

**October 21, 2024, Planning Commission Public Comments for UWSP
Draft DEIR**

Speaker 1: Louis Montoya

02:08:27.863-02:10:08.750

My name is Louisa, and I'm here today with my daughters and I've been living in a Natomas for almost 10 years, and I support the Upper Westside plan. It would help aid with the housing crisis that we face today. A lot of apartment complexes in Natomas that have a long waiting list, and as well as houses are selling quick to people that are coming from the outside. So I feel like this plan will help bring the people that are already in the community like help them out as well as it will help allow for a lot of our children to continue growing in the community that we all love with the school, the community college, parks, and just everything incorporated. It is also a good location. I work 2 like 2 min away from there as well. So it's a good. I feel like it's a good plan. I feel like everything that was that has been integrated into putting every like. Bringing the plan together will help bring more tax revenue as well with our growing community. And I, just that is all for today. Thank you.

Speaker 2: Bal Soin

02:10:22.200 --> 02:11:38.080

Yes, my name is Bal Soin. I think this project will be very beneficial for the community. And how can you go wrong with a new park, a new commercial places, the park, the schools, and the housing Sacramento is short of housing. It will give the housing. The more the better thing is, the government will make money. There's a billion dollars. When this project is done. Look at now, it's just a field. There's nothing there it's not pleasant to see, and when it's done you'll be surprised to see, it'll be one of a kind. It's modern. It's a new and the government will make billions of money will be spent in that place, and the government make more money on that, too. So the better it is. There will be a park, there will be schools, there will be a commercial places. There will be a lot of new jobs will be available in that area and the surrounding community. It'll be beneficial to them. So I really admire the people who put this plan together, and I thank you guys. At least you are considering to look at it. Thank you.

Speaker 3: Melanie Hartman

02:11:53.900 --> 02:13:56.500

What I'm concerned about is that the corps of engineers already determined that the levy as it was prior to these multi-billion dollars of investment. The levy was too fragile to protect Natomas. Okay. I'm in reach

A, we're in reach. A, and the construction is happening right across from us now. But one thing that hasn't been considered is the extra traffic. Every Garden Highway resident that I've spoken to about this, we all get rattled by traffic. We're talking SUVs trucks, and when semis go by it feels like the road actually distorts in a wave as they move past the house. We rattle. The whole place does everywhere does along the Garden Highway. And so my concern is with climate change deluges coming down and flooding areas, and with the fact that so many trees have come down on the Garden Highway and busted up the crust of clay that once capped it and made the interior of the levee secure and can't be washed out. That cap has been broken many, many times by trees and trees have come down, so we're very concerned about liquefaction. Our side will, with all that extra vibration from the traffic our side. I'm just. I'm just fearful for the extra danger that that vibration on a liquid levy will do to our houses, and if you're a hundred percent sure that reach A is going to protect the entire Natomas basin, then approve this thing, but I don't think it will. I think it's putting too much pressure on the highway.

Speaker 4: Arthur Hartman

02:13:56.500 --> 02:14:13.670

We're also in agreement with the many other issues that are going to be brought up tonight in in opposition to the size and scope of this project. Thank you.

Speaker 5:

Christine Schmeckel

02:14:29.240 --> 02:15:41.029

Hi! I'm Christine Schmeckel. You did good. And I'm here in. I lived in. I've lived in Natomas and various areas for about 40 years. So I've seen it grow, and I now live closer to the Garden Highway and Orchard Lane, and therefore West El Camino, and so my concern are many that are listed there, but particularly the traffic and the safety and the noise and the impact on the Garden Highway. I look at the Garden Highway. I watch the traffic go by. and it's it's a. This is a safety issue as well. We've I've lived in this location, for I think, 3 years now, and we've had several horrible accidents on that road. So adding more traffic to that location has already been said is is a big risk. I don't know what the statistics are like, how many thousands of cars equals, how many lives that have possibly been lost. But it's going to be a huge impact, and I do request that you reject this proposal. Thank you.

Speaker 6:
Josh Harmatz

02:15:52.140 --> 02:18:19.180

So. I had prepared remarks for tonight, and was at a community meeting last Sunday on the 13th with our neighbors on the Garden Highway Community Association. On that evening during the middle of the meeting, while we're talking about traffic and safety issues. This happened. This is from last Sunday night. This is the 4th time in the last 10 years I've had a car run through the front of my property. What else do you do? On Sunday evening at 6 o'clock. my oldest son, his chores are to take the trash out to the street. Fortunately he was at a friend's house that night, and was not on the road when this happened. This happens all the time.

The issue for me isn't as much that there is traffic and safety. It's number one. What has the county done about it? We were promised when the levee improvement I've been there 16 years when the levee was widened. We were promised they were going to repave and Redo Garden Highway and make it a more safer place. Nothing has happened. Now you're talking about adding 25,000 new residents. Look at this photo. I want you to understand what happens with the traffic maps down here people get rerouted on their apps from waze from Google maps, etc. When this freeway backs up, and this is before 3 million square feet in Metro Air Park. and the other places that are currently being approved have even come into play. This is the most direct route. People cut through Highway 5 and highway 80 through Garden Highway traveling at very high speeds.

The biggest issue with this is that the current proposal that they've submitted does not provide any planning, any solution for funding or any solutions on how to execute on the plan. Now really important. Here the traffic study, but done by the county. If you look at the bottom of page 7, it specifically States Garden Highway needs to meet current county requirements. Current county requirements, as provided by the county, is 2 12 foot wide lanes with a 6 foot shoulder correct. Our road is 16 feet in total width at the shortest, and at the widest 20 feet in total width, with no room. They just finished the levee improvements. They just moved the power poles. I spoke to RD 1,000. I spoke to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. The developers did not talk to them about any widening of Garden Highway which is required by the county, so I urge this Commission to delay this approval until these issues can be adequately addressed.

**Speaker 7:
Mr. Oliveira**

02:18:34.129 --> 02:20:44.130

I am here to express my serious concerns regarding the proposed Upper West side specific plan and its long-term impacts on our community. I've lived on Garden Highway for almost 40 years, grew up. There lived on the land side and the river side. I ask you to carefully consider the broader implications this project will have on the natural resources, local farmland, and public safety of our county.

I specifically want to refer to a key statement from the Sacramento County 2030, general plan. The land use strategies and policies of the Sacramento County, 2030 general plan are designed to promote the efficient use of land, encourage economic vitality and job growth, reduce urban sprawl and its impacts, preserve habitat and open space and protect agricultural and rangeland operations. 2 growth boundaries are identified to help implement this vision. The urban services boundary and the urban policy area. The USB is the ultimate growth boundary for the unincorporated area. This area is all outside of that.

The UPA defines the area within the USB. Expected to receive urban services in the near term together. The UPA and the USB. Promote orderly growth and efficient extension of infrastructure and provision of urban services. While I support these principles. I am concerned that the Upper Westside project deviates significantly from this vision. Here are my specific reasons.

Reduction of the Sacramento River corridor buffer. The county finally settled on a 1 mile buffer. This project is going to reduce that to about 700 feet in some areas and a half a mile in others. but I want to ask this basic question, is there adequate vacancy inside the urban services boundary for a project like this? Has that been analyzed.

Second, irreversible loss of open space and farmland. Talk about protecting habitat! Now we're getting rid of it.

Traffic, safety on Garden Highway which Josh talked about. the DI, EIR suggested. The project, could add 4,000 trips per day feeling it's gonna be quite a bit more than that. violation of existing, planning guidelines and significant and unavoidable project impacts. I guess that's it for time. Thank you.

Speaker 8:
Brandon Castillo

02:20:49.280 --> 02:21:59.360

I'll be quick. Brandon, Castillo Garden Highway resident. I want to echo what? Well, 1st of all, blowing through the urban services boundary. This is an environmentally sensitive area. It's right along the Sacramento River for those of us that live there. We know how sensitive it is, not only for recreation, but for species and habitat we're blowing through farmland. I happen to think it looks great. You may not, but the traffic concerns are significant. Nobody seems to have taken into account. It's it's become a freeway Garden Highway's become a freeway. We're now talking about 25,000 residents. I recently lost my dog because cars just fly by and they speed. We take the garbage out. My kids, check the mailbox. You're basically condemning us. If you approve this project, our front yard will become a freeway. It already is horrible. You're talking about, I think, 4 or 5,000 more cars per day. We don't have anywhere to go. This is our front yard. Our driveways lead to this Garden Highway. It'll turn it into a freeway. So in addition to smashing through environmentally sensitive areas blowing through the urban growth boundary. It's just not a sustainable development, and it's not safe. So it's both unsustainable and unsafe for our community. So we urge you to reject it. Thank you.

Speaker 9:
Alex Jang

02:22:16.670 --> 02:24:26.550

Board Chambers: Hello, and thank you for your time. I'm Alex Jang, a native Natomas resident whose family's actually been in Natomas since the 1950s. And I'm here today because I deeply care about our community. Natomas is special because of its balance between environmental stewardship and growth. The Upper West Side specific plan threatens that the land is proposed. The land that this plan is proposed on is rich in nutrients close to the river, and once it's developed, lost forever. Paving over it increases flood risk by reducing natural absorption, and our roads can barely handle the current population. We're already seeing accidents and deaths on fully developed roads due to drivers who rush neglect rules and show little respect for others. May the victims that even I personally knew rest in peace. And if our current services are not effectively addressing these issues now, what makes us think they'll be able to manage it once we add even more residents. And to add, years ago my neighborhood was alive with the sounds of frogs and crickets at night. Now their silence is a reminder that we're losing these precious wildlife. I also remember seeing herons along the levees. A bird one of our schools is named after, but now they're nowhere to be found. The plan would only further threaten their habitat, and then the Natomas basin habitat

conservation plan was created to safeguard these critical habitats, like those of the endangered giant Garter, snake, and the Swainson hawk. and the proposed mitigation strategies, are inadequate and insufficient to protect our local wildlife. we should remain committed to keeping our word and preserving what's left of our natural environment. Instead of continuing to pave over it. We can be smart about growth, and there's room for development within the current urban services boundary where we can respect the land and resources building outside of these boundaries will strain our roads and put everyone at risk. Drivers, pedestrians, cyclists. and in emergencies we'll be in serious trouble.

Natomas is unique. Let's preserve what makes it special for future generations and create a community we can all continue to be proud of. Thank you so much for your time. Thank you

Speaker 10:

Ted Costa

02:24:31.420 --> 02:26:07.620

Yes, sir, thank you very much. I have some property there at El Centro road and San Juan and my family moved there in 1917. That's the same year that the levee was completed, and the family has been there ever since. and I support the plan because that's about all that could be done with that property. Now that it's surrounded by houses from aerial applications. I know you know all the all those arguments. But I would like to make one other thing that. I'm, I am 83 years old. and in 83 years I have never seen a Swanson hawk on my property. and so I think I think someone is obligated to say that they have seen one there. If any 5 of you or your staff, or anyone. Yeah, I know they live along the Garden Highway, and they probably are on the Garden Highway. That's a mile and a half away. But I will be filing with you a a legal declaration of what I'm talking about here today, and it'll be much more in there because I did work for the reclamation district for 4 years. and I used to clean the canals, and I know where the garter snakes are there in the canals, and I will submit that to you a legal declaration, independently of perjury, so that you can use for your consideration, and I challenge anyone to do the same thing if they've seen any of those animals on my property. Thank you very much, sir. Thank you.

Speaker 11:

Gary Demar

02:26:20.160 --> 02:27:36.210

Yes, my name is Gary Demar. I came here to support my neighbors on the Garden Highway. I was born here. My dad was born here, and you know I was here when let's see, Bradshaw Road was vineyards, you know, and the Pocket road was farms. Man, you know, and Elk Grove was going to stop at

Elk Grove Boulevard. you know, and it's reached the sky. And then now they've jumped across the road on Elkhorn, and now it's all going out in the rice paddies all the way up all the way up into Sutter County. There's gonna be thousands of homes up there. They don't need the Garden Highway. We need to keep our farmland. We need the farmland in the country right there. It's the closest thing to the city of Sacramento, and it's the last farmland in Sacramento. There's nothing left. When you take that. It's gone. Once it's gone. You know. I went to the Alhambra Theater, too, you know. Now it's a Safeway store. I know you'd like that. Anyway, I don't know I'm thinking about. If there's some way to do a class action lawsuit and sue the levy people because of the devaluation of our homes. It's a nuclear free zone. We got little wooden stakes every 30 inches, you know, and weeds. So that's what we got left with after the levy. Thank you.

Speaker 12:

Jana Demar

02:27:47.480 --> 02:29:12.670

So I'm in agreement with all of those who is opposed to this project. I don't think that the developer is in it for anything but his own profit. The issue of the traffic is huge. I have twice almost been hit hit head on because the oncoming traffic was avoiding the group of bike riders that are always riding down this Garden Highway. They have now started the levy work, which has been awful. The dust and the dirt and the noise, and the everything that we are going through for that. Then, as soon as that's done, and they start this project, we will not have any peace.

The vibrating, the vibrations, and all of that have caused cracks in our house. It's it's just not a project that should go. We have plenty of places to build homes we have. They're going everywhere. Have you been out to the Folsom area? My gosh, you would not believe what's behind Slough House going up. There is not a lack of housing, maybe affordable housing, but I don't think this is what's going to be planned in this little city that they want to put in Prime Farmland. Thank you.

Speaker 13:

Howard Lamborn

02:29:23.440 --> 02:30:21.330

Hi! My name is Howard Lamborn. I'm a pharmacist. I've been in Sacramento living and working for 48 years. I'm here to express my support support for the Upper West Side plan. I think it. It's going to help our housing crisis. We need housing desperately. and it'll also bring a balanced approach to land use as it offers smart growth. It offers schools, colleges, parks, and preserving many acres of agricultural buffer. with this plan it will have a positive impact on economic growth and will generate a lot of tax revenue for the Sacramento area. I think growth is inevitable. You

can't avoid it. I think this planet has hopefully worked all that out, and it will be a positive thing for Sacramento. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 14:

Jas Benga

02:30:29.040 --> 02:32:08.910

Thank you. My name is Jas. Benga, and I have been living in Sacramento last 35 years. about 25 years in autonomous area. Whether this plan is so, I have seen the plan, the proposal. I have read the Dei R. Also there are a lot of benefits. That's why I support this plan. But of course there are some side effects. You can say the issues. They can be mitigated. It's in the report so reports is officially on your records with the county that they can be mitigated now. But just going back a few years, 8, 10 years ago, you know, Sacramento City had a big project called Stadium, one golden Stadium, one right, a lot of people. They opposed it at that time a lot of people, but, thanks to Kevin Johnson, he made his right decision. He saved the kings. They were moving to Las Vegas, if you remember now, Sacramento, everybody knows Sacramento. He saved the city of Sacramento kings and the arena that's his legacy nobody can take away from him after a while. Now we have a project called Upper West Side. It's 1 of a kind, unique project. and it will make our Sacramento beautiful. And it's just it's your legacy, the supervisors legacy. Nobody can take away in the future, when, after 2030, 40 years from now, you won't be here. I won't be here, but this thing will be here. Your legacy will be here. Nobody can take away for centuries, or as long as the city lives. Thank you, and I support this plan, and I urge you to support the plan, please, for our next generations. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 15:

Harpreet Benga

02:32:20.490 --> 02:34:23.540

Members. I'm here today to support this Upper West Side plan. 1st of all, I want to thank you for being here today, and as we all know the details of this project, and I firmly believe that establishing the Upper West Side community will be transformative step for our region as it offers unique amenities, schools, colleges, parks, walkability, and would make it ideal for families and local businesses. This Development Bill have a welcoming environment for all ages. This project helps to address our region's housing shortage. We need more housing units where our people have a house place to live. We don't want people getting chased away from California because of this crisis and creating more red tapes to make it difficult to build a house. this plan is a perfect solution for our smart growth goals. It will also offer houses, apartments, condos. Best of all, it will also offer agricultural buffer land. It will create countless valuable opportunities for

our community. It is a unique project, and one of a kind project that will make Sacramento more beautiful, and will be more visited place in California. It will add into our region's economic growth. Lots of jobs will be created and will generate millions of dollars in revenues. I'm looking forward for this department, this development of a vibrant community in the near future, and I strongly urge you all to support this project moving forward. and many of my families and friends and their friends. They are not able to come in here tonight to support this project, but I want to thank you everybody for consideration. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 16:

Rosalyn Bryant

02:34:40.270 --> 02:37:01.790

okay. Sorry. I have a little bit of laryngitis. My name is Rosalyn Bryant, and I live in the Riverview Subdivision. That is right off the corner. It's the corner of San Juan and El Centro Road. I moved from South Natomas about 20 years ago, and I'm sorry 10 years ago, and I've been in North Natomas in that area for about 20 years. It was so nice being able to go down El Centro Road on bike down El Centro Road. It was like a little farm road, and it was so nice. But over the years I have seen it, you know, actually grow. But the nightmare is what I'm looking at is because I live so close to the 49 er truck stop! That is a nightmare. There have been times when I have tried to get out of my subdivision, and I've had to wait I don't know how long, because of all the traffic coming up towards San Juan, and it's a four-way stop, so it just gets bogged up, and it's just it takes a long, long time to get to get out of my just out of my subdivision.

When we get across. San Juan, going down to the truck. Stop! The truckers are trying to get out, and nobody's, of course, letting them out so that bogs up, and it's very dangerous, and it's just been a nightmare. I was looking at the map, and I don't know if it's coming up to that area or not, you might be able to answer that I couldn't really tell. But If it comes up to that area, it's just really. And even if they widen el Centro Road. El Centro Road is like a raceway. I mean. Cars just speed down that road, and there's been numerous accidents on that road. There's been pedestrians that have been killed from cycling because it's like a raceway. So if they widen it, it's still going to be even worse. So you know, I oppose this project, because, you know, just because it's going to take away so much farmland. And it's just going to be just a nightmare.

Speaker 17:

Lynn Randolph

02:37:11.520 --> 02:39:32.610

Good evening. My name is Lynn Randolph, and I also reside in Riverview Park, at the corner of El Centro and San Juan Road. I strongly oppose the Upper West Side project. As I am a nearly 25 year resident of the area.

I raised my family boy and girl twins in Riverview Park. We spent many, many days, holidays, birthdays, play dates at the Park. We bought strawberries at Perry's farm. we learned golf at leaders driving range. I'm sorry. and my children played nearly every day at Bastillo's pumpkin patch in October. when they were 8, 9, and 10 years old. all of those places will be gone. With this project we moved to West Natomas for these reasons, as well as many others, and I don't want other families to miss out on the wonderful experiences of knowing that farmland and nature are right in their backyard. There are many other reasons to oppose this project, such as the traffic currently, during commute time, it can take as much as 10 min just to get through the overpass at West El Camino. Coming from South Demas. we would displace wildlife. Lately West Lake residents have been complaining about increased rodents in their neighborhoods, due to the apartment construction at El Centro and del Paso. That project is probably less than 2 acres. Imagine what it will be developing thousands. There's also the ability to evacuate in case of an emergency. There's little room to expand and widen existing access roads. There are also many other reasons that my fellow community members have have outlined. Please consider our concerns and reject this plan. There are other nearby areas that are approved already to accommodate housing. I wasn't going to mention this, but 4 years ago my husband was killed on Garden Highway in a motorcycle accident. so I support my Garden Highway neighbors in their concerns. Please don't pave over what little farmland we have left. Thank you.

Speaker 18:

Katie McCammon

02:39:36.110 --> 02:41:24.240

Hi! I'm Katie Mccammon, and I'm a staff with 350 Sacramento, an environmental justice organization. And I support all the other environmental organizations in the area who are in opposition to this plan. I can't really state it better than a lot of the folks who already spoke tonight. So I want to touch on what I've experienced. I live in Del Paso Heights. and since I moved here just a couple years ago, it's been really unique to experience a place that is trying so hard to develop an urban life in the midst of protecting. It's ecology. That's a very special thing. And this project obviously is going to risk that. And so take that very seriously.

Climate change is happening. There's no doubt about that and mitigating it is our job. You have a really awesome opportunity to continue to protect and expand the ecology here and make Sacramento even more unique than it already is. It's an amazing thing to be next to a highway that has so many problems that we could probably fix and focus on fixing that. But then, right next to that parallel to that is a bike trail where I can go and see cranes and a waterway full of life. And it's truly a magical place. So if I was a person with kids, I would say, those kids deserve a place like that to grow up in. I couldn't live without nature, and I really hope you think about that and think about the world you want to create for generations to come. Thank you.

Speaker 19:

Heather Fargo

02:41:38.700 --> 02:44:02.470

Good evening. My name is Heather Fargo, longtime resident of Natomas, and, like so many of my neighbors here, I think Natomas is a special place that deserves special attention. You spend a lot of time on that cell tower, and this is 2,000 acres. So please give us that level of attention that you gave the cell tower. We think it's worth it like a lot of my neighbors. I am here to strongly oppose the Upper West Side project and to point out to you the many flaws in the environmental impact report. Obviously, with 2 min. I can't share with you all of the reasons I oppose this project or all the problems with the EIR. But as planning commissioners, I know that part of your job is to implement the general plan, the county general plan, and to implement county policies and plans. This project is so out of line, not just with the county general plan, but with so many plans and policies that the county that staff and residents have worked on for decades, not just the Natomas habitat conservation plan, but the Urban Services boundary Plan, which, by the way, is not mentioned or discussed in the EIR and there are so many impacts to this project that are so severe some of them had mentioned already. We'll certainly be putting a lot of those into our written comments. But when you realize how inconsistent this plan is with the policies and plans of the county. I don't think you have an option but to say no to the project. so I hope you will do that, and I hope that you also will look closely at so many of the impacts that cannot be mitigated, and that are so severe and just as a final note, I want to say that when the Natomas vision was initially voted on decades ago, not the county version, but the City county version. The the idea was that the city of Sacramento would do the development of neighborhoods in the in the Natomas Basin, and that the county would take care of the farmland and the airport and those areas outside of the urbanization. And this project is completely contrary to that. So I only have 2 min I could go on. Thank you for your time.

Speaker 20:
Edith Thatcher

02:44:20.360 --> 02:46:48.650

There's been a lot of talk this evening about the Urban Services boundary, and so I thought I would bring a map and show it to you, and so you can see what it looks like in the Natomas basin. So that's the lower part of the Natomas basin. So okay, the poison. It's like we're at the airport flying in and out. The point I'd like to make is that there's not just one project outside of the Urban services boundary in the Natomas Basin there are 3, and there's 1 that's already been approved. And so what I was going to try and ask you to do is to consider that when people are talking about traffic problems, impact on the city city services issues with flooding, it's not just the West. The Upper West Side Grand Park is 5,000 acres proposed for commercial and residential. We've been told that the deir for that will be coming out next summer. This is Airport, South industrial, that is, 6 million plus square feet of warehousing next to communities and schools. And then we have Upper West Side, also of 2,000 acres, the people speaking before me. Almost all of them have mentioned traffic. Please think about it. It's not just Upper West Side. This is huge, and finally Watev, which I think you already know about. It is a charging station for semi-trucks, and that has already been approved. And more traffic. What's being imposed on our roads here is enormous. These fears are real, and the the impacts on city services are as well. Thanks for your time. Thank you.

Speaker 21:
Steve Schwyer

02:47:19.310 --> 02:49:26.570

Good evening, Commissioners. I'm Steve Schwyer. I'm working to protect our natural areas and agricultural lands and reach our statewide national 30 by 30 goals, but our region is severely behind. We only have 9% of our land protected compared to the Bay area that has 30% already and looking to protect 50%. So we need to catch up. I oppose this project. It's counter to the county's policies to protect open space and farmland sacog recently adopted their blueprint land use map for the current their current projections, and where we should be building it does not include this project. The general plan states, the county will support implementation of, say, Cog's blueprint and the the initial planning that was done. It basically relies on this being in the blueprint. The draft. EIR attempts to dance around that conflict by stating that somehow it complies by just meeting the the the goals of that, but doesn't mean it's in the map, right? The region will not meet its greenhouse gas reduction targets. If we develop outside those blueprint blueprint boundaries, and there's already issues where they can't meet that with their projections. Now, which could cause us to lose our transportation funding. the DEIR needs to analyze

what the effects of that are also the Natomas basin habitat conservation plan will be severely undermined. This area was predicated on staying in agriculture, and North Natomas and Metro Airport Park were developed, based on that. This developing this land is incompatible. You'll notice in the draft, EIR. There's requests from CDFW. Fish and wildlife service, LAFCO and the city for analysis of how it would impact the habitat conservation plan, which is totally lacking in the DEIR. It removes almost a 3rd of the Swainson's Hawk zone in Sacramento County, which is the one mile buffer from the Sacramento River. It's critical to the species and diminishes our already impacted areas that the hawks have to forage. Thank you, and we urge your rejection of the project.

Speaker 22:

Louis

02:49:33.520 --> 02:51:41.140

Hi, good evening, and thank you for the correct name. Pronunciation. I have many concerns and doubts surrounding the safety and affordability of housing in the project area. Even if the project develops an affordable housing strategy, there are a few site specific issues that drive up costs of living. These issues will not be addressed in the near future. First, st the Upper West Side specific plan area is in a flood plain, and, as the DEIR DEIR says, it is susceptible to land subsidence or sinking of the land. This project certainly wouldn't help the situation developing and increasing the weight load on land that is susceptible to land. Subsidence will further lower the already low floodplain and consequently drive up the flood risks. This drives up construction, costs to build code safe housing, and may also have unaccounted impacts on adjacent regions. What is the plan to keep hazard mitigation costs down and make sure that the affordable housing is actually affordable, and will regional subsidence impacts be assessed with each project proposal

could commut. Could cumulative effects impede full build out of the proposed structures?

Secondly, although the project area is geographically close to existing metropolitan centers. This point is made moot by the lack of transit infrastructure. This is not a high priority transit region, and necessary transit will not be built anytime soon. How affordable will living be if people and their need their own cars for work and everyday necessities, particularly through initial phases of development, when essential resource centers may not be fully built. These issues are fundamental to the project area. We should not forego important regional planning policies to allow development on this land. The sacog blueprint states that we are already entitling 2 and a half times the land for housing that we will need over the next 20 years. We don't need to focus on approving more land. We need to focus on getting housing built in already zoned vacant land within the urban

services boundary and on infill in regions that already have the necessary infrastructure. Thank you.

Speaker 23:

Susan Herre

02:51:50.870 --> 02:53:53.970

Chair Raethel and planning commissioners. I'm Susan Herre, the president of the Board of Directors of Ecos, Environmental Council of Sacramento. We submitted a letter today for your reading. This is Penn Station. It was destroyed in 1963, after passenger traffic declined. There was an international outcry. and causing 2 years later the formation of the New York Landmarks Commission to make sure that nothing like that destruction ever happened again. Now this, of course, is Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris on fire in 2019. It burned. They could have torn it down. but they wouldn't think of it. There would have been an international outcry. But we're in California. Our treasures are different. They are, in fact, nature itself.

We prize our open space. So tonight we've heard about the blueprint we've heard about urban services boundary and the Natomas Basin habitat conservation plan. These planning actions are like the Landmarks Commission in New York. They're our planning legacy. So if you go ahead and approve this tonight and keep the process rolling. There won't be an international outcry. but perhaps a couple years down the road. Maybe people will say, never, never again. Thank you.

Speaker 24:

Sri Ram

02:54:08.210 --> 02:57:01.390

Good evening, chair and members of the Planning commission.

My name is Shriram Taniru. I currently work for the State of California as a It project manager. I have lived in the Sacramento area for almost 30 years. and as someone who's intimately familiar with this area, I am here to express my strong support for this Upper West Side Specific Plan project, and I have several reasons. I know I have very limited time. Maybe I'll be able to cover all of them. Number one at the top of my list. Is anybody paying attention to the economic life of this country, of this state of this region is fully aware of the housing shortage, especially when it comes to multifamily and duplexes. This project is going to produce upwards of more than 9,000 units. more than half of which are going to be multifamily and duplexes. So I think this budget goes a long way to alleviate some of the how problems related to housing shortage in this in Sacramento region. The other thing that is that makes me strongly support this project is the location. It's less than 5 miles from the location of this project is about almost 200,000 jobs. And so, as some of the concerns that were expressed about vehicles, miles travels, Vmt. Or the greenhouse gas emissions. the

fact that you're reducing the commute, I think, will help to meet those goals. The urban town center that is being planned is a pattern along the lines of the Santana Row in San Jose would help with commercial activity as well as create new jobs. There is part of the project is a proposal for a West side canal, which I think would help with the beautification and provide a unique urban waterfront experience. Finally, this area, this project has been in discussion for more than 2 decades, and all during this time frame north, the Thomas has been developed. Projects have been approved in placer vineyards and West Roseville. These are locations that are much farther away from the job centers which cause sprawl and cause traffic jams and cause greenhouse gas emissions. So something that is so close to job centers meeting smart growth principles, I think, should be. I support it. Thank you.

Speaker 25:

Joseph Brazil

02:57:13.800 --> 02:59:49.410

Commissioners. Thank you. My name is Joe Brazil. My family has been farming 120 acres in the Upper West Side Project area for well over 80 years. Now, unfortunately, urbanization, changing conditions and many other problematic issues has made agriculture no longer economically viable or profitable for us. We actually were forced to sell some of our land in order to simply keep our farming operation going. Plainly stated, our land is simply not prime agricultural land, no matter what anyone says. Let me back this up with a few facts. Number one theft. We can't leave tractors or equipment in fields overnight. People also come into our fields, they trample and steal the crops, and also any of the materials we leave there. Number 2 vandalism. This is definitely a problem in the fields. It's a real issue for our crops and our machinery. Number 3 farming restrictions on our methods, timing pesticides, etc. These are all enacted due to the proximity of all the homes and businesses all around the area number 4, water table and soil and mineral erosion. This limits the types of crops we plant, and prevents us from planting an orchard. I know you guys are all fond of eucalyptus trees, but unfortunately no eucalyptus trees on our property. Sorry the good news, though, is that Upper West Side has some solutions. Number one mitigation land. It offers a 1 to one mitigation ratio of prime farmland, contributed for every acre of developed land in the project. This ensures that while development goes forward, farmland preservation continues in areas that are much more better suited for agriculture, plus. The project includes a 534 acre agricultural buffer to help with open space and protect the surrounding farmland. Wildlife wows. 2 min. Is that quick. Just one more thing, wildlife. It produces the corridors and habitat restoration efforts as part of the plan housing shortage. It will help in that area, and it will create nearly 90,000 new jobs during

construction, and also after in the long term. So just in closing. thank you. In closing, I respectfully and humbly request that you support the Upper West Side development along with me and my family, who has dedicated 80 years to farming this land. Thank you.

Speaker 26:

Steve Arditti

02:59:49.410 --> 03:01:25.510

Mr. Chair and members. My name is Steve Arditti. I reside with my wife Melva, on the Garden Highway. I'm not going to tell you how long, because you'll be able to figure out how old I am. But I want to resonate with all the folks who have expressed concerns and objections frankly to this plan as it currently exists. I remember as well as others here, the development of the current urban limit line services line and so forth, much research back and forth. Input went into the development of that. It had compromises. But it was a thoughtful effort to sort of balance the need for development with the values of preservation, of open space, habitat and agriculture. I've not yet heard an argument for why this particular project needs to ride roughshod over that. Someone raised a question before. why can this not be done within that those lines. to say nothing of other areas of town that are just begging for development? For example, the rail yards, the river district. So I would urge you to look very carefully at the policies that have been so carefully developed. The compromises and the balancing that's been done, and ask yourselves whether there's really a case to just ride a rough shot over that with this new development. Thank you so much. Thank you.

Speaker 27:

Melania Rothenberger- NUSD

03:03:02.090 --> 03:05:06.410

Good evening. My name is Melania Rothenberger, and I'm the executive director of facilities and strategic planning for Natomas unified school district. and we've been involved with this project since the beginning, and we appreciate the opportunities that we've been given so far to be part of the process from the Technical Advisory Committee to where we're at now. We did submit comment letters on the urban services plan as well as the public facilities financing plan and on the draft EIR so in regard to the draft, EIR, I do want to state that all of our schools need to be built in compliance with the California Department of Education. and that is the size of the lot of the land, and depending on what the environmental issue is on the site or the proximity to other hazards like gas lines, electrical lines. all that needs to be considered. So while the plan shows 4 schools, all 4 plans show 4 schools are going to need to be here based off the students that are going to be generated. We need some ability and flexibility and assurances that as we work with the California Department of Education to build these

schools, that they're going to be in compliance, that now we're not given a lot of land that's too small or doesn't meet the needs that we need for our students. And then part of your guys's policies, of course, and the framework that you have does require the urban services plan and the public facilities financing plan. And right now, after we've done analysis on best case scenarios. If we were to pass a general obligation, bond and levy the highest amount of developer fees that we could get, and spend it all on the build out of these schools, we would not have enough money to build these schools, and so the developer, the applicant, has been meeting with us. But right now there is no policy that requires mitigation of that potential funding gap that can ensure before there's vested entitlements. And before this moves forward that we can meet the need of Natomas, unified school district students in their community.

Thank you.

Speaker 28:

Marilyn Pendola

03:05:15.840 --> 03:06:22.720

When I 1st moved here, 1820 years ago Natomas was an uncongested haven for both people and the animals and birds and wildlife that live there. Since then the natural environment of our beautiful area has been systematically destroyed with mega complexes, apartment buildings, huge industrial complexes, and thousands of new homes. I remember we had red tail hawks and sparrow hawks. We had the sweet little ground owls that would peep up out and look at you. They're all gone. There were rabbits and rodents and foxes and coyotes and an occasional deer because of human development, they are no longer here. We must preserve the open land that is left. We must preserve the open land that is left. We must be stewards of our natural environment. We must be the voice for the creatures who have no voice. I oppose this project, and the degradation of the natural world that it will destroy. Thank you.

Speaker 29:

Lori Harmon

03:06:31.760 --> 03:08:35.720

Good evening. My name is Lori Harmon. I am a retired sergeant from the CHP. I worked for them for 27, proudly worked for them for 27 years. I will add that I am not in any way representing them tonight. I am not against development. my family's in development. I'm certainly not against our farmers selling their land. This is, I strongly oppose this project. It's for a lot of reasons, but for one, it's reckless, and it's disregards the people who already live here. I've lived in Natomas for 25 years. I've seen how traffic has been impacted. This development proposes 9,000 housing units which should bring about at least 20,000 vehicles to our 4 roads. West El Camino,

El Centro Garden Highway, and San Juan. 2 of those 4 roads can't be widened. They're levee roads. There's nowhere to put that other. those extra traffic that we're stuck with it. I've heard countless people talk about accidents that they've seen. I can tell you. I've been there and I've seen them. They're bad. People are impatient at the West, El Camino. I 80 interchange. People are impatient. They run that light. It's not safe for pedestrians. I won't even ride my bike over there. I know that emergency response. Time is detrimental. It can save lives. I've been there. I've been a responder, and I know how frustrating it can be 15 min 20 min knowing someone needs my help, and I can't get there because of congestion. because there's no way to pass. There's no way to get around. I want to be clear again. I'm not against the farmers, or I'm not against development. This is a reckless, just, a reckless disregard for the people who have already been there for nothing more than profit. Thank you.

Speaker 30:

Liz Bergeron

03:08:45.680 --> 03:08:54.479

I've been a resident of Natomas for 17 years, and for the past 5 years I've lived in Swallow's Nest, which is on the corner of garden, Highway and Orchard Lane. Prior to that. I lived in Westlake, and frequently I commuted downtown to my job downtown. taking El Centro San Juan and Garden Highway because I 5 was backed up then, and it's gotten even worse since then. So my primary concern is traffic traffic congestion. And we've heard a lot about that tonight. But beyond the safety concerns. I'm also troubled by the piecemeal approach being taken with the development projects in the Natomas basin, as Edith mentioned earlier. and the other concern I have is, and I'm not sure how this works. But the traffic impacts seem to be in the city while this project seems to be in the county, so I have real concerns about how to address that. But I think that the that you need to consider the cumulative effect of the multiple developments across the Natomas basin rather than the piecemeal approach. I have personal experience with this, as in my professional role, I worked for the Pacific Crest Trail Association, and we had a 2,650 mile corridor, and we saw a lot of piecemeal planning. And I've seen the impacts of that. So I do hope that you will consider that, and I strongly oppose the project. Thank you.

Speaker 31:

Deborah Lugo

03:10:26.380 --> 03:11:58.070

Yes, Hello, thank you. My name is Deborah Lugo, and I've lived in South Natomas for over 35 years. and I'm very concerned and opposed to this project. I'm concerned about the traffic mainly on Garden Highway, which

you've heard a lot of, and I would urge all of you to maybe drive down there this weekend and take a look at it. This is the city portion, not the county portion, but army corps of engineer is still working on the levee down on the county side, and there are still semi trucks traveling down Garden Highway, which should be prohibited from doing. And if you go down Garden Highway by all of the businesses, like Chevy's Virgin Sturgeon, and so forth, you will see a crack down the center of the highway where many years ago, army corps of engineers came in and put down a 25 foot slurry wall. and that was probably about 12 years ago. They need to go deeper, but they didn't want to touch this, that portion this time, but the road is actually splitting. There's nothing that has been done to any of the outlying roads ever since I've lived there. It's quite a mess, and I would urge you to come and visually look at this, because there is no way. no way that we can support a city running off this road in this area. Thank you.

Speaker 32:

Georgia Prescott

03:12:08.480 --> 03:12:56.120

Well, I don't want to beat a dead horse, and everybody's talked about traffic, but I feel like probably you need to hear it from everybody. So let me just say that I think this is actually a very interesting project. It's just in the wrong place. I and I live about a half a block from Garden Highway, and I can tell you the present traffic right now on Garden Highway is a lot, and then you add 30 or 40 bicyclists in a group going. I play a lot of golf in Teal Bend. and if you have to get around these bicyclers and the trucks that are there and the cars that are there. And then to add this kind of additional motor vehicle motor cars. You just don't want to do that. So thank you.

Speaker 33:

Dana Schwartz

03:13:21.920 --> 03:14:06.180

Well, I will be very brief. I want you to ask yourself, why are they planning this project? Given that the EIR, which is what you want us to talk about says it will increase noise, air, pollution, create major traffic problems, pave over farmland and destroy wildlife habitat while increasing the potential of flooding. This will not benefit the Natomas community. There is plenty of infill land to build on in Natomas and address the housing shortage. So who is going to profit from this project, I beg you to follow the money and reject this project.

Speaker 34:

Harriet Steiner

03:14:14.180 --> 03:16:58.090

Good evening. My name is Harriet Steiner, and you're doing a great job pronouncing all of our names. I'm here because I think this project has so many problems and so many problems that those of us who live in Natomas like I do will inherit as this project goes through. If it should be approved. I think the EIR ignores the fact that there are planning documents that set urban limit lines and general plans that set development guidelines. and none of them contemplate this project. So first, st I would say that the EIR is inadequate because it fails to actually look at the impacts of this project on the rest of Natomas and the rest of the county that were never considered and asked to jump ahead to some, you know right now and amend all of these plans without any actual global. I'll call it global regional, countywide. Look at this. And the worst offender is the urban services boundary. Now, maybe I feel fondly about that because I was a young attorney when I represented SACOG, and we put the all of those things started to go into effect, and they've served us well. and they served us well because they were boundaries, and things happened within the boundaries and outside the boundaries there was conservation, and there was agriculture, and there was keeping nature together with the development of Natomas. And now we are faced with 4 different projects, which have thousands of houses and hundreds of thousands of square feet, of commercial and industrial. Each one wants to go forward. Each one doesn't want to look at the other ones, and the county has never looked at what the impacts of all of those changes would be together. And I think that that's really important. And I think it's really important also for the EIR perspective, to have the county really look at what the impacts of the city on the city are, and to say, Why is this project going to go forward in the county when all the impacts are in the city, when it has to connect to the city, when the only roads which are woefully inadequate to hold this project. Go through the city. I think this, as one of the other speakers says, is maybe an okay project. but it's in the wrong place, and it's bringing to you lots of traffic generators and lots of other issues without any of the infrastructure necessary to do this. There's a reason why major shopping centers happen next to freeways. And this is not it so? Thank you.

Speaker 35:

Carmen Lugo

03:16:58.090 --> 03:19:40.930

Hi! I'm Carmen. Lugo and I live in the Whittier ranch area. I say, leave Sacramento Green. I oppose the development of the Upper West side. I do not want to see another Los Angeles area, one city butting up against another. The reason for this proposed development is pure greed on the

side of the county and our cities collecting more revenue. Property taxes permit fees, and for developers it is profits at the expense of residents living here. The increased revenue is a result of the passage of prop 13. The so the authorities have figured out a backdoor to getting more money. What do we get for the increased revenue. Residents have to contend with increased traffic, air, pollution, crime, crowded living conditions, and, worst of all, the loss of our natural habitat. we cannot destroy the habitat and not have to deal with consequences. The environmental impact report does not include the impact of building on coyotes, hunting grounds. Sacramentans are totally unaware of the tyranny that occurs when coyotes come into their neighborhoods. Coyotes have already been seen in Natomas Park, Swanson estates, cats, small dogs, squirrels, possums, wild turkeys are starting to disappear. The counties, and the city's response to this situation is to keep your pets inside. Shall we keep our toddlers inside, too? Even one attack is too many. What about the free space open for the migratory birds that stop to rest? I love watching those birds land. We do not have a right to that land. It belongs to nature. This is not the Sacramento that we want to live in. Believe me, we don't want to see a concrete jungle, more people and traffic congestion. There is no compromise. Sacramento needs to stay green to protect our way of life. Thank you, miss, and to keep us unique as an area that has a lot of greenery. Do not allow greed to control your way of thinking. Thank you for your consideration. Thank you.

Speaker 36:
Charles Waters

03:19:40.930 -->03:21:54.510

Thank you. Good evening. My name is Charles Waters. I'm a longtime Natomas resident, and my wife and I live immediately adjacent to the proposed project area. So we know it well, we've been following it for 5 years now since it was introduced. I had concerns initially when I 1st heard about the project. Now, after reading the EIR, my concerns are magnified exponentially. My wonderful Natomas neighbors have so articulately outlined all of the things, and many more that I'm concerned about. But I'd like to just focus on one number in my comments. 25,460. I'll say it again. 25,460. Every impact that has been articulated tonight stems from that, the number of potential residents that would be relatively approach, or the pardon me for stumbling over that. But 25,460 is mentioned in the draft environmental impact report as the number of potential residents that would be impacted by this project. So 25,000 residents would be approximately the size of an La city like South Pasadena. Do we want to bring South Pasadena to Natomas El Cerrito in the Bay Area. Do we want to have a city like that size in the Natomas area? I don't think so I think my neighbors have articulately said that we don't want that as well. So thank you very much. I oppose this project.

Speaker 37:**Yadwinder Sandu****03:22:33.080 --> 00:00:26.409 (Recording 2)**

Yeah, good evening, everybody. and this is Yadwinder Sandhu. I am resident of Natomas Sacramento, for the last, many, many years. and for your kind information I'm also running a soccer group and a community group composed of about 200 members for the last 15 years. And for your kind information we support, we all. But today I am here from that on behalf of all. and we support this project and this upper Natomas, this should be developed. and let me come to the point. In short, we still have home crisis in California, in millions and in Sacramento in thousands, so that we need more homes to accommodate the population who are not getting the homes right now. A lot of the people could not buy home because of the high prices and prices are high because of home crisis. and therefore we need a lot of land for the new construction, and we support this Upper West Side plan so that some part of the population can be accommodated in that area. This project site is very convenient to the downtown airport and freeways as well as the environment report. I read that one that's okay with that one that's favorable. And secondly. we will also get a few more schools, colleges, and libraries for the bright future of our kids as per the plan. A lot of the playgrounds, parks, lakes, canals, and greenery, farm greenery, urban farm greenery will boost the environment. Eco-friendly transportation transportation system is also part of this plan. Moreover, commercial zone includes. And this hospitals, clinics, and markets create a lot of employment opportunities to finally, government bodies will generate a lot of revenues through the taxes in the end. Once again, I want to mention that myself and my community, my soccer group, support this strongly, support this Upper West Side project. Thank you very much.

Recording 2

Speaker 38:**Lori Tenhope****00:00:33.480 --> 00:02:09.070**

Good evening. Thank you for staying here so late. I'm Lori Tenhope, a homeowner in Natomas. I have several concerns with this project. Starting with flood risk. We all know we're in a flood basin dependent on a ring of levees that are still undergoing strengthening. We're one of the most at risk cities in the county for catastrophe in the country for catastrophic flooding. I love my neighborhood. But our flood risk is a deep concern to me and my family. A new development of this size puts added pressure on the levees and the entire flood protection, infrastructure by paving over farmland and

open space runoff is accelerated. Climate change adds additional uncertainty with unprecedented weather patterns increasing the possibility of a flood protection, failure. a related concern is traffic congestion. How quickly can residents of this proposed project evacuate when also competing with Natomas and Sacramento? Finally, a point of pride for me, and I think many Sacramentans is the connection to our agricultural heritage. The proximity proximity to farms fosters the local farm to fork movement. Let's not pave over this rich Ag land that surrounds the city and provides us with food, aesthetic beauty, and rich habitat for wildlife. Please consider these comments and reject this project. It's not needed at this time. It'll put undue pressure on adjacent communities and other areas are better suited for development. Thank you.

Speaker 39:

Ron Costa

00:02:21.490 --> 00:04:32.000

I'm going to start out with the last first. I'm for the project. I think it's badly needed. We went out, and we had all these children. and then they had children, grandchildren. We have to have a place to house them. There is a housing shortage. Our children and grandchildren do not have the wherewithal to go out and start a development. so it's up to us to do it. It's our responsibility to do it. You can't just cut them loose and then say you're on your own. I got mine. We need to build that housing. and this is a project that has been looked at carefully. They did a beautiful job on the EIR. The I. EIR addresses the concerns that have been raised here today about hawks and snakes and all that business. So just refer to that booklet, the EIR for the environmental concerns farming. Our family 1,917, was on El Centro and San Juan, right in that vicinity there. and we still have the family farm on El Centro. I moved over there when I was in 1951. I'm now 87 years old. and I'm in it for the money. You know farming doesn't get it. You'll go broke if you ever try to farm that thing and make a living off of it. so sell the land and use the money to do some good so just to wind it up. I am in it for the money.

Speaker 40:

Oscar Ballagher

00:04:42.950 -->00:07:38.399

Hi! So I'm Oscar Ballagher. I'm with 350 Sacramento. It's a climate change Advocacy group. We've got a lot of comments. We'll submit written comments. But I'll just mention 3 of our concerns tonight in the interest of time. 1st Upper West Side is outside of the UPA, so it relies on land use policies 1, 19120. We believe those that the project cannot tear from the general plan. Zir. In regard to those policies, because actually they were not developed, those policies until after the 2,010 EIR. For the general plan was

completed. and the certification of that EIR, and the findings that the county made in adopting them don't cure the the lack of analysis regarded by CEQA. Section 21, 0 9, 4. Second, the project's greenhouse gas mitigation is inappropriately considered on a project specific basis, contrary to the county, general plans to the county's 2,011 promise to mitigate GHG. Emissions by adopting a climate Action Plan within one year. This was in 2,011. The advantages of a cap over default CEQA. Project-specific mitigation are the reason that that mitigation was credible. Back, then the effect of of now proceeding on a project specific basis is exactly as if the county had never proposed any mitigation at all. Back in 2,011. We don't think that's appropriate, legally or morally. Finally, 3rd subject mitigate. I used a little of your time to start with, so go ahead. Thank you so much. I'll end up briefly. 3rd project, mitigation for VMT. Assumes full build out. However, such a build out will be indefinitely delayed because of the vast oversupply of already entitled projects within the UPA. This project is not needed, is not going to bring any new housing to market that wouldn't otherwise be built economically with projects that are already approved and zoned for their development. The county has not substantiated how the modeled build out will occur. Thank you so much.

Speaker 41:

Megan Elise

00:07:47.020 --> 00:10:16.390

Board Chambers: Megan Elsie also, with 350 Sacramento. A climate justice organization. that work, Hurricane Helene. Okay. caused somewhere between 30 and 47 billion dollars of damages recently. Why am I talking about something that occurred across the country because it killed people was very expensive and was caused at least in part, by climate change. Climate change happens because of burning fossil fuels, fossil fuels are burned when you increase vehicle miles traveled. This project is outside of the urban services boundary which will increase vehicle miles traveled. Yes, of course we need affordable housing. My son became homeless this summer for a time, and is very low income. He needs housing, but it's not this kind of housing that's far out that's away from public transportation. There's plenty of spots to build housing along light rail and established bus routes. Now, places that are accessible to services by public transportation and by bicycles which this new project will not be. Also, it takes away from agricultural land agriculture done correctly. Regenerative agriculture can actually sink carbon and mitigate the climate crisis. If you pave over it. There's no chance to do that same with all the hawks and all this beautiful stuff. It's beautiful, but also nature sequesters carbon. So once you take it away, you lose that ability also. This is a flood zone. So the chances of increased climate disasters are bigger in this area. The EIR is deficient

because it does not consider all these aspects that I've just mentioned.
Thank you.

Speaker 42:

Harvind Dartsem

00:10:16.390 --> 00:10:34.420

Hello, everyone! My name is Harvind Dartsem. I live in Westlake so many years. I just like this plan, and to be proved. I don't want to say too many things. It's too late. And now, thank you for everyone. Thank you.

Speaker 43:

Arther Gibson

00:10:54.210 --> 00:13:44.060

Hello! My name is Arthur Gibson. Howell and Thomas, resident specifically on Garden Highway. I was originally a little upset that I got here early and got to hear all about the cell tower, but actually I was quite excited to learn how much you guys negotiate over, or, you know, talk about each other over the little things like the visual aspects of it being 55 foot tall versus 85 foot tall. And what kind of tree it is? Because for this we're talking about 25,000 new residents, 10,000 new homes up to 5 million square feet of resident or built of commercial space. So that will definitely require a lot of discussion as to how that's going to be so as to do with the draft. The DEIR. One thing I can talk about is the cultural resources, the land that is planning on being developed in the Upper West Side project, was originally part of the watershed of the Sacramento River before the levee was built, and was a known area of historical tribal activity and burial site. When the construct, when any construction on Garden Highway is planned, there is a requirement to investigate on a parcel by parcel basis for any historical archaeological resources, even though the land on Garden Highway has been elevated by dredging from the river and fill from elsewhere to build the aforementioned levee. Any development in the Upper West Side specific plan will have to excavate into the original watershed to the actual depth and below of these culturally significant areas potentially causing an irreparable harm. My question is, is there a plan to investigate mitigation measures? CUL, 2, A and CUL. 2 B. On a plot by plot basis. or just go and say, Well, this is a 20 acre parcel. It looks fine. and then the other part of population and housing the new envision. The new project, envisions, population, density equivalent to the most crowded parts of New York City. of approximately 18,000 per square mile. with no real mass transit and a job geography that requires most people to drive the Der States that they believe significant portions of residents will work in the project footprint and walk, bike, uber, or carpool. But that does not reflect the reality of life in California. the, and finally. the what was mentioned about the Garden Highway needing widening. From what I can tell, the army corps is not

going to allow it. So if this project, if the Deir says it has to be widened, and it cannot. Then that puts an end to this project right there, as far as I can see. But I would like to apply for a permit for a car and passenger ferry in case the project is approved, so I can ferry people from Natomas to downtown via the river. Thank you.

Speaker 44:

Patrice Stafford

00:13:53.050 --> 00:16:25.190

Board Chambers: Hello! My name is Patrice Stafford, and I'm a retired civil engineer from the county of Sacramento and Caltrans with the county. The last place I worked was the County Sewer Department, and 1997. I popped every manhole in South Natomas to find out why everything was. All the alarms were going off. So I know the whole area related to where the problems are regarding our water table, and so the levee work will help, because when we plotted the info we plotted the flows along with the rivers, it was just a 1 hole. The water is just underneath the ground right there at the ground. So. But I would say I am in favor of this project, because everything else around it has a specific plan. So this area needs a specific plan, too. The part about how long it will take for this proposal to come to fruition that could be staged so that the transportation infrastructure could be built at the truck. Stop, and further along San Juan and El Centro. I just almost saw a big accident on my way here. And so one of the things is maybe because once it gets built, then maybe these smaller neighborhoods. These people that are using it as a cut through won't do that anymore. So that's 1 way. But also I see that there's buffer for the environmental protection of Garden Highway and the properties that are already there. And so I think that it's pretty smart development. And I think, that I think it should be approved with a commitment from the County Transportation Department to put in their master plans the work that is required in this area. Thank you.

Speaker 45:

Bill Schomberg

00:16:25.190 --> 00:17:46.130

I'm Bill Schomberg, and I oppose it. I live on the Garden Highway Friday, when I was coming home from Woodland 5 was backed up from Woodland to who knows that way which towards Sacramento they've added an off ramp at the air at the airport exit that was full of people. I got in line. That line of traffic followed me. I went 45 miles an hour, which is the speed limit down Garden Highway to my residence, and I went to pull into my driveway. in which you have to pretty much stop to get down onto your property. There was 25 cars behind me, all very pissed off, beeping and very upset that I slowed down that flow. Last week I got off of 80 on El

Centro or West El Camino and El Centro was backed up clear past San Juan, Clear into the residential district, and I have a video of that. I'm not sure how to put that on here. Oops. Oh, we don't. We don't need video tonight. We believe you. It's it's terrible, anyway, I oppose it. Thank you. And I like open space.

Speaker 46:

Johanna Williams

00:17:46.130 --> 00:18:42.870

All right, Johanna Williams, good evening. I'm Johanna Williams, and I am a homeowner in the Willow Creek area of Sacramento, and I'm here to say that I strongly oppose this project. For all the reasons stated in the DEIR that appear to be unmitigable. The severe damage and the serious impacts that you can't mitigate. And I don't see that I'm really curious about the purpose of this project. It can't possibly be housing, because we've got millions and millions and millions of dollars that we don't even know where it's going for housing projects that are in. That's in the pipeline right now. So I don't see where this fits in with that. So again, I, for all the reasons previously stated. I strongly oppose this project. Thank you.

Speaker 47:

Terry Burns

00:18:47.040 --> 00:20:56.960

Thank you. I'll associate myself with the remarks of Mayor Fargo. Those who spoke to the urban services boundaries, those who spoke to the Substandard highway. and most particularly those who spoke to the flood issue. Natomas is called the Natomas Basin, because they used to sail ships through it. We are at risk of flooding. Unfortunately, the EIR has very conflicting statements about how it's going to deal with any emergency services, both access for emergency services, personnel. and egress in the situation where there's a flood or some other disaster, I think that's significant part of your concern as well. I'm a former member of the drowning accident rescue team. There's a talk about drainage canals. drainage, canals that are cement and are fixed. Get very slippery and very slick, and I can't tell you the number of children I have pulled out of drainage canals who were dead because they couldn't get out of that drainage canal, so I would like to see some mitigation done there. Likewise, I'm currently a member of the River City Waterways Alliance who does cleanup in the canals and the creeks and the rivers around here. We've taken out millions of pounds of trash. There is nothing in this EIR that talks about the maintenance of those canals, and who will be responsible for pulling out the trash and the other things that go in there and disposing of that trash. So I would encourage you to. and be sure that that is resolved. Again, this is not a destination project. It can be put in any of the places

that are currently approved to build housing, I would encourage you to do so. Thanks for your time. Thank you, Miss Birds. all right.