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INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background Report Introduction

This chapter describes the purpose and organization of the General Plan and provides an overview of what a General Plan is, why it is prepared, and why it is important. This chapter also provides an overview of the purpose, organization, and format of the General Plan Background Report.

This chapter is divided into the following sections:

- What is a General Plan?
- Using the General Plan
- Planning Boundaries and Areas
- Purpose of the Background Report
- Format of the Background Report

1.2 What IS A GENERAL PLAN?

Every county and city in California is required by State law to prepare and maintain a planning document called a general plan. A general plan serves as the jurisdiction’s “constitution” or “blueprint” for future decisions concerning land use and resource conservation. All specific plans, subdivisions, public works projects, and zoning decisions must be consistent with the local jurisdiction’s general plan.

A general plan has four defining features:

- **General.** As the name implies, a general plan provides general guidance for future land use, transportation, environmental, and resource decisions.

- **Comprehensive.** A general plan covers a wide range of social, economic, infrastructure, and natural resource issues. The issues include land use, urban development, housing, transportation, public facilities and services, recreation, agriculture, biological resources, and many other topics.

- **Long-Range.** A general plan provides guidance on achieving a long-range vision of the future for a county or city. To reach this envisioned future, the general plan includes goals, policies, and implementation programs that address both near-term and long-term needs. The Sacramento General Plan looks out to the year 2040 (roughly 25 years in the future).
Integrated and Coherent. The goals, policies, and implementation programs in a general plan present a comprehensive, unified program for development and resource conservation. A general plan uses a consistent set of assumptions and projections to assess future demands for housing, employment, and public services (e.g., infrastructure). A general plan has a coherent set of policies and implementation programs that enables citizens to understand the vision of the general plan, and enables landowners, businesses, and industry to be more certain about how they will be implemented.

1.3 Using the General Plan

The General Plan is used by the City Council, Planning Commission, and City staff on a daily basis to make decisions with direct or indirect land use implications. It also provides a framework for inter-jurisdictional coordination of planning efforts among officials and staff of the City and other government agencies (e.g., Federal, State, and local). City residents, property owners, and businesses also use the General Plan for a particular geographic area or for a particular subject of interest to them.

The General Plan is the basis for a variety of regulatory mechanisms and administrative procedures. California planning law requires consistency between the General Plan and its implementation programs. Implementation programs and regulatory systems of the General Plan include zoning and subdivision ordinances, capital improvement programs, specific plans, environmental impact procedures, building and housing codes, and redevelopment plans.

Over time the city’s population will change, its goals will be redefined, and the physical environment in which its residents live and work will be altered. In order for the General Plan to be a useful document, it must be monitored and periodically revised to respond to and reflect changing conditions and needs.

The General Plan should be reviewed annually. A more comprehensive and thorough review and revision should be done every five or ten years to document changes in local conditions based on the new data. State law permits the General Plan to be amended up to four times in any calendar year, unless special conditions apply as defined by Government Code Sections 65358(c) and (d). Each amendment may contain more than one change to the General Plan.

The General Plan should be user-friendly. To this end, the General Plan is divided into two documents: the Background Report and the Goals and Policies Report. The Background Report is further divided into nine chapters, and the Goals and Policies Report is divided into four parts and nine sections so that information can be easily referenced by subject or issue.

The following paragraphs provide a summary of the two component documents that make up the City of Sacramento General Plan:
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- **Background Report.** The Background Report takes a “snapshot” of Sacramento’s current (2012) trends and conditions. It provides a detailed description of a wide range of topics within the city, such as demographic and economic conditions, land use, public facilities, and environmental resources. The report provides decision-makers, the public, and local agencies with context for making policy decisions. Unlike the Goals and Policies Report, the Background Report is objective and policy-neutral. The Background Report also serves as a setting for the Environmental Impact Report prepared for the General Plan.

- **Goals and Policies Report.** This report is the essence of the General Plan. It contains the goals and policies that will guide future decisions within the city. It also identifies a full set of implementation programs that will ensure the goals and policies in the General Plan are carried out.

As part of the City of Sacramento General Plan Update, the City also prepared a **Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR)**. The MEIR responds to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as set forth in Public Resources Code (PRC) 21100 and 21157 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126, 15175, and 15176. The Planning Commission and City Council will use the MEIR during the General Plan Update process to understand the potential environmental implications associated with implementing the General Plan. The MEIR is not part of the General Plan; however, it is intended to streamline project-level CEQA review for subsequent projects that are consistent with the General Plan.

### 1.4 Planning Boundaries and City Limits

The General Plan uses several terms to describe the city and areas beyond, including the following:

- **City Limits.** The jurisdictional boundary of the city. The city limits includes the area within a city’s corporate boundary over which cities exercise land use authority and provide public services. State law requires cities to adopt a general plan that at a minimum addresses physical development within this boundary.

- **Sphere of Influence.** A sphere of influence (SOI) is the probable physical boundary and service area of a local agency, as adopted by a Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo). A SOI includes both incorporated and unincorporated areas within which a city or special district will have primary responsibility for the provision of public facilities and services.

- **Planning Area.** A general plan, pursuant to State law, must address all areas within the jurisdiction’s planning area. The planning area encompasses all incorporated and unincorporated territory that bears a relationship to the long-term planning of the jurisdiction. At minimum, a jurisdiction’s planning area should include all incorporated land within the city limits and all land within the city’s Sphere of Influence.
1.5 Purpose of the Background Report

The Background Report provides a “snapshot” in time of the city’s existing conditions. The Background Report presents the physical, social, and economic resource information required to support the preparation of the General Plan. The data and information in the Report are generally current as of 2012.

The Background Report serves as the foundation document upon which planning policies and programs will be formulated later in the General Plan update. The document is also used as the “environmental setting” section of the General Plan MEIR.

1.6 Format of the Background Report

Each topical section of each Background Report chapter includes the following:

- **Introduction.** The introduction provides a brief description of the issues covered in the section.

- **Existing Conditions.** This section describes existing conditions as of June 2009 for each resource or issue area. Supplemental information developed since that time is provided in some cases.

- **Regulatory Context.** Each section summarizes the laws and regulations pertaining to the topics identified. Federal, State, and local regulations are described, as applicable.

- **Findings.** Each section contains a brief summary of key findings. The findings present key facts and preliminary issues from the section. These findings serve as the basis for the identification of issues to be addressed in the Policy Document.