

Grant Line East Visioning
Public Workshop #2
Workbook Feedback Summary
April 30, 2008



The following report provides a summary of participant feedback, representing a broad range of opinions and ideas about concepts in land use planning. The findings are strictly advisory, meaning they are not representative of the broader population. However, they do provide important insight into the opinions and perceptions of 45 workshop participants; additionally, not every participant chose to complete a feedback form.

Introduction

The County of Sacramento Planning and Community Development Department hosted a public workshop to gather feedback on its Grant Line East Visioning project; 45 participants attended.

The workshop was held from 7–9 p.m. on Wednesday, April 30, 2008, at Cosumnes Elementary School. Workshop advertisements were posted on the County Web site, through stakeholder and property owner mailers and personal emails. The workshop included a short PowerPoint presentation of project concept maps, followed by four stations highlighting concept elements for participants to view at their leisure. The four stations included County staff and consultant team members and focused on: road/transit, agriculture/habitat/recreation, land use balance/design overview and a question and answer station.

Feedback forms were developed to collect participant feedback on the overall concept map comments and the following development principles:

- Create distinctive and sustainable community nodes that contain a “complete” mix of land uses.
- Design communities so that employment nodes, parks, schools, shopping and other daily needs are within a close distance to housing.
- Provide a range of housing choices that could include:
 - Semi-rural
 - Traditional single family homes
 - Condominiums
 - Townhomes
 - Apartments
 - Mixed-use development
- Provide a variety of transportation options that could include:
 - Roadways
 - Bike trails
 - Walking paths
 - Public transportation
- Protect and preserve existing natural resources, including agricultural, rangelands, critical habitats and open space.

The development principles were derived in part from participant feedback obtained during the first workshop.

Participant Feedback Forms

Map #1	Map #2
Create distinctive and sustainable community nodes that contain a “complete” mix of land uses.	
<p>This statement is well represented on Map #1. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8 8 2</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much high density not enough ag. Off road park w/I 5 miles of residential will be disruptive due to noise Sac speed way & Laguna (???) raceway should be lessons as to avoid conflict. • I like the effort to develop a traditional grid. This map demonstrates a design that can make those nodes viable and successful. • I feel, the keep it vague then say this is what we choose is a bad tactic! • They may be “complete” communities with a mix of land uses, but because they are separated from the larger urban area and from each other, they will only add to traffic congestion and air pollution and greenhouse gas emission. • It does not appear that either map 1 or map 2 include “distinctive” elements, or “sustainable” elements. • Civic use is separated from other uses. Should be combined w/ more intense uses. • North area: separate core avenue is better than single core on #2. • There is a mix of land use true, but the south end of this project as well as the middle should not be subjected to any hi or med. density housing. There are to many valuable natural resources in the form of vernal pools and head waters to Laguna Creek. • Nothing distinctive other than large non-development tracts. • Too much open space. • Such a “mix of land uses” is completely inappropriate in this area. • Allowed communities are too small to be distinctive or sustainable. • Don’t think it should all be premised on “nodes,” but agree on mixed land use. • [Agree with statement] But not my vision for the area. 	<p>This statement is well represented on Map #2. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4 11 2</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much high density not enough agg. Off road park w/I 5 miles of residential will be disruptive due to noise Sac speed way & Laguna ??? raceway should be lessons as to avoid conflict. Failed to incorporate enough agricultural use. Better than #1 though. • The uses seem to be in larger chunks, at a denser grain. The roads are spread out far apart and will likely lead to a hierarchial feeder/artery network of streets. This plan appears unfriendly to bike/ped users and awkward for transit. It feels like sprawl. • They may be “complete” communities with a mix of land uses, but because they are separated from the larger urban area and from each other, they will only add to traffic congestion and air pollution and greenhouse gas emission. • I feel, the keep it vague then say this is what we choose is a bad tactic! • Not enough land uses south of Douglas Blvd. Need large more integrated core area. • North of Douglas – core area all on White Rock is too much. • Not enough open space. • What’s a “complete” about 3 miles of continuous ag-res along USB? • Too much open space. • Such a “mix of land uses” is completely inappropriate in this area. • Allowed communities are too small to be distinctive or sustainable. • Neither map is feasible. • Agree with statement] But not my vision for the area.

Map #1	Map #2												
Design communities so that employment nodes, parks, schools, shopping and other daily needs are within a close distance to housing.													
<p>This statement is well represented on Map #1. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td>AGREE</td> <td>DISAGREE</td> <td>NO OPINION</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>11</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not well represented in either map. • New communities are extremely inappropriate in this area. • Not enough housing to support retail in nodes. • Too much open space. • Skip commercial along Grant Line south of Douglas? Where's the housing? • The maps show "civic use" which it is no secret that there is a university planned here. This is no place for a university! Boards on 3 sides by either land fill, USB or preserve space, it should be in close to high density usage. • Uses are too separated. Need some open space but splits land uses too much. • Separating civic uses and housing and commercial uses with a strip of habitat conservation creates distances that are too great for walking and bicycling. If you must develop in this area, all development should be contiguous and use as little land as possible. • The university should connect to town center. Students walk and bike a lot. • Based on the county's failure to accommodate N. Natomas despite these same promises I say "No." 	AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION	4	11	3	<p>This statement is well represented on Map #2. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td>AGREE</td> <td>DISAGREE</td> <td>NO OPINION</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>13</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not well represented in either map. • New communities are extremely inappropriate in this area. • Not enough housing to support retail in nodes. • Too much open space. • The scale of the planning area seems to have been lost on the planners! • The maps show "civic use" which it is no secret that there is a university planned here. This is no place for a university! Boards on 3 sides by either land fill, USB or preserve space, it should be in close to high density usage. • North of Douglas – uses too concentrated. Spread out more. South of Douglas – uses too segmented by O.S. • Separating civic uses and housing and commercial uses with a strip of habitat conservation creates distances that are too great for walking and bicycling. If you must develop in this area, all development should be contiguous and use as little land as possible. • It's not just distance, but connectivity. The huge swath of single family does not appear close to other uses. • Based on the county's failure to accommodate N. Natomas despite these same promises I say "No." 	AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION	2	13	3
AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION											
4	11	3											
AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION											
2	13	3											

Map #1	Map #2
<p align="center">Provide a range of housing choices that could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-rural • Traditional single family homes • Condominiums • Townhomes • Apartments • Mixed-use development 	
<p>This statement is well represented on Map #1. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p> <p align="center"> AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION 6 6 4 </p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High density so close to the USB lacks principles of “smart growth.” • I don’t often find myself supporting semi rural/single family “ranchettes” but this design appears to create a meaningful buffer at the edge of the urban area. • Semi rural does not preserve ag land. • Mix may be ok – don’t know the % of (illegible). • Without specifics and #s it is difficult to say. • No “range.” • Too much open space. • Housing is a completely unacceptable land use in this area. • Agree with the concept of a wide range of housing, but the concepts presented are unfeasible. • Not nearly enough space to allocate to housing and related res. • No Development. Yes, for urban infill. Yes, for TOTAL 100% Habitat Protection. • Not enough information to make an opinion. • There should be no 6-lane thoroughfares through this area 	<p>This statement is well represented on Map #2. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p> <p align="center"> AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION 4 7 5 </p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High density must happen in city infill projects. Tele commuting will make (illegible) smart growth principles obsolete anyway. • Semi rural does not preserve ag land. • Mix may be ok – don’t know the % of (illegible). • Without specifics and #s it is difficult to say. • Mostly low–density residential shown – no mix! • Too much open space. • Housing is a completely unacceptable land use in this area. • Agree with the concept of a wide range of housing, but the concepts presented are unfeasible. • Not nearly enough space to allocate to housing and related res. • No Development. Yes, for urban infill. Yes, for TOTAL 100% Habitat Protection. • Not enough information to make an opinion. • There should be no 6-lane thoroughfares through this area.

Map #1	Map #2
Provide a variety of transportation options that could include:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roadways • Bike trails • Walking paths • Public transportation 	
<p>This statement is well represented on Map #1. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION 2 12 3 </p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not see bike trails, walking paths. • Yes, for habitat protection. • Will push development out of area and create more reasons to drive. • Agree with concept. Plans presented are not feasible. • Both alternatives have far too many roadways, not provisions for rail access, and too few walking paths through large areas of intact habitat. • Access points are insufficient. • Can't see any trails. • Lacks grid network. • Too much open space. • Based on this evenings presentation I did not get the impression that this would or would not be commuter friendly. • Roadways north on Aerojet should not be shown. Will not happen til 2050. • The distances are too great in most cases, because the development is spread out with open space in between. • The density and road network are inviting to users of a variety of transit nodes. 	<p>This statement is well represented on Map#2. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION 1 13 2 </p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not see bike trails, walking paths. • Yes, for habitat protection. • Will push development out of area and create more reasons to drive. • Agree with concept. • Both alternatives have far too many roadways, not provisions for rail access, and too few walking paths through large areas of intact habitat. • Access points are insufficient. • Can't see any trails. • Lacks grid network. • Too much open space. • Based on this evenings presentation I did not get the impression that this would or would not be commuter friendly. • Circulation too segmented. Broken up by too much open space. • The distances are too great in most cases, because the development is spread out with open space in between. • The big roads are bad for bikes/ped transit.

Map #1	Map #2
Protect and preserve existing natural resources, including agricultural, rangelands, critical habitats and open space.	
<p>This statement is well represented on Map #1. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION 6 10 1 </p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough agg + minimal growth. • This is a decent plan for growth. Future plans will need to demonstrate firm, enforceable standards that mandate preservation through public habitat preserves and growth easements for ag land. • The best way to preserve these resources is to leave this land as is. • OS segments land uses too much. Should have more comprehensive land uses. • [Disagree] on both maps. The middle and south ends of this are show lots of development on prime vernal pool habitat it is an incredible preservation potential which should not be squandered by the county. • That's all these 2 concepts do! They represent a pre-ordained vision of a few, none of which are actual landowners. • Too much open space. • No need to preserve agricultural and rangeland within the USB where the soils are non-prime and the land barely supports grazing. Need to maximize space within USB in order to preclude sprawl in the future. • Both propose building on high quality vernal pool and other habitat. Each builds on habitat protected by the other - which indicates habitat protection is not valued. There is no protection of important prairie habitat that provides a critical corridor between vernal pools and riparian habitat at Deer Creek. • Do not agree with introducing ag activities into USB. It will force needed development further out. Contrary to blueprint and sustainable vision. • That's all these plans do! • Agriculture designations inside of the U.S.B. are not a good concept. More complete buildout inside the US.B. would allow for protection of ag lands 	<p>This statement is well represented on Map #2. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION 3 12 0 </p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough agg and low residential. • Not a great map. I'm not sure the "no growth" voice was adequately considered. • The best way to preserve these resources is to leave this land as is. • OS segments land uses too much. Should have more comprehensive land uses. • [Disagree] on both maps. The middle and south ends of this are show lots of development on prime vernal pool habitat it is an incredible preservation potential which should not be squandered by the county. • That's all these 2 concepts do! They represent a pre-ordained vision of a few, none of which are actual landowners. • Too much open space. • No need to preserve agricultural and rangeland within the USB where the soils are non-prime and the land barely supports grazing. Need to maximize space within USB in order to preclude sprawl in the future. • Both propose building on high quality vernal pool and other habitat. Each builds on habitat protected by the other - which indicates habitat protection is not valued. There is no protection of important prairie habitat that provides a critical corridor between vernal pools and riparian habitat at Deer Creek. • Do not agree with introducing ag activities into USB. It will force needed development further out. Contrary to blueprint and sustainable vision. • That's all these plans do! • Agriculture designations inside of the U.S.B. are not a good concept. More complete buildout inside the US.B. would allow for protection of ag lands outside of the U.S.B. by keeping larger more economic units of ag land in a continuous trust.

<p>outside of the U.S.B. by keeping larger more economic units of ag land in a continuous trust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not represented well enough! Natural resources are not to be compromised. Their value transcends money (any monetary gain) has not value in the future when future generations need arable land, clean soils, access to water, and contact with open space and nature. This <u>is</u> a <u>critical habitat!!</u> • Partically • This area should retain as much natural habitat and farmland as possible and not be opened to high density development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not represented well enough! Natural resources are not to be compromised. Their value transcends money (any monetary gain) has not value in the future when future generations need arable land, clean soils, access to water, and contact with open space and nature. This <u>is</u> a <u>critical habitat!!</u> • Particially • More open land-natural habitat and farmland should be protected
--	---

Do you have any additional comments?

Please provide your overall comments about the two conceptual alternatives.

Comments:

- Both concepts are “again the same” – Please – no more Elk Grove, Natomas or Rancho Cordova community development. Not a wise place to plan a university.
- No ag use land designation within the USB. This is contrary to the long-intended purpose of containing future growth closer in. The purpose of the USB is not to have ag designation.
- As a landowner in the area, I feel that the mail points were misrepresented in trying to determine the uses designed in the east county. I feel the data is misrepresented to reflect a conservation theme. In actuality, there were more votes for development overall than for conservation.
- I represent a landowner in the Grant Line East area. We do not support having land designated agricultural use inside of the Urban Service boundary. The land in this area is of limited ag value and only is suited to large animal grazing. Even this is of marginal grazing quality. It is important for the long term viability of our operation to be able to realize fair market value for land inside the U.S.B. We can then reinvest in our operation and continue in business for years to come.
- Dear city planners of Sacramento, please “grow” into downtown/midtown and restore and renew the quality of living in an urban area. It can be a very “green” urban area. Please look into urban permaculture, green roofs, urban agriculture, green walls, true green building infill to reliven our inner city, where jobs are, and meets 100% all of the core values as stated in the presentation. I am here to affirm the intrinsic value of this land as a unique vernal pool ecosystem, beautifully intact, clean water, clean soil, with rare and threatened species. I value open space in Sacramento Valley as a special plant and animal ecosystem, and world class agricultural use, may we look at this land for its resource of natural resources, beauty, available land, and natural habitat. May it be preserved and protected for all time to come. May we think not of monetary gain so much, as the food and clean air, and open, natural spaces are grandchildren and great grandchildren and all future generations to enjoy. May we love the earth more than money. Peace! Abi
- Both concepts are terrible. They plan for SUV based sprawl development that sabotages state policy to significantly reduce CO2 emissions. They continue policies that put Sacramento in the top 5 subprime foreclosures – which was driven by sprawl projects like these 2 concepts now threaten to not only sink the U.S. economy but that of the whole world. And last but not least both concepts waste oil, an increasingly scarce resource that is being priced out of each of anyone who might live in what these plans propose. This plans could fly in the twentieth century, but are already obsolete in the twenty-first.
- Ag land should not be designated within the USB where the soils are non-prime.
- Concepts were based on inaccurate surveys in first workshop. Each citizen had 5 votes and the extreme environmentalists put all 5 votes to habitat conservation while the level headed citizen put 5 votes in different categories with the intent of a balanced community. As a result, habitat conservation showed as #1 priority.
- Ridiculous process.
- Both alternatives miss the mark by a long shot – preservation of large tracts of open space and/or ag. Land inside USB is contrary to regional BluePrint and smart growth which will then lead to the need to develop outside of USB. Also, proposed land use concepts are not financially feasible, entirely ??? development potential to support infrastructure needs.
- Obviously, there should be substantially more land dedicated to habitat conservation based on the response to workshop 1. Neither map depicts that.
- I disagree with having non-landowner votes count as much as owner votes. This does not reflect landowner thoughts at all!
- I was surprised land use maps were developed after so little input and study. Both of the maps do not seem to have any relation to constraints or genuine community input. It is disappointing that all of the input solicited in this form relates to the two poor alternatives.

- To get this area from Sacramento, one drives through miles and miles of open space. In addition, there are thousands of parcels of vacant land within existing development boundaries that could be rezoned and developed more densely. Given the needs to preserve ag land and habitat conservation, and to reduce driving in the region, it doesn't make sense to develop "town squares" in the middle of habitat or ag land. Even if you create both jobs and housing, some people will choose to drive downtown or other places to work. The only way to reduce driving in the region to build closer to the urban core and leave this space truly open.
- Concept Plan II will destroy the ag land in the area.
- I am skeptical of Sac County to execute either of the two plans as shown b/c N. Natomas was planned as "smart growth" but is a large residential area. In some cases 3 story apt. buildings were built adjacent to residential back yards. I think high density must be moved out of G.L. East and placed adjacent to LRT transportation corridors. We need BRT (bus rapid transit) Not LRT (lightrail) due to costs of LRT. Or we need trains with designated right of way, i.e. Bart.

Additional Comments

A separate comment card provided space for participants to express any additional comments pertaining to the workshop, concept maps or general project comments.

- We do not want to have the land we that have inside the USB identified as open space or locked up as ag in perpetuity or prohibited from being development. That land for us gives us the ability, when the time is right, to sell that land and reinvest in our main operation and really establish our operation so it can be long viable for the long term.
- The overall concept is misplaced. People want to preserve the ag and open space. Any development out in these areas is premature. Maybe in 100 years! No it needs to be infill only.
- The University should be directly connected to a commercial and rental housing area. In Option 1, it is connected by...something that doesn't look well lit and that doesn't appear to have "eyes on the street." Every university has a "rape trail," but this one should have it be the only way to walk home from the store or bar.
- Existing conservation easements should be part of the base information. Sac Valley conservancies' vision map should also be considered for Jackson Road Visioning.
- This project, including both concepts, puts CO2 wasting sprawl where it least belongs – in an area of outstanding natural beauty, world-class and sensitive biological resources, and an intact ecosystem that connect the Sacramento area's most important natural communities.
- I am here to affirm the intrinsic value of open space, wildlife friendly agricultures, and the protection and preservation of our wildlands for all time to come. We must not be looking for money in our hands now, when it takes away food and contact with natural habitats from the future generations – grandchildren, great grandchildren, and on...