

October 3, 2024, Natomas CPAC Public Comments for UWSP Draft DEIR

Speaker 1: Heather Fargo

30:12-32:31

Good evening to the Natomas CPAC, it's nice to see you all here. My name is Heather Fargo. I'm a South Natomas resident and have been for more decades than I want to tell you. So, if you need to use me as a resource down the road when you are looking at more information about the project, please let me know, I can make myself available.

I am also the former mayor here in Sacramento and I was the mayor when the Natomas Habitat Conservation Plan was approved. I was serving Natomas as City Council Member when the North Natomas Community Plan was approved. I'm also currently the board member of the Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS), and I'm sharing their Natomas team. I along with our team are adamantly opposed to this project. We do not want to see it move forward. I want to first start by saying there are number of farmers here, number of property owners. We don't have any opposition of people selling their land. I mean, everyone can do that. If farmers can find someone to buy their land, I think that's fine. Our concerns is what happens in terms of development to that land. So, as you have heard already there significant and unavoidable impacts. I want you to think about that what that term means because they asked us to focus on the EIR, which by the way, was not in the announcement for the meeting. It didn't ask us to focus so not everyone who is speaking on the behalf of the community got that message. But the first issue, is that of aesthetics, the view that people have in Natomas and drive through Natomas, the actual visual impacts really do matter. Valley Vision did a survey and found out that the number one reason people like living in Sacramento region is the access to open space. So, keep that in mind, that's what people would like to see. The second impact, which obviously could not be mitigated. *[Clerk notes two minutes is up]* Did you just tell me I ran out of time? The lost of farmland, increase in air pollution is a huge issue, they call it traffic, but we call it congestion when you pass by on the I-5 and 180 and obviously two minutes is not enough. Please deny the project.

Speaker 2: Edith Thatcher

32:31-34:47

My name is Edith Thatcher, I'm a resident of Natomas. The Upper Westside project is a part of 8,000-acres of proposed development in the Natomas Basin. The EIR does not consider cumulative impacts on traffic congestion, the environment, roads, flood, emergency response, evacuation and so on. I provided the Council with a map, you can't see it well, I'm very sorry. There is a black line, black dotted line, that is the Urban Services Boundary. In the most recent County General Plan it describes the Urban Services Boundary as the ultimate growth boundary for the unincorporated area. I mean, the General Plan says that that's edge of growth. The building occurring in the Natomas Bay, that we see, the apartments, Costco, all that is inside that Urban

Services Boundary. But there are 8,000 acres of projects planned outside that boundary. On this map. If you look at page 4 in your handout, there will help you a little bit. Grandpark which is 5,000 acres of residential, commercial. That's basically a small city. Over here we have a Watt EV, Watt EV is about 118 that will be solar charging, solar park. This is Airport South Industrial; that is about 150 acres that is planned to be over six million square feet of warehouses. And then we have the 2,000 acres of Upper Westside, which is why all of us are here thinking about that. Of those projects, three of them are going to require moving the Urban Services Boundary which is suppose to delineate our *[Clerk notes two minutes is up]* the other thing to think about is the cumulative impacts of all of these projects, not just the Upper Westside. Thank you very much and thank you to the Council.

Speaker 3: Robert Burness

34:53-37:56

Thank you, good evening I would like to address, my name is Robert Burness. I'm a resident of South Sacramento, but I was also a Planner for the County for 30 years and was very much involved in the development of the policies that we're going to be talking about tonight. I'd like to get into a little bit of detail about the consistency of policy number LU-127, which is about moving the USB. I want to talk briefly about the fact that really the County should not be deciding this project, it should be the City. And thirdly, there are some other risks, issues, and impacts associated with this project that are not adequately dealt with in the Environmental Impact Report.

First of all, Policy LU-127 lays out very specific requirements before the boundary should be expanded. I won't get into detail on it, but I encourage you to look at them closely. It's pretty clear that most of them are not being met in effect. There is an opt out clause which that basically says that the Board with a super majority of 4 can approve the project, and override these concerns if there is something of extraordinary value associated with the project that merit them making this decision. I've looked and I don't see anything really very extraordinary about it. And if you really have to stretch to find it that's a good reason to consider this inconsistent with the policy. The County should not be approving this project and here's why. When this whole project went to hearing, or rather the General Plan policy went to hearing, it came to the Board with the recommendation of that the entire North Natomas area be included within the Urban Services Boundary. That was a recommendation of the Planning Commission at the behest of landowners with interest in the area. At the time, Grantland Johnson was a representative on the Board. *[Clerk notes two minutes is up]* And Grantland basically said this should be developed by the City. They will be providing services for the area. They' will be having the most residents living in areas that are being impacted by it. It should be their decision we won't get into it why. *[Clerk asks for comments to be concluded]* But keep in mind as you talk and finally just once, there really does need to be a close look at congestion issues. There's an analysis buried in the environmental document, appendix b that has a whole bunch of numbers about what the traffic will be. You should ask the County specifically

[Clerk asks for comments to be concluded] for direction of what that impact is. The congestion is your most important issue. Talk about all these projects that are on the table. Thank you.

Speaker 4: Luz Lynn

38:00-40.12

Good evening and thank you for taking our comments tonight. Today, I'm just really going to ask you to consider the housing and climate readiness challenges that are here in Sacramento. And really, what is this project going to address these needs that we have. There's no doubt, there is a housing crisis going on and we definitely needing to increase housing, especially affordable housing. But at the same time, we really need to think about what kind of development is going to be good for the area. We know that vehicle miles traveled, VMT, is the leading cause for greenhouse gases. As we're in a climate crisis right now, we really need to focus on going forward with infill development with dense development around areas where there are existing transit lines and infrastructure. The Upper Westside project area currently does not have the transportation infrastructure that the new community would need. Nor is the area transit priority region so it will take a very long time to actually have this transit infrastructure built. Creating this new community before addressing necessary infrastructure needs will only drive up VMT's and will actually reduce affordability of this housing as an option. I also urge you to consider the importance of working with the agencies that are already leading efforts to increase housing. That includes SACOG and one quote that they had in their comment letters in the Notice of Preparation for this project says the capacity for growth in existing entitled lands far exceeds expected demand for over the next 20 years. Collectively, the region's jurisdictions have entitled or are in the process of entitling two and a half times the region's projected needs for the next ten years. So, we already have people addressing these issues of housing and if we already have that in the works, then how can we justify the removing 2,000 acres of... *[Clerk notes two minutes is up]* How can we justify all of these negative consequences that everybody is speaking to? Thank you.

Speaker 5: Alex Jang

40:38-43:13

Thank you so much for taking our comments. I'm Alex Jane, I've been born and raised here in Natomas specifically. My family been here since the 1950's just for reference here. And I'm going to comment specifically on, like, the environmental impact. The Natomas has changed a lot of years. But it's charm and its balance between city and nature is what makes it unique. Sadly, I've noticed, the silence of frogs and crickets and the decline of migratory birds, other wildlife. I mean, just the other day I heard some coyotes howling which I didn't hear it for a long time. We would lose that, essentially over time. Now is a perfect time to consider other alternatives to the development plan, like establishing easements or trusts to keep

our open spaces safe from overdevelopment. Development is part of what puts Natomas at risk. Recently I saw a lot of residents on Facebook actually talking about the increase of mice in their home. And I think that's due to the development that has happened already. The Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan has also been created to protect vital habitats and various species, like endangered ones that we have here, the giant garter snake and Swainson's hawk. If the development plan continues [...] the development plan does talk about mitigation strategies, but disrupting these critical habitats can still lead to even more declines. Of wildlife populations putting short term profits ahead of long-term environmental care., and it's just not fair to future generations. We should focus on sustainable solutions that utilize existing spaces, address built community needs rather than contributing to urban blight. It's important to note that the Upper Westside Specific Plan is heavily backed by private developers, which raises a conflict of interest and concern. Their financial interests suggest participation of profit over community welfare and environmental sustainability. On top of that, while there's a plan to ease the pressure on local services, traffic is still a big issue. *[Clerk notes two minutes is up]* Our roads need to be able to safely sustain our people here. Sorry. I'm, like, panicking now. May all the victims of our traffic incident in our area rest in peace. We have not been able to sustain and, keep our people safe here. Let's not forget that we live in a high flood risk zone. Heavy rains and potential levee failure are real concerns. Soil and natural vegetation are crucial to flood control. Paving, over these elements have disastrous consequences. *[Chair notes time is up]* Thank you so much, and I hope you can continue to be proud of generations to come.

Speaker 6: Josh Harmatz

43:25-45:53

Hi everybody, Josh Harmatz, I'm a 19-year resident in Natomas. I started on Del Paso Road and was fortunate enough to buy on Garden Highway and have lived there for some time. I don't mind the coyotes being gone actually because they keep eating my chickens. [...] Really urge this group not approving it as is. They are glossing over some really important points on mitigation which I'm very concerned about. Mitigation efforts needs to be detailed out. I'm going to give you four big points that are very important. By the way, of the public comments, 90% of these 24 in support are all from email address and they're all canned emails. So please hear the real voice of the residents here, not the canned emails you're getting likely from the developer, who knows.

So, number one traffic is the most pressing concern. You are talking about the [...] lifestyle of residents. Two roads, one of them is to be maintained by the County [...] and the other annexation. Sacramento County is getting no benefit from this plan. They're not getting the millions in tax revenue that is coming in. And they already lack the ability to navigate the resources that are needed. Access to our beaches, levees, and out river fronts are going to be a problem. 25,000 people now wanting to go to the waterway, which has to be managed by the County. There's no plan in

here of how that's going to be dealt with. There's already not enough parking, not enough amenities, no trash service. The Garden Highway Community Association, I'm the former Deputy Director of District Three, has not been consulted. And I urge you to add that in there that the local resident groups, including the Garden Highway Community Association, are required to be consulted on this plan moving forward. Safety is a huge concern for us. During the levee project, we saw a huge uptick in crime and traffic coming to our area. That pales in comparison to a project like this. There's been nothing to address specific mitigation efforts of crime, traffic, remember residents of Garden Highway are managed by the County. It takes up to an hour when you call 911. The County is nowhere close to where we live. Now you are adding 25,000 new residents [*Clerk notes two minutes is up*] Finally, I want to talk about [..recording unclear..] from the crumbling roads over the past decade, things that have not already not been addressed by prior construction. You're exasperating that with no solution and coining mitigation efforts without outlining those things is a serious concerning flaw in this plan. I will say now, I will not support the new 25,000 new residents. Just do the math, look at the infrastructure there, it doesn't work. Thank you very much.

Speaker 7: Ronald Costa

46:10-48:32

My name is Ronald Costa, and I live South Natomas. Me and my family we moved from Garden Highway, the land side, over to 3200 block of El Centro Road in 1951. So that puts me at 87 years old and I know the area real well. When I moved in you could count the houses along the river side at Garden Highway by a couple of couple hands. There wasn't any. Now, during all that time my parents were two, then the offspring was four, my offspring was four, so I had children, grandchildren, great grandchildren. It multiplies. Our children need a place to live. If we are going to go procreate and make a lot of children, we have to provide a place for them to live. How are they going to survive? It just got to be done. So not building housing is not an option. [..recording unclear..] In order to house the people, we need to house the people that came from us. I don't think that, I think the plan is well-developed. The environmental impact covers the issues. And if we have to step on a couple of bugs or a couple of snakes or let the bird fly to a different tree and make a nest, so be it. The dinosaurs have been gone for thousands of years and you won't miss them a bit. So if we lose a few bugs, it wont hurt a thing. We haven't for five thousands [..recording unclear..]. Theres no getting around it, that's a good housing place and biggest job center in the area, [*Clerk notes two minutes is up*] and its close. So, not building housing is not an option.

Speaker 8: Howard Lamborn

48:410-49:55

Howard Lamborn, I'm a pharmacist. I've been here in Sacramento for 48 years. I used to work for Sacramento, I realized that there are a lot of problems that go along

with any development but this one as long as it is done conscientiously and the concern for the environment I think would be a very good thing, stimulate people. You all like positive things, we've pretty much talked about the negatives already. It will stimulate the economy, housing, and I think it would be a good thing for Sacramento as long as it's done in view of the environment and i.e. situations like overcrowding etc. etc. But we do need room for people to come here, and they will come here regardless. Sacramento is growing so as long as it's done responsibly, I think it's a very good thing. I had a speech all written out, I'm not going to read that I'm going to put it away. I will keep it short and sweet. Thank you very much.

Speaker 9: Joseph Brazil

50:09-53:00

Chair, CPAC members, my name is Joseph Brazil. My family has been farming 120 acres in the Upper Westside Project area for over 80 years. Unfortunately, urbanization and changing conditions, along with many other problematic issues, has made agriculture in this area increasingly, unsustainable and quite frankly, no longer profitable for us. We actually were forced to sell a portion of our land in order to simply keep our farming operations afloat. The prevailing concern is that the land being converted into the Upper Westside development should remain designated as farmland. Anyone who thinks this is prime farmland really needs to talk to my family, who has been farming this for eighty years. In reality urbanization, has surrounded our land, which has created numerous problems for us. So let me share a few points on that issue and bring some truth to light. Number one, we can't leave our tractors or equipment in the fields overnight. People also come onto our fields and trample and steal their crops. Vandalism, this is definitely, definitely a problem and a real issue for us. Increased traffic. This impacts the transport moving of our slow moving tractors up to the heavy equipment, farming restrictions on methods, timing, pesticides, etc.. They're all now due to the proximity of all the homes and the businesses all around the area. Water table and soil mineral erosion. This limits our crops. Fences from planting an orchard, keeping agricultural designation for this land ignores the on the ground reality that farming here is no longer practical, sustainable and extremely difficult to profit from. But Upper Westside has a solutions number one mitigation land. They offer a 1 to 1 mitigation ratio of prime farmland to contribute for every acre developed in the project. This ensures that while development proceeds, farmland preservation continues in other areas that are much better suited.

[Clerk notes two minutes is up]

Okay, yes, I will wrap it up. Wildlife corridor [..recording unclear..] has a system to ensure that there's an ecosystem for the Swainson Hawk, giant garter snake and other species are intact. Number three housing shortage. This also takes care of the demands for the severe housing shortage that is happening. So, in closing, Upper Westside project offers a forward-thinking solution that balances the nature of development, response to farmland mitigation, and environmental protections. Our family and I fully support the Upper Westside Project thereof and all these benefits

solutions I mentioned, along with others, which had considered as well. I hope you guys consider it as well.

Speaker 10: Yudwinder Singh

53:14-56:16

Good evening, everybody and decision makers. I'm a resident of Sacramento and been living here for the past 25-years and same area the Natomas Sacramento. I'm in support of this site-specific plan, which is why I end up at the meeting today. It's my pleasure to share my opinions of this agenda. For your information, I am managing and running the [..recording unclear..] group for the community group in this area from the last 12 years, more than a decade. And almost all of the members are living here in Natomas. And all of the members we spoke when this project was started, five-six years ago. We made our statements about this project its already in your files. And let me come to the point in short, we still have residence in California and the convenience of Sacramento houses, we need more homes here. My grandson, he lives in an apartment because the home prices are very high. Why are the home prices high? And if that objective can be processed, then the homes can be built over there so that new construction [..recording unclear..]. That's why I support this project which can also predict some percentage of the population. And, this project site is very convenient and very close to the freeways, downtown and get pushed moreover [..recording unclear..]. We will get a few more schools, colleges, and universities in this area. And the hospitals to for the future generations. *[Clerk notes two minutes is up]*

Eco friendly transportation system will be a part of the plan. And the city can attest to the public transit, light rail, and transportation system. Moreover, the commercial, hotels, motels, and the hospitals and clinics are the main market. Everything creates the employment opportunities over there. [..recording unclear..] (clerk ended public comment). *[Clerk notes two minutes is up]*

Speaker 11: Sri Ram

56:23-58:49

Good evening members of the Natomas CPAC Board and members of the public. My name is Sri Ram, short for Sri. I work for State of California as an IT project manager. I have, been working in the IT industry in the Sacramento area for the past 30 years. And, and I'm here to express my strong support, for the Upper Westside Specific Plan project. And I want to share with you all, some of. - there are many reasons just I feel like we should support this project, but a few critical. I'd like to, quickly share, I don't know if I will have enough time. So not in any particular order, first reason, I feel like we should support this project is because of the shortage of housing that we have, not only in this region, but it's a statewide problem. So, I think that this project will alleviate some of that, shortage, especially, regards to apartments, affordable apartments and duplexes. So that's reason number one. The other reason why I am in strong support of this project is because it's very close to downtown Sacramento,

and there are over 200,000 existing jobs close by. And so, this will enable, the region to meet its goals of especially people, miles traveled VMT as well as the greenhouse gas emissions. So, those things are going to be satisfied by this project. I got many points. I mean, the other thing, I want to point out is, as I've lived here for such a long time. Every time I pass by this area, I also see this area empty and see so many northern area projects being done. I always felt like why can't we develop so close to downtown and so close to job centers meeting smart growth objectives. Thank you.

Speaker 12: Tristen Griffith

59:00-1:01:19

I stand here before you today as a representative of my family's business the Sacramento 49er shopping plaza, which we've own since 1988. However, our connection to this community goes back even further over 55 years, when our plaza was second to the airport, the number of public pay phones that we had, I remember driving down the road as a little girl and seeing the 49er as, at the time as the only business around for miles. Throughout these years, we dedicated ourselves to serving our guests, whether it's fueling up, getting repairs, staying the night, or enjoying a meal. The price of the growth around us, investing in innovation like short power to make our plazas sustainable. Recently, we completed significant renovations to our restaurant and exterior, repaved facility, upgraded our lighting to enhance the experience for everyone who visits, to name a few. I'm excited about the Upper Westside Plan, which is vital for our future. This project will bring essential infrastructure improvements, including expanding West El Camino Avenue and upgrading interstate 80 interchange. These changes will reduce congestion, improve accessibility for truckers, and make it easier for travelers to stop by our plaza. I try to exit our plaza, often have to wait several minutes for all the traffic is either pass or stop long enough for my car to exit, let alone a large truck. Moreover, this plan is an investment to our local economy; projected to create thousands of new jobs and foster more growth. More people living and working in this area means more customers for not just the Sacramento 49er Travel Plaza, but for all local businesses that contribute to our commute as someone who has invested in sustainable technology and happy to see that the Upper Westside development prioritizes payments to accommodate these practices. In fact, 49er is on the verge of opening a new Tesla supercharging station any day now. The improvements planned are long term solutions, including enhanced roadways, expanded intersections, and better public transit connections that will help manage the region's growth rate decades to come. For my family and the Sacramento 49er of Travel Plaza, I'm here to testify in support.

Speaker 13: Bal Soin

1:01:21-1:02:39

My name is Bal Soin. First of all, I want to admire and really appreciate the people who put this project together. And this is the best project its going to be looking like in that area. I want to thank all of you guys. At least you are looking at the area. Sacramento needs housing. This is the biggest problem we have right now. Sacramento needs the jobs, there are so many, all in a different type of industry, there a lot of stores, lot of [..recording unclear..], and many people be working in the stores to give us services for people who are in the area. And there's a school, there's a park, what else do we need in the community, what else do we need in the area. Maybe new roads, new projects, new everything. I think this is the best project for the area. Look if you see now, you see two, three, four, five years. I don't know how long it will take. You guys know better, I can't tell you what to say but I like the project and I support it.

Speaker 14: Paul Pannu

1:02:57-1:05:10

Good evening, Council Members and fellow residents, my name is Paul Pannu. I'm a long time Natomas resident since 2002. I came to you to express my strong support for the Upper Westside development project. After reviewing their proposal, it's very clear this plan promises to bring substantial benefits to all local residents. Development staff addressed housing diversity with many years of varied densities, this project tackles housing supply while promoting voting, social equity, [..recording unclear..] economic growth, the integration of commerce on all the space and bring local job opportunities, reduced commute times, and fueling our local economy. The town center promotes social interactions, walkable and bike friendly environment. School sites will ensure access to quality education [..recording unclear..], and access to parks, trails, and greenbelts will promote to healthier lifestyles, and preserve our connection to nature. The plan also aligns with regional goals to reduce car dependency and decrease greenhouse gas emissions. I would like to highlight the fact that there would still remain an agricultural buffer which will maintain the area's farming heritage while integrating urban and rural land use. The proposed special financing district will ensure sustainable finding of enhanced public services like police and fire and for maintenance. In conclusion, the Upper Westside development project represents a holistic approach to urban planning that addresses our community's current needs while safeguarding the future prosperity. It's really a testament to thoughtful, sustainable growth that will enhance the quality all life for all residents. I urge you to support this transformative project. Thank you.

Speaker 15: Patrice Stafford

1:05:14-1:07:02

Hello, my name is Patrice Stafford, I'm a retired Caltrans and County of Sacramento civil engineer. I have worked in this area and all-around Sacramento in various levels of engineering work and from Caltrans greenway work, sewer and stormwater infrastructure during flooding events around this area. And I'm in support of this

development with some considerations. Well, I would appreciate more single-family homes instead of so much urbanized development, but there are a lot of I would in this area. It is very important to develop this because everything around is developed. It needs a good development plan. And there's also many parcels that I have worked on, but they're zoned agriculture. So some have been allowed to be there for over 50 years but they need to be in alignment with, what's going on and providing and they already provide housing. And I do agree with the buffer for agriculture because this area has been, you know, it's a great place to have all the farm stands and also, I love the 49er truck stop. And, when I came out here 30 or so years ago, it was just that and Witter Ranch and, the, the senior mobile home park, and then it's moved up. So then I would say that's what I would support. And I agree that this should be approved. Thank you.

Speaker 16: Hector

1:07:24-1:07:52

I will say that I support the project as long as it's done responsibly. Give an opportunity the people that live in the neighborhood, not have people come in and buy all the houses. It's interesting for the community, it has schools parks, lakes, trails and all that stuff. So that's pretty much it, yeah.

Speaker 17: Dana Schwartz

1:08:06-1:05:57

My name is Dana Schwartz. Besides the many negative impacts of this project, like traffic increase and noise, deterioration of air quality, we need to ask ourselves why is this being built when there is so much infill land within city boundaries that can be developed first. Why are we instead developing open farmland and that has been designated for flood control and habitat and wildlife conservation. This does not make sense and will impact the quality of all residents of South Natomas negatively. I implore you to save our open spaces and not approve this plan. Thank you.

Speaker 18: Simarnjit Malhi

1:09:05-1:09:34

Good evening Natomas Council members. My name is Simarinjit Malhi. I go by Malhi as well. I've been living in Natomas for the past 16 years, since 2008, and ever since I moved to Natomas. Ever since Natomas has been developing, day after day, night after night. So today I'm here to deliver my message once again that I am in favor of another development which is the Upper Westside. So, I'm in favor of the project. Thank you.

Speaker 19: Z Wayne Johnson

1:09:41-1:12:53

Hi, I'm Z Wayne Johnson, everybody simply calls me Z. I'm president of the River Oaks community association and former chairman of the District 3 Community Coalition. We have caveats about this project. Clearly as you heard, traffic is a huge concern. With all due respect and support for the 49ers. When you come off of I-80 on the [..recording unclear..], you come down to El Centro, the weave between cars and trucks is horrible. There have been accidents as well as multiple near accidents that have occurred along the El Centro itself. There's already a two-lane road, absolutely would have to go to four to be able to sustain this level of traffic. There are no budgeted plans for Caltrans with City of Sacramento for substantial improvement to the I-80 ramps that don't [..recording unclear..]. Not in the ten-year plans and not in the twenty-year plan. Destruction of farmland is a mix use, you know, on our farmers in terms of that. But also, we're concerned about what the traffic studies tend to indicate. The most people are going to access and egress from using I-80 off of Arena Drive. That doesn't make sense for those of us that live here and live in close proximity to the those that are closest to west El Camino are going to use west El Camino to get on the I-80 coming and going. That's also not just for cars but also for trucks that are coming in, which will all create an issue of the problem. It is just disingenuous to be able to note that the studies indicate there will be significant impacts, air, cultural and so forth and not mitigate each one of those, you know, say this is a bigger issue. The air quality affects not only the area directly around but also [..recording unclear..] the air currents that push the pollutants further out. *[Clerk notes two minutes is up]* Actually, I'm done right away. And then lastly, you can't just mention housing. There needs to be a commitment to build affordable housing. Don't use the buzz words because it allows them to move forward. There has to be a commitment to change. And the last comment, again, you talk about change but look at what the quality of life is like in this section of Natomas. And what we want on it versus what we're going to propose. And we have been supportive of various developments. I thank you so much.

Speaker 20: Dave Brady

1:12:58-1:15:21

Hi, good evening, I'm Dave Brady, I also live in the River Oaks, neighborhood. I was gonna call myself a long time Natomas resident, but I can't compare to Heather and so many others here. But I have to say, in the time I've lived here, I've been involved in a lot of community projects, and I've never seen one like this. It struck me as I was sitting in the crowd out there, we're meeting in a silo, and it's very indicative of this project, because the County has been operating in a silo this whole time for this project. They have not engaged with the environmental community. They have not engaged with the City of Sacramento. And most of us live in the City of Sacramento, they represent us and the represent our interest. And so, yeah, the project with the County can go ahead and push it through, they probably will. But you're going to get resistance from other folks in the community if you do that. So, I think the thing that I really want to get across tonight is you need to engage better. This is not going to do it. And I brought two things that I would hope to submit to you tonight. There's

been a lot of talk about transportation. In the proposal, there's two comments, and one of them says it's the 2030-County General Plan, and it has a map that says these are four lane arterial roads and I marked six places where that is false. So, I think it's really incumbent of this body to get with the applicants and correct this information. And I wanted to finally - the other item that I wanted to submit tonight, it's a picture I took of the El Camino overpass over I-80 on my way here tonight. This was about two hours ago- wall to wall traffic, and it gets a lot worse than this. But this is the only way, the only logical way you're going to access this site. People are not to drive 20 minutes up to Arena Boulevard and back. So, you guys keep going over this, and I hope you'll consider this. Thank you.

Speaker 21: Pam Davis

1:15:28-1:16:36

I'm not a public speaker. Thank you for allowing me. Just really quickly my concerns. And I'm not involved in anything except I've lived here for 40 years. The major impact to the wildlife habitat that had been promised for so long, and the major traffic impact the existing, roads that are mostly two-lane. And like Dave said, the traffic right now on the freeway is insane. Come 3:00 here it's a dead stop. And then the lights that make you stop before you get on the freeway -you know- the traffic gets backed up from those. It's insane. To add, I don't remember how many people it said for this housing project. It's just going to impact ten times worse going to impact ten times worse. So that's what I want. And it doesn't say anywhere that housing is affordable and affordable for who, the people from San Francisco?

Speaker 22: Susan Herre

1:16:40-1:19:27

Good afternoon, good evening Board and everyone, I'm Susan Herre. I'm the president of the Board of Directors for ECOS, that's Environmental Council for Sacramento, and I'm an architect and planner, and South Natomas resident. So, I'd like to thank you and thank everyone who spoke. And summarize briefly the concerns from a neighbor point of view and a from planning point of view. So first, of thank you's to the CPAC members and County staff, and the community members who spoke, and our own Natomas team from ECOS, Heather, [...recording unclear...], and Edith. But the concerns, I'd say they're two. One is, from the neighbor's point of view, and that's increased traffic, loss of use; perhaps if they've got a house that fronts what they were told would be open space in perpetuity, there are lots more people and people have. So but those are impact issues.

I'd like to talk to you about larger, the bigger picture and larger planning issues. And three things in particular that I would say are really important for our region. And they are planning actions that have been taken over time that have set framework for us here in Sacramento, in the Sacramento region. One has maybe been talked about, the Blueprint from 2004 by SACOG and all the community. It was smart growth plan. It was considered a model for the nation. And it is really about infill and working

around transit, living close in. The second one is the Urban Services Boundary, which has been touched on since 1993, and it was set to protect development from fire and flood, and to preserve Ag and habitat on the outside of it. And the third is the Habitat Conservation Plan, which people have talked about. To protect species in the basin, resident wildlife and much work has gone into making those planning actions. It's something that this region should be really proud of and not toss away lightly. And also, those three things together, if you think of them, they are really guards, defenses, etc., against climate change and for our regional sustainability.

Speaker 23: Shikha

1:21:30-1:42:50

Thank you, I am in favor of the Upper Westside project. My question to you is, or perhaps the planner might be able to address is, you know, I appreciate folks sharing their kind of thoughts around you know, pros and cons. What are the next steps so from here on out? What will be the next steps? I've heard the conversations that take place today. And how is that going to kind of circle back to the owners of the parcels?

Speaker 24: Harriet Steiner

1:22:53-1:25:20

My name is Harriet Steiner. I live in North Natomas. This is a matter of history. I was, General Counsel in Sacramento Area Council of Governments when they did the first Blueprint. So, I've been around a long time. And I would say that, like we did the Blueprint, there was a lot of discussion about urban and rural and urban and conservation and why, why and what you develop and what shouldn't. And at the end of that process, which sometimes is contentious, we came up with a plan. The County adopted Urban Service Boundary and the adopted Natomas Basin Conservancy plan and the Blueprint. And we lived with those for a long time and now we're at a crossroads where different partners, different developers are coming in and asking, can I build this, can I build that, and they are not in the General Plan. They're outside the Urban Services Boundary and they should at least consider that, but they don't, and I think that's wrong. I think that if we are going to take these plans, which were so thought out and has served us so well and decide to do away with them, we should do it in a more thoughtful manner, and we should do it so that we look at all these different lands and other people who make plans and figure out what should develop if any and what shouldn't develop. And that way we can save our conservation and make sure that we are done with flooding issues, we have horrible traffic as many people will say, and we can deal with that too, but to take and do different EIRs, for little pieces or not so little pieces, and build all these little cities in these little pieces without really being able to grasp all of these areas and yet still do away, and yet still do away with all wildlife conservation with our flooding and take these plans and go with them. And not using them as guidepost, but rather use them as impediments. I just don't think that that's what the County should do, and I don't think that's what the City should do. I think we should go back, and we should look at these plans.

Maybe they're good plans but they're not timely. And we all know that they is little bit of housing. But SACOG will tell you, two and half times, the amount of housing we need for twenty years in their land, we just need people to build on it and make sure it's affordable when they do. Anyway, thank you very much.

Speaker 25: Harpreet Banga

1:25:34-1:27:20

My name is Harpreet. Thank you all for being here. And lending your ears. And, I want to tell you, my son was going to come and talk today. He couldn't get through, he's becoming doctor, and he wanted to, give a comment. So, I want to read what he said in the message. He said, hello, I am Raj Banga and I am resident, resident physician, completing training in the Florida and right now I have full intention to return to my hometown of Sacramento after the residency in the next few years. I firmly believe that establishing the Upper Westside community will be a transformative step for the region. It would offer unique amenities, school, and walkability that would make it ideal for families and local business alike. This project helps to address our region's housing shortage, align line with the smart growth goals, and will create countless valuable opportunities to the community. It will enhance quality of life through expanded recreational facilities, new schools and welcoming environment for all ages. I look forward to serving this vibrant community in the very near future. I strongly urge you to support this project moving forward. I understand you all are very busy, so thank you for your time and consideration and I am a pharmacist, and my name is Harpreet Banda. I am also support of this project and all the family and friends; they are here for the support of this project. Just a small thank you so much.

Speaker 26: Caller

1:27:37-1:28:16

I wanted to comment on the inadequate public transit. If this project is going to go forward and need something better than a bus route. People are not going to take the bus. The developer should be required to build a light rail system that goes out there. That would be efficient, and people would actually use it. And that way we wouldn't be overcrowding west El Camino, with cars of everyone trying to get downtown from that community, because that's the only way they're going to be able to get into downtown. So, the public transit needs to be way better if this is going to go through.

Speaker 27: Liz Bergeron

1:28:34-1:29:27

Hi, my name is Liz Bergeron and I'm a resident. I was twelve when I moved here in South Natomas and I married somebody who works at a California Highway Patrol for 25 years and we've had a lot of conversations about traffic, safety, and congestion.

I've spent a lot of time, driving up and down Garden Highway, and the speed limit is 40 miles an hour and I get passed on a regular basis of people doing 55 miles an hour. Same on Orchard Lane, which actually has a school on it. And I've been passed on Orchard Lane. And if you think the traffic is bad now you have to take to get to your area. Very, very concerned. That's my biggest concern I have. I agree with all the other side of the comments today and I strongly oppose this project.

Speaker 28: Jana Demar

1:29:45-1:31:24

I'm Jana, and I have lived in this area first and have been in this area and my husband has been in this area for over that. We've had property for over 50 years. I pretty much agree with everything that people have said about opposing this project. But there is one thing that only one person really mentioned in here and that was crime. Shortly after we moved in here, we had somebody actively trying to break into your house while we were there and it took the police 45 minutes to get to our house. So, if that was 15 years ago, I can't imagine how long would it take for them to get to my house now. And, I've had several incident of other issues with criminal where I've had to call the police, but it it's a big concern. I noticed on the map that there was one potential police station and one potential fire station. Okay, who's going to man that? Who's going to pay for that? Yeah, they're already plenty police officers and everything like that. So, to me, crime is big issue along with many other things. And by the way, I don't hear the frogs anymore either. Thank you.