantline. Facilitating development in this area will heavily impact US 50, since it serves as the only major nearby east-west connection. Additionally, there is currently little opportunity for public transit due to the area's location near the urban fringe. The area's location and environmental constraints would make it difficult to provide urban densities high enough to support enhanced transit services.

For more information regarding the opportunities and constraints within the area east of Grantline, refer to the Board Workshop #14 staff report and Attachment A from March 15, 2006.

Growth Accommodation and the Need for Additional New Growth Areas

A recurring argument heard at past Board Workshops is that the UPA must be further expanded to include additional areas (like the area east of Grantline) in order to accommodate the County's Blueprint growth assumption. While there may be a compelling reason to study the area east of Grantline during the Vision process, this is not one of them. The Jackson Planning Area provides ample capacity for this task. Since the Jackson Planning Area can easily accommodate anticipated growth plus a sizable oversupply, there is no need to consider identifying other new growth areas for the 2030 planning period.

The Jackson UPA Expansion Area is approximately 12,500 acres, of which up to 4,500 acres may be constrained from residential development due to protected natural resource areas (both current and projected) and/or Mather Field's 60 CNEL noise contour (assuming the larger of the two contours currently being considered). This conservative estimate leaves approximately 8,000 acres of the Jackson Planning Area available for residential development. As described in the draft Land Use Element, the Jackson Planning Area only needs to accommodate 25,000-

35,000 new units to meet the County’s targets, which would roughly translate to a density of 3 to 4.5 units per acre (Table 3), far below the acceptable minimums for the “smart growth” or Blueprint-style development that the County is striving to achieve. This is an extremely low density given the size of the area, it’s proximity to jobs and the urban core, and its proximity to high quality roadway and transit opportunities, both existing and proposed. Although the draft Land Use Element sets a modest target for this area, Planning staff is confident that this area can accommodate a minimum of 35,000 new housing units, with a potential to accommodate up to 45,000 new housing units and supporting retail, employment, recreational and public uses if truly planned as a series of compact, transit oriented nodes.

*Table 2  
 Potential for Housing Units in the Jackson Planning Area*

<b>Jackson UPA Expansion Area</b>	<b>Acreage</b>
Entire Area	12,500
Constrained from Residential Development	4,500
Developable for Residential Uses	8,000

*Table 3  
 Jackson Planning Area*

$\frac{25,000 - 35,000 \text{ units required}}{8000 \text{ acres available}} = 3 - 4.5 \text{ units per acre}$
--

***New Land Use Diagram Designations***

During the last Board Workshop, Board members discussed the possible need for additional Land Use Diagram designations and/or overlays. Two new potential designations were put forward: 1) an overlay that recognizes the area covered by the Natomas Joint Vision MOU, and 2) a new designation to differentiate certain new growth areas from others. These new potential designations are discussed in more detail below.

Natomas Joint Vision Overlay: Supervisor MacGlashan discussed the need for an overlay designation to denote the Natomas Joint Vision area on the Land Use Diagram. In response to this direction, staff proposes that a new “Natomas Joint Vision Study Area” overlay designation be included on the Land Use Diagram to identify the area addressed by the Natomas Joint Vision Memorandum of Understanding (see Attachment “B”). Staff also proposes that associated language be included in the Land Use Element to explain this designation. This language is as follows:

*On December 10, 2002, the City Council and Board of Supervisors adopted a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding principles of land use and revenue sharing between the City and County of Sacramento for the Natomas area, setting the stage for what has come to be known as the “Natomas Joint Vision.” The “Natomas Joint Vision Study Area” overlay on the Land Use Diagram indicates the area addressed by this MOU. The MOU identifies the City as the appropriate agent for new growth and the County as*

*the appropriate agent for preserving open space, agricultural and rural land uses in Natomas. Together, the City and County will forge a leadership role on a regional scale for growth management. The cooperative effort addresses land use, economic development, and environmental opportunities and challenges in Natomas. The result will be quality development balanced with permanent open space preservation systems.*

Designation for New Growth Areas Adjacent to Planned Communities: In response to property owner testimony, the Board raised the possibility of creating a new designation for certain areas outside the current UPA (but within the proposed UPA expansion area) that are viewed as logical extensions of existing and/or planned communities. The example given was the “Elbow Area” between Bradshaw Road and Excelsior Road, south of Elder Creek Road and north of Gerber Road. While some of these areas may be in close proximity to existing and/or planned development, staff does not support creating a specific land use designation for this purpose. Staff’s reasoning behind this is described below and is directly tied to how the UPA expansion area, as currently identified in the Draft Plan, came about.

Planning staff originally recommended a much smaller UPA expansion footprint in the Jackson Area (from Watt to Excelsior). This recommendation represented a traditional “capacity limiting” approach: expand the UPA only enough to accommodate anticipated growth – no more, no less. However, based on Board direction, the Draft Plan currently identifies a much larger UPA expansion area (from Watt to Sunrise) that can accommodate more growth than is anticipated through 2030. This represents a “targeted growth” approach: expand the UPA to include more land than is needed to satisfy anticipated need, thereby allowing the market more flexibility to respond to future demand, but direct growth to strategic target areas (transportation nodes) within the area.

To be effective, this new approach relies on two key premises: 1) the need for a comprehensive planning effort (via the Jackson Area Vision Plan) to ensure that as individual developments occur over the next 25 years, they will fit in and contribute to the overall land use pattern and transportation system in the area, and; 2) the requirement that future developments radiate from nodes along major transportation corridors and include a true mix of uses (“complete communities”), including sufficient retail and employment opportunities, a variety of housing types, and land use patterns that afford people opportunities to walk, bike and take transit. If either of these key premises are abandoned, we will be back to a basic “capacity limiting” approach but without actually limiting the capacity of available land, as 50% more acreage has been added to the UPA expansion area (~4,600 acres) than was originally recommended. The new “targeted growth” approach was also based upon a third “silent” premise: to avoid the mistakes of the past, which resulted in new growth areas dominated by low density single family residential homes with little supporting retail, employment opportunities, mix of housing types, or transit opportunities. These do not represent the “complete communities” that we are trying to accomplish in the Jackson Planning Area.

The Elbow Area was ultimately included in the UPA because staff thought that it could be treated as a logical extension of the Jackson Planning Area, not because it was viewed as a logical extension of the planned communities to the west. If the Board or the property owner does not feel that the Elbow Area is a logical extension of the Jackson Planning Area, staff

recommends removing it from the draft UPA expansion area. Again, the intent of expanding the UPA in the Jackson Planning Area is not to continue the low density growth patterns of the existing planned communities into this new growth area. Instead, the intent is to create new “complete communities” of unparalleled diversity and quality.

Some property owners are uncomfortable with this new “targeted growth” approach, especially those that may not be located near a potential node, as their property may not be the first to be planned for and developed. Under the “targeted growth” approach, land that is not near an identified node will most likely be developed later in the planning period. It is important to note that while potential nodes have been shown where major roadways intersect with Jackson Highway (Watt, Bradshaw, Excelsior and Sunrise) other nodes may be identified during the Jackson Area Visioning process that are not along the Jackson Highway itself.

Lastly, due to the sheer size of the Jackson Area, it is not feasible to plan for and develop the entire area at once. Therefore, regardless of approach, it is an unavoidable fact that some land will be planned for and developed first, whereas other land will not be planned or developed until later in the planning period. Due to this inextricable fact, staff recommends that the emphasis in planning this area should be based on a comprehensive vision to promote the development of strong and viable communities concentrated around centers served by transit and transportation facilities, rather than allowing development to occur haphazardly throughout the area. It is also important to note that the Board will have further opportunity to evaluate the approach to subsequent master planning efforts during their consideration of the recommendations resulting from the Jackson Area Vision study.

### ***Franklin and Freeport***

During Board Workshop #20, held on December 5, 2006, Planning staff presented draft policy LU-78 to the Board of Supervisors. This new policy was crafted to allow limited urban services to be extended beyond the USB to serve the towns of Franklin and Freeport. During the workshop, it was noted that if this policy is carried forward as part of the General Plan Update process, it would be at least 2 years until its adoption. Since even the most preliminary infrastructure planning efforts could only begin *after* this policy is adopted, the Board asked staff to explore initiating a General Plan Amendment to adopt this policy in a timelier manner.

Planning staff met with Department of Environmental Review and Assessment (DERA) staff to discuss the cost, timing and other issues associated with a County-initiated General Plan Amendment. The table below summarizes the key differences between pursuing adoption of LU-78 via a General Plan Amendment vs. the General Plan Update 2030:

	<b>General Plan Amendment</b>	<b>General Plan Update 2030</b>
<b>Cost</b>	<\$10,000	Unknown*
<b>Timing</b>	Less than 1 year	At least 2 years

\* The cost of processing the policy via the General Plan Update is unknown, since it would be lumped together with the overall project. However, staff presumes that it would be somewhat less costly than a separate General Plan Amendment due to the economies of scale.

As indicated above, initiating a General Plan Amendment will result in adoption of the draft policy at least 1 year earlier than if it were packaged with the General Plan Update. However, this timeframe assumes little or no public outreach; any public outreach conducted in conjunction with this process would add considerable time to this estimated timeframe. While the General Plan Amendment will require some additional direct costs and staff time to accomplish, the difference is relatively minor, especially if 1) public health and/or safety issues, such as septic failures, currently exist or may occur in the near future, or; 2) infrastructure planning is being held up by this policy change. Since discussions have occurred regarding this policy change for a number of years, staff recommends pursuing adoption of this policy via a County-initiated General Plan Amendment so that associated infrastructure planning can occur as soon as possible, thereby avoiding any future health and/or safety issues. If so directed by your Board, staff will initiate this process immediately. A proposed project schedule is provided in Attachment “C” and the resolution to initiate the General Plan Amendment is provided in Attachment “D”.

***Proposed Revision to Policy LU-33***

Planning staff met with Regional Transit staff on two occasions to discuss possible revisions to draft policy LU-33. As a result of these meetings, as well as a number of internal meetings, a handful of relatively minor changes are being recommended:

- Update Table 8 of the Draft Land Use Element (page 56) to establish target densities in addition to the minimum density and intensity requirements currently included in the table.
- Include an additional column in Table 8 so that it can separately address three distinct areas around identified sites: within 1/8 mile, between 1/8 and 1/4 mile, and between 1/4 and 1/2 mile.
- Change the first sentence in the policy to read “It is the policy of Sacramento County to support and encourage Transit Oriented Development (TODs) in appropriate areas throughout the county. Development applications within ½ mile of a transit stop/station shall comply with the TOD development requirements as listed on Table 8.”

The revised policy LU-33 and Table 8 is provided as Attachment “E.” The proposed changes are shown in track-edit mode (text with strikeouts are proposed deletions, whereas underlined text are proposed additions).

### ***Map of Activities in East County Area***

During the last Board Workshop, Supervisor Peters asked for a map showing all activities in the eastern portion of Sacramento County, including proposed hard rock mining operations. Attachment “F” illustrates proposed or existing mining operations and other activities in this area. Staff researched the issue of adding an overlay on the Land Use Diagram to show hard rock mining resource areas, but two problems quickly arose. First, there is no information available from the state regarding where such resources exist. If an application for mining such resources is approved by the County, the area could conceivably be indicated on the Diagram or elsewhere in the General Plan. However, this would require another level of discretionary approval (a General Plan Amendment) for all hard rock mining applications, leading to unintended consequences on the applicants.

### ***References to Infill Strategy in the Draft Land Use Element***

Staff agrees with Supervisor Collin’s sentiment that referring to the infill growth management strategy as an “assumption” (while the corridor and new growth area strategies are referred to as “proactive”) may give the impression that the County is not actively pursuing and encouraging infill development. Staff will reevaluate this wording and will make appropriate changes to intent language within the Element to address this concern.

### ***East Sacramento County Open Space Study***

Supervisor Nottoli asked staff whether or not the outcomes of the East County Open Space Study (East County Study), namely the recommendations within the “toolbox,” were incorporated into the Draft Agricultural, Open Space and/or Conservation Elements. Staff is currently evaluating the East County Study and its recommendations against the policies included in these Elements. Staff will report back on this subject during the Board Workshop scheduled for March 14<sup>th</sup> that will focus on the Agriculture and Conservation related themes of the Draft General Plan.

## **2) JACKSON AREA VISIONING**

The Jackson Area Vision study was conceived as a proactive, County-led approach to capitalize on the enormous opportunities offered by the greater Jackson Area. The objective of the Vision effort, as indicated in the Draft Land Use Element, is “coordinated near- and long-term planning efforts for the development of the greater Jackson Area that creates cohesive and complete communities while protecting environmental resources.” As such, this Vision will span beyond the 2030 timeframe of the General Plan to ensure compatibility between near-term decision-making and the Area’s long-term development potential. This plan will strive to encourage the creation of new communities that are connected and balanced, while preventing piecemeal and haphazard development that can occur as large new communities emerge over an extended period of time.

The scope of this effort is anticipated to contain a level of detail and policy language that is more specific than the General Plan, but not as explicit as a Community Plan. It would address strategic planning considerations relating to the Jackson Planning Area, including development

potential at full build out, phasing of development, location and conceptual layout of land uses, economic development opportunities, environmental issues, and public facilities and infrastructure. Results from the effort will be included in the Draft General Plan. Your Board will have the opportunity to review these additions prior to the adoption of the General Plan.

Planning staff is recommending the use of \$150,000 from the Economic Development Fund (ED Fund) to retain a consultant to conduct the Jackson Area Vision program. To be considered for ED Funds, a proposed project or activity must be consistent with existing, planned or future redevelopment or revitalization plans, policies and strategies, as well as meet at least one of the following criteria:

- Contributes to achieving the County's vision, mission and goals;
- Contributes to accomplishing any redevelopment and revitalization area's goals and objectives;
- Removes blight;
- Provides an economic benefit;
- Influences significant private investment;
- Provides recreation opportunities;
- Contributes to an increase in County revenues; or
- Creates jobs.

The Jackson Area Vision program will satisfy a number of the criteria established by your Board for awarding ED Fund monies, including:

- Contributes to achieving the County's vision, mission and goals: The resulting Vision will guide all future master planning efforts in the Jackson Planning Area. The Vision will ensure that all future planning and development efforts work toward accomplishing the County's overall goal of smart growth and creating complete communities.
- Influences significant private investment: Visioning and planning efforts for the Jackson Planning Area will ultimately result in an exceptional amount of private investment and development. This Vision will help the County create a conceptual land use and circulation plan to guide this private investment.
- Provides an Economic Benefit / Contributes to an increase in County revenues: The economic benefits and revenue generation potential of the Jackson Planning Area is immense. Developing additional retail and employment uses in this area will contribute significantly to both private economic development and the County's revenues. The Vision will ensure that this area's potential is capitalized upon by identifying the appropriate amount and location of these uses.
- Creates jobs: Again, new employment and retail uses in this area will result in a large number of new jobs. The Vision will show how job and retail centers will be served by transportation and transit facilities, and how they will be connected to, and interact with, nearby residential, recreational and institutional uses.

Planning staff is prepared to initiate the Jackson Area Vision program immediately. If so directed today by your Board, staff will prepare and release an RFP right away to engage a consultant (or team) and initiate the Vision process.

### 3) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT THEMES

#### ***Board of Supervisors' Workbook – Economic Development Themes Chapter***

During Workshop #4, held on December 1, 2004, Planning and Economic Development staff introduced the concept of including a new Economic Development Element in the General Plan. Subsequently, the Board directed staff to craft the new Element based on a number of key themes/objectives presented during the Board Workshop. The resulting Public Review Draft Economic Development Element contains eight distinct sections/themes:

- Balanced Mix of Land Uses
- Regional Sales Tax Strategy
- New Growth Areas
- Commercial Corridor Revitalization
- Agriculture and Agricultural Tourism
- McClellan Park and Mather Field
- Business Retention, Attraction, Development and Recruitment
- Sports, Tourism and the Arts

Planning and Economic Development Department staff have created a new Workbook chapter (Attachment “A”) that focuses on these key themes. Although these themes form the backbone of the Economic Development Element, they are also woven into a number of other General Plan Elements, the most notable of which include Land Use, Agricultural and Open Space. As such, the new Workbook chapter includes specific references to relevant information in other General Plan Elements and Diagrams, as well as pertinent public input found in the *General Plan Update Public Outreach Process Summary Report*, provided to your Board on October 31, 2006. Economic Development Department staff will be on hand today to introduce your Board to these key themes.

#### **NEXT STEPS:**

Several workshops have been scheduled to enable the Board of Supervisors to review the Draft Plan and to consider input and feedback received during the community outreach process. Today’s workshop was scheduled to discuss Land Use and Economic Development related themes. Three additional workshops are scheduled in February and March to discuss the other topics outlined in the workbook. The topics and dates are as follows:

- I. Mobility Themes and Human Services ..... February 13, 2007
- II. Agriculture and Conservation Themes..... March 14, 2007

III. Mobility Themes Continued..... March 28, 2007

Once the Board has reviewed the key themes of this Draft Plan, the environmental review process will be initiated, which is anticipated to begin in March 2007. An Environmental Impact Report will be prepared to assess the environmental impacts of implementing this Plan. Public hearings before the Planning Commission and your Board will be initiated following the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

**CONCLUSION:**

Today's workshop was scheduled to conclude discussions on Land Use themes of the Public Review Draft General Plan 2030, as well as to present key Economic Development themes. Staff has provided feedback on several issues raised during Workshop #20, held on December 5, 2006.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- A. Board of Supervisors Workbook - Economic Development Chapter
- B. Map Showing Proposed Natomas Joint Vision Overlay
- C. Proposed Project Schedule for Franklin / Freeport General Plan Amendment
- D. Resolution of the Board of Supervisors to Amend the Land Use Element of the General Plan to Allow Limited Urban Services to be Provided to the Towns of Franklin and Freeport  
  
Exhibit 1: Proposed Amendment to the Land Use Element of the General Plan to Allow Limited Urban Services to be Provided to the Towns of Franklin and Freeport
- E. Revised Policy LU-33 and Table 8
- F. Map Showing Existing and Proposed Aggregate Mining Sites in the Eastern Portion of Sacramento County
- G. Map of Jackson Visioning Study Area
- H. Resolution of the Board of Supervisors Authorizing the Planning and Community Development Department to Conduct the Jackson Area Vision Program and Authorizing the Planning Director to Retain Associated Consultant Services