

## Potential Policy Considerations in Implementing Measure M

### Considerations related to Measure M and the accompanying explanation.

- How firm will the developers and the Board hold to the language used in the advisory measure and the accompanying explanation?
  - Is there any tolerance at all for diversion, or is the language presented the only deal there is?
  - For example, does 2,900 acres of residential mean just that, or can they exceed that by 1% in order to make the plan fit the land? 2%? 3%?
  - Shall we incorporate the language along with clarifications in an initial agreement describing the processing process?
  - What process will the Board use to clarify cases of interpretation of the language? For example, “proposal” and “workshops.”
  - Would the Board consider including land on the west side of Highway 99 that is not currently in the South Sutter County Industrial/Commercial Reserve (so that the 7,417 acres planned include both sides of the highway), or should it be restricted to the east side as the map currently shows?
  
- Does the Board intend for the developers to plan all 7,417 acres?
  - The “incidental take” permit issued to Sutter County by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service limits urban development in the County’s portion of the Natomas Basin to 7,467 acres, including public improvements. SYSCO has developed 50 acres of this land, leaving 7,417 acres.
  - Is some smaller acreage acceptable, with the remainder being designated as an urban reserve?
  
- What role does the Board see themselves playing in the processing of the applications submitted by the main group of developers?
  - Will the Board define which 7,417 acres?
  - Will the Board define where the residential development will occur?
  - Will the Board want to be involved in receiving status reports on the project?
  - Will the Board wish to identify where the public land will be located?
  - Will the Board want to do the general plan level planning on their own, and process specific plans as they come in during the process?

### Other Considerations.

- How does the Board intend to deal with the roughly 1,700 acres not controlled by the “Measure M Group”?
  - Will they require everyone else to wait until the General Plan work has been completed before processing any more specific plans?
  - Will they allow the main group of developers to process their specific plan concurrent with their amendment of the general plan?
  - How would the Board like to deal with property owners that are within the roughly 5,700 acres, but not with the main group of developers? (i.e., Hobday)
  
- Is the Board interested in obtaining any additional citizen input into the planning of this area?
  - What may be the forum for obtaining such input?
  - Perhaps using the Planning Commission?
  - Perhaps using an ad hoc citizen advisory committee?

- How would the Board like to deal with the development of those properties in the area that are already zoned industrial while the “master plan” is being developed?
  - Would the Board consider placing all urban development on hold until the “master plan” is in place in order to ensure that all development is coordinated?
  
- How will the Board ensure that the industrial/commercial development will progress at roughly the same rate as the mixed use residential development?
  
- What may be the timing for incorporation of the urban developed land?
  - What may need to happen in the interim to prepare the way for this?
  
- Is the Board of Supervisors interested in establishing any type of regular, formal coordination efforts to include adjacent Counties in the process?
  - Sacramento?
  - Placer?
  - Yolo?