



FOR YOUR INFORMATION

To: Mayor and Members of Council

From: Clare Hartman, Director

Subject: CC 1/24 – Item 3.1 – Q&A re: Annexation Opportunities for Santa Rosa

Staff has received several questions from the public in response to the posting of Study Session Item 3.1 on the Council’s Agenda for January 24, 2023. The following are the questions received regarding the item, Annexation Opportunities for Santa Rosa, and staff responses:

Questions and Staff Responses:

- 1. On page 4 of the Annexation staff report there is reference to the City’s Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and its original adoption in 1996 for a period of 20 years. Wasn’t the UGB extended by Santa Rosa voters in 2010?**

Yes. Please see the amended staff report excerpt below (new text added in underline); Revised staff report will be posted on January 24, 2023:

Urban Growth Boundary. An urban growth boundary, or UGB, is a regional boundary that separates urban areas from the surrounding natural and agricultural lands. It places a limit on how far a city can expand. UGBs are often voter-approved, as is the case with Santa Rosa, and set for a specified period of time. Santa Rosa’s UGB was last adopted in 1996 for a period of 20 years, assuring that the current UGB would not be significantly changed until at least 2016. In 2010, Measure O, which included a Santa Rosa UGB Extension ballot question, passed with a 67% vote in favor of a time extension. The passing of Measure O resulted in the adoption of a City of Santa Rosa ordinance that amended section 17-28.010 of the Santa Rosa City Code to extend Santa Rosa’s Urban Growth Boundary ordinance through to December 31, 2035.

- 2. On page 13 of the staff report there is mention that preparing a work plan for the annexation may delay other items, including those funded by ARPA. To help us understand the level of impact that Council might be weighing here, can you identify what programs or items would be delayed? Would delay of ARPA funded programs jeopardize ARPA funding?**

Until Council provides direction, and until the work plan review can be conducted, impacts to ARPA projects, among other state and federally funded projects is unknown. Should the Council direct staff to take the next step towards a city-initiated annexation, staff would work to prepare a work plan in balance with core services and the Council Goals work plan. Currently, the Council Goals work plan includes federally funded projects such as through ARPA (American Rescue Plan and the Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund), among many other efforts. ARPA projects are sponsored by federal funding that must be expended by the end of calendar year 2026 so they are time sensitive.

3. Could the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) costs of the annexation be folded into the greater General Plan process instead of standing alone?

No, not at this time. We are two years into a three-year grant supported General Plan effort which includes a programmatic EIR. The annexation and rezoning of specifically identified unincorporated areas were not included within the scope and therefore are not a part of any of the environmental analysis or the public process required by CEQA. To revise the project scope at this time in the process to include annexation of specific properties would be a restart of the General Plan process having to reassess its planning, engagement and analysis elements. Certification of the General Plan EIR is anticipated in Fall 2023. Following its certification, any subsequent effort, public or private, may be able to tier off of its analysis and findings. Any environmental analysis needs outside the scope of the EIR, however, will require subsequent and separate documentation in compliance with CEQA.

4. In the analysis of the staffing needs, it is determined that there will be a need for a part time Assistant City Manager (ACM). Because of workflow and workload, there may be a need for a FT assistant city manager. Is there a plan to add the position regardless or has that determination not been made yet?

No, the reference to the part time ACM position is only relayed in reference to the Roseland Annexation effort as an example. For the Roseland effort, staffing was added and adjusted based on circumstances at the time, and to support the prioritization of the effort over its 3.5-year work plan process. If directed to move forward, staff will work with the City Manager's Office to prepare a work plan to support the new annexation effort, in accordance with the city's current staffing and work plan and Council directed boundaries, principles, and expectations for prioritization.

5. While there has been an analysis of the considerable cost of this process, has there been any analysis on the financial benefits that may exist long term?

No, a full costs and benefits analysis has not been prepared at this time. Should the effort move forward, staff will include in the work plan a cost and revenues analysis in the early

phases of the effort. This work will include a fiscal analysis as well as a joint effort between the City of Santa Rosa and the County of Sonoma. Again, using the Roseland Annexation as an example, the approach to this work will be identified upfront in the work plan and an Annexation Costs and Revenues report will be prepared.