

1974

SACRAMENTO COUNTY-CITIES CONSOLIDATION

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props

Recommended Citation

SACRAMENTO COUNTY-CITIES CONSOLIDATION California Proposition 8 (1974).
http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props/793

This Proposition is brought to you for free and open access by the California Ballot Propositions and Initiatives at UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Propositions by an authorized administrator of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact marcusc@uchastings.edu.

Ballot Title

SACRAMENTO COUNTY-CITIES CONSOLIDATION. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Enables County of Sacramento and all or any of the cities within that County to be consolidated as a charter city and county as provided by statute, with approval of majority of county's electors voting on consolidation question and upon such other vote as Legislature may prescribe in such statute. Charter City and County of Sacramento shall be a charter city and a charter county; its charter city powers supersede conflicting charter county powers. Financial Impact: This measure involves no significant cost or revenue considerations.

Analysis by Legislative Counsel

Effect:

The State Constitution now requires that in consolidating a city and county government, all cities in the county must be included.

This measure would apply to Sacramento County only. It would authorize legislation which could enable the county government of the County of Sacramento to be consolidated with the city governments of all or any of the incorporated cities located within the county in the manner provided by statute. Thus, if provided by statute, the consolidated city and county government could include Sacramento County and any one or more of the cities of Sacramento, Folsom, Galt, and Isleton, without the others.

To be effective, the consolidation proposal would have to be approved by a majority of the electors of the county voting upon the question of consolidation and upon such other vote prescribed by the Legislature. As indicated below, implementing legislation requires that the consolidation proposal must receive a majority vote within the City of Sacramento. Thus, as provided by the Legislature, the consolidated city and county government must include the City of Sacramento, but will include any of the other incorporated cities only if a majority of the voters of the city so desire.

Fiscal Impact:

The Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst advise that adoption of this measure would impose no direct fiscal effect on either state or local government.

You should vote "YES" on this measure if you wish to allow the electors of the County of Sacramento to consolidate that county with all or any of the cities within the

county, pursuant to statute.

You should vote "NO" on this measure if you want to continue the existing constitutional provisions which require a statute providing for city and county consolidation to provide that all the cities within a county must consolidate with the county for a valid consolidation to occur.

Statute Contingent Upon Adoption of Above Measure

If this measure is approved by the voters, Article 3 (commencing with Section 51920) of Chapter 5 of Part 2 of Division 1 of Title 5 of the Government Code will become effective. Article 3 is contained in Chapter 972 of the Statutes of 1973. The text of Chapter 972 of the Statutes of 1973 is on record in the office of the Secretary of State in Sacramento and will be contained in the 1973 published statutes. Chapter 972 is the statute which, upon passage of this constitutional amendment, provides a procedure which will enable the County of Sacramento to consolidate with the City of Sacramento and any or all of the other cities within the county.

This procedure provides for the submission of a proposed charter for the government of the City and County of Sacramento to the electors of the county. Also the voters of each of the cities in the county other than the City of Sacramento will vote on the separate question of whether to retain their local governmental structure.

The charter will be adopted if approved by a majority vote of the electors within the county and by a majority vote of the electors within the City of Sacramento. Charter provisions relating to cities would not be applicable to other cities which elect to retain their existing local governmental structure.

Text of Proposed Law

This amendment proposed by Assembly Constitutional Amendment 91 (Statutes of 1973, Resolution Chapter 159), expressly amends an existing article of the Constitution by adding a new section thereto; therefore, the provisions thereof are printed in **BOLDFACE TYPE** to indicate that they are **NEW**.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XX

SEC. 1. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 6 of Article XI, the County of Sacramento and all or any of the cities within the County of Sacramento may be consolidated as a charter city and county as provided by statute, with the approval of a majority of the electors of the county voting on the question of such consolidation and upon such other vote as the Legislature may prescribe in such statute. The charter City and County of Sacramento shall be a charter city and a charter county. Its charter city powers supersede conflicting charter county powers.

**Remember to Vote on Election Day
Tuesday, June 4, 1974
Polls are open from 7A.M. to 8P.M.**

Argument in Favor of Proposition 8

Sacramento County has had a 40-member Charter Commission studying local government reorganization for over two years. This representative body of citizens is in the process of producing a charter of government for Sacramento County and its cities which will be voted on by the people of the county in November, 1974.

Sacramento County has within its boundaries four cities, the City of Sacramento, and three outlying smaller cities: Folsom, Galt, and Isleton. These three cities have requested that they be allowed the option of voting themselves in or out of the proposed governmental charter. In order to accomplish this, the Constitution of the State of California must be changed.

Proposition No. 8 is a proposal to change the California Constitution to allow the people of three small cities in Sacramento County to decide whether or not they desire to be a part of the new government.

This is purely a local issue—it deals **ONLY** with Sacramento County, and provides for an option vote for the

three small general law cities in the County. If these cities decide not to participate in the new government, they will remain as they are now and will retain the same relationship they currently have with the County government. If they decide to participate, they will become a part of the proposed government.

Sacramento County is in the process of reevaluating and perhaps changing its local governmental system. The largest city in the County already has a separate vote. This amendment makes it possible to have an equitable method of election for all the cities in the County. It allows **LOCAL** voters to decide **LOCAL** issues.

WE URGE A **YES** VOTE ON **PROPOSITION NO. 8**.

E. HENRY KLOSS
Chairman, Sacramento County Board of Supervisors
RICHARD MARRIOTT
Mayor, City of Sacramento
EDWIN Z'BERG
Member, California State Assembly

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Proposition 8

The proponents of Proposition No. 8 make it all too clear that the real reason for their sponsoring Assembly Constitutional Amendment 91 was to provide a special procedure just for the County of Sacramento and the City of Sacramento because the voters in the other three smaller cities are opposed to losing their independence under a proposed City and County consolidation. The present law protects these three smaller cities.

Proposition No. 8 should be denied passage because it sets up special legislation for just one county. As set forth in the main argument against Proposition No. 8 there will be created many problems for these three small cities which now can contract for services with the County of Sacramento but will not be able to do this if Proposition No. 8 passes, since the County of Sacramento will not exist as

it does now. The Constitution presently provides for a City and County consolidation but requires **all** of the cities in a County to be consolidated. The City and County of San Francisco is an example. The requirement that **all** of the cities agree guarantees there will be no remaining problems of what to do with floating cities.

If Proposition No. 8 passes, the three small cities could later be forced to vote against their will to annex because of their inability to survive alone. These cities are protected now. Under Proposition No. 8, the people in these cities lose their protection.

Vote No on Proposition No. 8.

CLARK L. BRADLEY
Senator, 14th District

Argument Against Proposition 8

Proposition 8 relates to Assembly Constitutional Amendment 91, proposing to add Section 1 to Article XX of the State Constitution as it pertains to Local Government in California.

The California Constitution now provides for the consolidation of cities and counties to form in a county a city and county system of government, an example of which is the City and County of San Francisco. The important feature of the present constitutional requirement is that **all** of the cities in a county be consolidated so as to form **one** city and county government countywide. This is done by a majority vote of approval by the voters in a county and in the cities of that county.

Proposition 8 proposes to make a technical but very serious change in the present constitutional requirement, in that, if adopted, part of the cities in a county could refrain from being consolidated with the other cities and the county, to thus form a "hybrid" concept of a city and county form of government.

The voters in the County of Sacramento and in the several cities in the County of Sacramento, have tried, on several occasions, to form a City and County of Sacramento under the present constitutional requirement, i.e., consolidating all of the cities in Sacramento County with the County of Sacramento. The voters in three cities in Sacramento County have rejected this consolidation. Proposition 8 now proposes an amendment to the Constitution to permit a "City and County of Sacramento," **leaving out these three cities.**

As a long-time member of the Committee on Local Government and Chairman in the Assembly for some eight

years, it is my firm belief that there will be many complex and extremely unsatisfactory problems arising if Proposition 8 is adopted to allow anything less than a complete consolidation of **all** of the cities with a county government in setting up a consolidated form of city and county government. The very purpose and intent of consolidation is to bring about a complete consolidation and not a partial consolidation as would be the case in Sacramento County if Proposition 8 carries.

Proposition 8 is so broad in its concept that you could have the county seat city of a county consolidated with the county government but leave a dozen other cities in the county "floating." Cities receive major services from county government and under Proposition 8 there is a serious question in my mind as to how these unconsolidated cities would continue to receive county government assistance and services. Would the incorporated areas of these "outside cities" be a part of the tax base of the consolidated county government?

I am in favor of the concept of the consolidation of the cities and county government on a countywide basis, but I urge the voters to reject Proposition 8 which is proposed purely as an expediency because one county in the state and the City of Sacramento have been unable to get voter support for a complete city and county consolidation.

Vote "NO" on Proposition 8.

CLARK L. BRADLEY
Senator, 14th District

Rebuttal to Argument Against Proposition 8

The argument against this amendment is based on THREE ERRONEOUS ASSUMPTIONS:

First: That the amendment applies to all counties in California. By its specific terms, this amendment applies ONLY TO SACRAMENTO COUNTY.

Second: That the amendment will permit a "hybrid" and unworkable form of City-County government.

To the contrary, the plan of reorganization envisioned in Sacramento County will not be adversely affected by the continued existence of the three small cities. They are located outside the urban area and represent less than 2% of the population of the county. These cities, in any event, will continue to receive their county services from the proposed new government. Most important, a Yes vote on this amendment will enable the voters of Sacramento County to work out a LOCAL SOLUTION FOR LOCAL PROBLEMS.

Third: That the voters of Sacramento County and its cities (Sacramento, Folsom, Galt and Isleton) have rejected consolidation proposals in the past. The fact is that the voters HAVE NEVER VOTED AT ANY TIME ON THE ISSUE OF CONSOLIDATION OR REORGANIZATION.

Proposition 8 is important because it gives the voters of Sacramento County the opportunity to consider and then accept or reject a plan of local government reorganization. Moreover, it specifically permits the residents of the three small cities, Folsom, Galt and Isleton, to decide whether these cities should be included in the plan of reorganization.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition 8.

E. HENRY KLOSS
Chairman, Sacramento County Board of Supervisors
RICHARD MARRIOTT
Mayor, City of Sacramento
JACK KIPP
Mayor, City of Folsom