

UPPER WESTSIDE SPECIFIC PLAN | NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING SUMMARY

Sacramento County held four neighborhood meetings on the Upper Westside Specific Plan at the following venues:

North: NP3 High School, Multi-Purpose Room
3700 Del Paso Road, Sacramento, CA
August 28, 2019, 6:00 – 8:00 pm

East: Witter Ranch Elementary School, Multi-Purpose Room
3790 Poppy Hill Way, Sacramento, CA
September 24, 2019, 6:00 – 8:00 pm

South: Leroy Greene Academy, Multi-Purpose Room
2950 W. River Drive, Sacramento, CA
October 9, 2019, 6:00 – 8:00 pm

West: NP3 High School, Multi-Purpose Room
3700 Del Paso Road, Sacramento, CA
November 5, 2019, 6:00 – 8:00 pm

Three internet-connected devices were available at the welcome station to provide participants with the opportunity to easily [sign-up for project notifications](#). Also, a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document was provided to participants at the welcome station (this was not created until the second meeting in September, but was emailed to participants who had RSVP'd for the first meeting in August).

Each meeting began with a presentation led by County staff, followed by an open house where County staff received feedback and answered questions. The applicant team staffed a station at the first meeting in August, and were present at the remaining three meetings. The PowerPoint presentation shown at the meetings is available on the [project webpage](#).

Six notepads located at the open house stations were pre-filled with feedback that had previously been received at the open house in June, and were used to capture any additional feedback from participants. Additionally, comment cards were available at the welcome station for participants to anonymously write their questions or concerns.

The following is a running summary, grouped by topic, of all of the written comments that were received by staff during the early public outreach (including both the open house and neighborhood meetings). The parentheses indicate the total number of comments that were received when a comment was repeated by more than one participant.

General Opposition

- Against development/project (8)
- This area just shouldn't be developed due to the number of issues

Transportation and Traffic

- Gridlock/congestion already on existing roads (9)
- Only one road in and out (5)
- Improvements to W. El Camino interchange needed (3)
- Add EV chargers
- Ensure traffic and commute times do not increase for existing residents
- Traffic and safety concerns about three large schools in one area (2)
- Road/Traffic issues need to be resolved (9)
- Include lights or roundabouts to help with traffic; many stop signs currently
- Bike-friendly provisions needed to connect project to the larger bike trail system (e.g. pedestrian bridge near Peregrine Park)
- San Juan Road entrance to the bike path will be overly impacted/unsafe
- New connections to Garden Highway need to be deleted, otherwise major widening is needed (2)
- Improvements to Garden Highway interchange needed (2)
- Transit needs to be convenient and not stuck in traffic
- Widen I-5, add lanes and build more bridges to downtown and West Sacramento
- Deal with 49er Truck Stop congestion; close W. El Camino driveway and create more lanes on El Centro (2)
- Need additional access to Garden Highway for emergency evacuation
- Remove Radio Road and other new access points to Garden Highway (2)
- Neck down San Juan at the Garden Highway
- Needs bus stop near River View
- No way to evacuate the number of homes proposed if a levee breaks (3)
- No public transportation exists and a new bus line will not mitigate the project
- Traffic will increase resulting in damage to the levees

- Minimize traffic on Garden Highway, leaving it for residents, cyclists and people accessing the river for recreational purposes
- Ensure transit service is funded with development (i.e. not just bus spaces with no service)
- Design to have least amount of vehicle miles travelled (VMTs)
- Need public transportation to existing community
- Do not include Regional Transit stations in project
- Need more connections to the freeways (2)
- More traffic will be put on the Garden Highway which can't be widened and will be unsafe for cyclists

Agriculture, Open Space and Habitat

- Need open space for exercise and health
- Need open space for quality of life
- Increase amount of parks and public spaces
- Good to have urban farms for health and local business
- Keep vegetation next to canals cut so that pedestrians can walk along them
- Concern about existing Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan
- Violates agreements for no development zones
- Unclear how USFWS can issue a Biological Opinion
- Inappropriate to develop new parks without finishing existing parks in this area (e.g. San Juan Reservoir Park Phase II)
- Greatly increase proportion of open space buffer and park spaces
- Buffer along Garden Highway should be ¼ mile as was studied with the Natomas Joint Vision
- Don't degrade animal habitat previously agreed to in earlier plans
- Land should be preserved to maintain the agricultural and farmland feeling
- Don't take away farms to create a city in Natomas
- Keep suburban feel of the area, close to farms and nature
- One-mile buffer is being ignored
- Land is currently conservation land
- Many species depend on this area for their livelihood
- More consideration of habitat to preserve character of natural resources
- Agriculture is part of the character of Natomas for people and habitat for animals
- Adequate buffers are needed to help protect Swainsons Hawk habitat and Natomas Basin Conservancy managed habitat near Fisherman's Lake from people and pets

- Protect site is a convenient location for residents of the Farm-to-Fork Capitol to access fresh fruits and vegetables
- Maintain a minimum 2,500 foot buffer from the levee to minimize encroachment of new development on Garden Highway property owners
- Levee is not habitat
- Too much habitat/rural land is being taken out
- What about Swainsons hawk; it took us 10 years to build because we could not be within 500-feet of one
- Should maintain designated zoning of agriculture
- City/County should buy the property and keep it as open space

Land Use

- Don't want to be packed-in tight
- Develop other areas in Natomas (2)
- Like affordable housing which is needed to address the crisis
- Support for a sustainable, net-zero community (2)
- Include healthcare presence; hospitals and medical research facilities
- Ensure there is high-end retail
- Great to have education node to help young adults find work
- No development west of El Centro
- Nice plan; unrealistic
- Includes overly-dense housing that is out-of-character with the adjacent communities (2)
- Favor low-density residential and minimize high/very-high
- Too much development
- Too much high/very-high density concentrated at W. El Camino; typically low quality product that brings crime, etc.
- Mitigation or spacing between homes to prevent home-to-home fires
- Don't make a this area a downtown
- Support growth and added amenities
- Provide a balance employment opportunities, not just housing, to help pay community assessments and fees
- Concern about college located in the middle
- Adding 30,000 people in a small area doesn't make sense
- Better suited to warehousing, office, commercial and green belts than housing and schools under flight paths
- Possible site for a new zoo
- Ensure adequate parking on-site for residents and guests
- Do infill development before building in open space
- High/middle school locations conflict with existing residential to the south

Flooding

- Too close to levee (2)
- Concern about flood and levee safety
- Check soils to ensure proper drainage and mitigate against flooding
- Risk of flooding from Sacramento River over-flowing its banks
- No development should be permitted until all levee improvements have been completed

Infrastructure, Taxes and Fees

- No new taxes/fees for existing residents to fund project (5)
- Cost of infrastructure
- Insufficient infrastructure to support the project
- Need ongoing revenue stream for repairs
- Provide funding mechanisms for services such as law enforcement and fire protection

Airplanes

- Land should be an alternative flight path and available for aircraft emergencies (5)
- Noise from aircraft over west Natomas is unbearable
- Without an alternative flight path, property values will depreciate, and the City/County will collect less taxes (2)
- Will constrain the airport by adding more people who will want less noise, safety concerns (2)
- Land should be kept as a strategic reserve for the airport as open, agricultural land

Process

- Keep the public informed through the process (2)
- County staff was friendly and helpful at the open house (2)
- Like the greeting and QR-coded materials at the open house
- Liked differentiation of nametags between County staff and applicant
- Caution applicant not to misstate information; the plan is not approved, the process must be allowed (2)
- Maintain open, honest, transparent public participation throughout process
- Disappointed that developer's representatives were unwilling to explain details of plan
- Complete a thorough Environmental Impact Study
- Need to allow questions in an open, public environment (6)
- Clarify that it is not a "done" deal (2)

- Provide the number of comments for/against the project for transparency
- Studies should be completed before issuing Notice of Preparation (NOP)
- Conduct multi-year biological resources study
- Invite participation online for those that can't show up to meetings
- Send a postcard again at next milestone; near the submittal of the application
- Appreciated having a Q&A session

Other

- All for profits/money (3)
- Concerned with traffic, safety, preserving farmland, quality of life, etc. (2)
- Concerned that it is outside of City boundaries
- Concern about no City of Sacramento involvement
- Not all landowners are on-board
- Fix homelessness