

UPPER WESTSIDE SPECIFIC PLAN | OPEN HOUSE SUMMARY

Sacramento County held a public educational open house on the master-planning process for the Upper Westside Specific Plan at the following venue:

NP3 High School, Multi-Purpose Room
3700 Del Paso Road, Sacramento, CA
June 11, 2019, 6:00 – 8:00 pm

The format of the open house included County staff at multiple “stations”, each with numerous large-format poster boards and informational graphics on the master-planning process. The applicant team also staffed a station with boards showing the preliminary project design, vision and goals. The boards presented at each station are available on the [project webpage](#). Additionally, four internet-connected devices were available to provide participants with the opportunity to easily [sign-up for project notifications](#).

Comment cards were distributed at the welcome station and provided throughout the venue for participants to write their questions or concerns. The following is a summary of the written comments that were received, grouped by topic. 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)

Transportation and Traffic

- Gridlock/congestion already on existing roads (9)
- Only one road in and out (4)
- 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
- 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
- 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 (2)
- 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

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

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
- 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

Flooding

- Too close to levee
- 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 (4)
- Cost of infrastructure
- Insufficient infrastructure to support the project

Airplanes

- Land should be an alternative flight path and available for aircraft emergencies (3)
- 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

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

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