

CITY LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP

Key Challenge No. 2: Regional Consensus on "Smart Growth"

Rating: S=Support / NS=not support Y=Yes/N=No

#	A. Natomas Joint Vision Area		B. East Area New Growth		C. Delta Shores		Question 1 - Should the city create an action strategy on regional issues such as mixed-use and infill development, habitat and open space conservation, flood protection, public transit and affordable housing?		Question 2 - Should a comprehensive regional plan be prepared by affected jurisdictions in the region to address the need for habitat mitigation, flood protection, and open space preservation?		Question 3 - Should portions of areas such as the Natomas Joint Vision Area, East Area, and Delta Shores be used for low density executive housing?		Question 4 - A balance of both employment uses and retail development. Box 2 - Only retail uses.		Additional thoughts?
	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:	Checked Box 1	Checked Box 2	
1	S		S		S		Y		Y		Y				
2	S	Ag is no longer economical, city needs room to grow, HCP addresses endangered species, need flood control resolution prior to development of this area.	S		S		Y		Y		Y		X		
3	S		S		S		Y		Y		Y		X		
4	NS		S		S	Florin/Fruitridge.	Y		Y		N	Subsidized?	X		
5		Open		Open	S		Y		Y				X		
6	S		S		S		Y		N		Y			X	
7	S		S		S		Y		Y		Y				X
8	S		S		S		Y		Y		Y		X		
9	S		S		S		Y		Y		Y		X		
10	S		S		S		Y		Y		Y			X	
11	S		S		S		Y		Y		N		X		
12	S		S		S		Y		N		Y		X		
13	S	Prefer less development in NJVA more focus on infill development.	S	Good future use of land.	S	More executive housing is positive but keep some greenfield between Sac and next area of City/need jobs to keep people of 15	Y		Y		Y		X		
14	S		S		S	A warmed over community plan	Y		Y		N			X	
15	S	City should annex the land because the county is incompetent. Maintain urban reserve and construct light rail to airport	S	Its run-down (thank you sac county) needs a job center though not just housing.	NS	Too much retail, not enough jobs, too much traffic added to I-5.	Y		Y		N		X - limited retail.		
16	S	But build transportation with housing not after housing.	S	Environmental impact already exists.	NS	Takes energy away from core, area is too undeveloped.	Y		Y		Y		X		Focus energy to already built and impacted areas.
17	S	The growth should happen, after a level of infill development has occurred in the city - perhaps 50% - 75%.	S		S		Y		Y		N		X		
18	S	We need to make sure the city has a full say.	S	I support the widespread support for annexation and development.	S	I support the preliminary conclusions on the new direction and the implications of new choices.	Y		Y		Y		X		
19	NS	In principal, like concept of city annexation however need to address the infrastructure sufficiency/funding issues - ensure adequate key service levels! Cannot run from the infrastructure/services financing issues. No need to access if we cannot adequately serve - transp/education/flood prot.	S	Without focusing first on what exists.	S	Must have a robust housing component!	Y		Y		N		X	add housing	
20	S	We have the opportunity to build a legacy permanent open space for limited development.	S		S	Some amount of office is critical to the success of S Sac area.	Y		Y		Y		X		
21	NS	Any development of the Natomas JV does not make Sacramento more livable. City should annex and hold as open space.	S	Should have high density near light rail. Good area for growth.	S	I do not support the retail option with big box development.	Y		Y	Very high priority!	N	Develop a nice downtown and cities	X		I also strongly support the Florin annexation.
22	S	Consider - Designated as reserve. Do a special plan answers are focus for flood protection habitat protection.	S		S	Focus on retail and some employment. The key is mixture.	Y		Y		Y		X		
23		The need to preserve open space to maintain a healthy environment and flood protection.	?	I'm not sure how I feel about this - no comment!		I like the idea of more jobs in the area, but would like to see shopping and restaurant opportunities, grocery stores, park space. I am not an advocate of big box stores.	Y								
24	NS	The "new" direction assumes suburban-style development of NJVA is inevitable. I disagree. Jobs/housing balance is an illusion, doesn't reflect reality of multiple job and even career changes over time.	NS	Not enough mixed use. Not nearly enough jobs / housing balance is an illusion.	NS	The big box concept is ludicrous. "When will we ever learn?" Neither approach strikes me as realistic for executive housing, i.e., it is hard to imagine wanting to live there no matter how "executive" the housing is. Jobs/housing balance is an illusion.	Y		Y			I am completely indifferent to executive housing.	X		
25	S		S		S		Y		Y		Y		X		
26	S	Flood protection in the new growth area is extremely important.	NS	I feel there are more demands for city services that would not be self sufficient with taxes.	S	Job creation. See #3 below	Y		Y		Y		X		
27	S	Y					Y		Y				X		
28	NS	Public does not want to build out this area. I think there is a fallacy in question #3 below. Dot. comment's exec's may not want to live in low density housing.	S	Utilizes land resource wisely.	NS	Looks like sprawl to me. Abandoned opportunity for a true large employment center.	Y		Y		N		X		
29	S	I have serious questions about flood protection but prefer control over development.	S	Logical.	NS	I'd prefer to keep it open and also really people are more inclined to have multiple jobs, not multiple houses. Not realistic to think all employees can live there!	Y		Y		N	Never assume these employer's work nearby!	X		
30	NS	Keep all farm land.	S	It is in the middle of our area.	NS	Looks like another Elk Grove.	Y			Silly question.		Silly Question.			
31	NS	The city has no long range benefit. If we are concerned with what the county might allow, then making sure that open space within our current jurisdiction is carved out.	NS	Rosemont annexation makes sense, but the undeveloped "new growth area" reflects no long range benefit.	S	I really believe that south Sacramento can benefit greatly.	Y				N		X		
32	S		S		S	Because we would definitely need exec housing.	Y		Y		Y				
33	S	Needs time for planning once planned great idea.	S	Once it's annexed it will benefit the city.	S	More housing.	Y		Y		Y		X		
34	NS	High risk area (flooding).	S		S		Y		N		N		X		
35	S	We have an appropriate joint effort with the county. This direction balances the open space interests with projected urban/development.	S	Proximity inclusion. I favor the city as the agency to develop this area because the city can integrate the area as a contiguous component of a large plan. County jurisdiction would be more vulnerable to treating the area as a fragment. Needs a greater open space component than is proposed.	S	Although I support this especially like larger home sites attractive to corporate managers. Strongly prefer the office/retail mix option.	Y		Y		Y	Great	X		
36	S	Not realistic to say that area will remain in county.	S	annexation to the city best. Due to city best able to provide services. Sewer infrastructure funding may be problematic.	S	Less employment not a problem due to I-5 and light rail. Treatment plant odor buffer currently extends into south portion of the area.	Y		Y		Y			X	
37	S	Flood control issues must be addressed first; however, it is good to have in reserve for future development.	NS	Should develop area for industrial (clean/green technologies) and employment center uses.	S	The uses proposed would be compatible with the uses already along the I-5 corridor. City's southern gateway.	Y		Y		Y		X		
38	S	It allows more residents and increases the public transportation usage.	S		NS	More area needs to be kept as open space and/or farm land.	Y		Y						
39		Too early to tell: sphere of influence study needs to be finished; flood protection issues need to be addressed.	S	Comprehensive planning approach if annexed.	S		Y		Y		N	need to balance with smart growth and open space.	X		Fruitridge Florin unincorporated area - support new direction 36.
40	S	But, is the area safe for development given the letter from Army Corp of Engineers - regarding levees being unsafe.	S		S	What about the City of Freeport? They oppose development.	Y		Y		N		X		
41						No reason for more office - don't want the back of big boxes on major entrance to Sacramento.			N		Y			X	
42	S	We must keep an eye on: beauty, night life, attractiveness, arts event, we need community input and control and balance mechanisms.	S	We need to stop appeasing the developers.	S	We need to anticipate more telecommuting and distance learning. Please re-examine the separation of the "rich & famous" from the worker, poor, middle class, upper middle class.	Y		Y		N	how about more mix use and diversity? Unsure of the impact on poor, middle, upper classes.	X		

A. Natomas Joint Vision Area		B. East Area New Growth		C. Delta Shores		Question 1 - Should the city create an action strategy on regional issues such as mixed-use and infill development, habitat and open space conservation, flood protection, public transit and affordable housing?	Question 2 - Should a comprehensive regional plan be prepared by affected jurisdictions in the region to address the need for habitat mitigation, flood protection, and open space preservation?	Question 3 - Should portions of areas such as the Natomas Joint Vision Area, East Area, and Delta Shores be used for low density executive housing?	Question 4 Box 1 - A balance of both employment uses and retail development. Box 2 - Only retail uses.	Additional thoughts?				
#	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:	Checked Box 1	Checked Box 2		
43	S/NS	Agriculture land should be valued not destroyed. Ag. development around the airport will encourage problems. Urban reserve. S - if it is going to be preserved. NS - if it is going to be developed.	S	I can support it if there is a development plan that integrates the whole area. Does not allow unintegrated project by project development.	NS	Agricultural land is too important to cover with houses. Well thought out infill and east area development with good transportation should be adequate.	Y		Y	Critical to look outside the current project for impact	N	How about building mg H.D. that is attractive to anyone	X	
44	S		S	Unless it becomes an economic drag on the rest of the City's growth	NS	Mayor says plan is no good, we're not ready	Y		Y				X	
45	S	Annex the area.	S	Annex the co-area.	S	Don't forget to annex Freeport. Delta Shores - Make sure that roads, etc. are tied into and become part of South Sac and Meadowview areas. Delta Shores should not stand alone as an exclusive growth area. Have the developers put in the interchange at Consummes River College Blvd and I-5. Fruitridge Pocket - needs to be annexed and take over the water (special) district that is charging such high costs for water.	Y		Y				X	
46	S	To ensure that development options support city objectives more than 100 year flood protection should be considered, along with habitat and open space.	S	To ensure development supports city objectives.	NS	The infrastructure (I-5 and hwy 99) does not / cannot support additional traffic.	Y		Y		N		X	
47	S	Reserve for future growth. Annex into the City.	S	Must collaborate with county. Village / neighborhood development is +. Can this be annexed?	S	Yes, must create employment opportunities job centers community and easy access to services.	Y		Y		Y	executive housing westside '5'.	X	
48	S	Need to encourage infill projects joint vision area also needs focus on executive housing, and land use under appreciated now.	NS	Focus on NJV 1st and Delta Shores Annexation of too much area will dilute effectiveness and resources.	S	Large track of undeveloped land keep housing close to city.	Y		Y		Y		X	
49	S	Reserves right to plan develop / or not following study completion.	S	New reserve will have to ramp up enough to cover new residential service needs.	NS	Annex golf course? What are ramifications? Like retail mix option - need to look at policy issues to help employers rather than not having space later. Need to protect access to river.	Y		N		Y		X	
50	S	Annex preserve as open / flood with cautions of urban sphere.	S	Buffer - is north only buffer traffic impacts. Support annexation question extent of growth and use.	S	Blur with existing.	Y		Y		Y		X	
51	S		S	Since this area is far from the downtown area, I think it would be nice to place a "mini-downtown".	NS	I think its important to preserve some of sac's "naturalness".	Y		Y				X	
52	S	Prudent approach.	S		S	Job/housing mix.	Y		Y		Y		X	
53	NS	The agriculture buffer. Also, proximity to sac airport makes this less than ideal.	S	Further development of neighborhoods in this area may provide convenient housing for current business developments on 50 corridor/Rancho Cordova.	S	the retail option without employment center helps maintain CBD in downtown. However, need to improve transit options.	Y		Y		Y			X
54	S	Resolve flood issues first.	S		S		Y	like SACOG focus on transit.	Y		Y/N	Are these the right location? Exec airport, railyards Richards Blvd are better locations for exec's.	X	
55	S	Allow for greater time for evaluation, then plan for creative architecture to blend well with sac's existing "look", not formulaic include public transportation to connect with sac.	S	Low density retail is unappealing. County would cater to developers instead of residents and city.	S	Maximize land use.	Y				N		X	
56	S		S	The area is considered industrial and I believe that it should remain the same.	S	The idea of more retail and any employment in the area and the idea that there is more housing development.	Y		Y		Y		X	
57	S		S	Need to densify and gentrify so close to RT.	NS	Work in current city growth areas.	Y		Y		Y		X	
58	NS	Too many houses and other structures in a known flood plain.	S	If multi-family housing is built first.	S		Y		Y		N		X	
59	S	We need control.	S		S		Y	we need to take control.	Y		Y		X	
60	S	SFD already contracts for Fire Service in this area. Additional stations required.	S	Metro Fire currently provides service. Provider "debate" could ensure.	S	Same as Natomas Joint Vision.	Y		Y		Y		X	
61	S	The vision area is mostly a nightmare which no one has the balls to codify.	S	Not ag land - employment here would decrease commute to CBD. Opportunity for "from scratch" development in "hilly setting".	S		Y	Well, duh!	Y	Like a Regional G.P.?	Y		X	
62	S	Need a map the city - county can vote on (land use agreement).	S	Rosemont needs to be in Rancho Cordova or Sac City.	S	Need a large regional park.	Y	we already do.	Y			Ambivalent	X	
63	S	Needs to remain flexible until flood control issues are resolved.	S	To keep the county out.	S	Good looking plan.	Y		Y		N		X	
64	S	As long as I support city objectives.	S	I annexed to city.	S	Mix option.	Y		Y			not sure yet.	X	
65	S	Support ridership for the DNA line in the future.	S	Infill development - potential ridership for transit.	S	Infill development - potential ridership for LRT and new bus services.	Y		Y		N		X	
66	S	Support contingent on adequate funding of emergency services impact.	S	Same	S	Same	Y		Y		Y			X
67	NS	NJVA should not be designated urban reserve. Too many outstanding/unresolved issues to deal with. Should wait for next GP update to plan.	NS	East area should not be considered in this GP Update. Need more info on annexation before adding to city's long range planning documents.	S	Better solution than existing GP planning direction should create a better rural transition in the SW corner.	Y		Y		Y		X	
68	S	Support the completion of the JV process. The city can better serve and plan the area than the county.	S	The city need to annex this area into the city.	S	South Sac need higher end job and higher end houses.	Y		Y		Y		X	
69	S	City can better serve area increase city/county co-op for 2008 meantime what?	S	Increase city/county co-op. Annex	NS	How much mixture? Too general now - needs work - proposals not known.	Y		Y		N		X	
70	S	Nothing specific to support at this time. Open space? Yes, better zone, yes.	S	Better than if leaving as is.	S	new destination place, tax base, retail, commercial, office space, add to area vita city.	Y		Y/N	project review must still take place.	Y		X	
71	S	Flood protection issues.	S	Underutilized - office preferred.	S		Y		Y		N		X	
72	S	but only if saved for conservation / buffer / open space. Not if at high cost(s) from buying land, especially if (other) land has been given away for lower costs.	NS	Keep industrial / manufacturing - promote incubator businesses. Do not wholesale clean-out of existing. What about balancing wet lands, etc.	NS	Not another Natomas - Keep more open space - promote limit development.	Y		Y			Limited amount	X	
73	S	A must or it gets fully developed. Constraint wildlife/flood.	S		S	Keep the land use option / multiplicity.	Y		Y		Y		X	
74	NS	Vast need for nexus as to developer assessment for infrastructure. Concern over ag interests w/ WM Act. Conservation easement.	S	Regional infrastructure concerns. Hi labor concepts review. Should have less emphasis on retail office!	NS	Same as above. Regional connections transit orientation. Police protection issues in meandering commercial areas.	Y		Y		Y		X	
75	S	Framework exists. Primary infrastructure in... project area going and successful.	NS	Question timing at this time.	S	City boundaries to grow southward. Much infrastructure exists.	Y		Y		N		X	
76	S	Favor open space in particular adjacent to airport.	S	Removes landfill with history of problems.	S		Y		Y		Y		X	
77	S	Development is important to help fund flood proofing, but needs to be balanced against habitat and their protection.	S		S	This area should not compete with proposed office development in railyard / Richards Blvd.	Y		Y		Y			X
78	S	Generally - need (regional) infill trigger.	S	Could have higher density.	S	Lower density south end - executive housing - sort of like transect - create buffer with / Elk Grove.	Y		Y		Y	Should mix income where ever we can.	What is market for employment?	
79	NS	Doubt with / be kept as a reserve.	S		NS		Y		Y		Y		X	

A. Natomas Joint Vision Area		B. East Area New Growth		C. Delta Shores		Question 1 - Should the city create an action strategy on regional issues such as mixed-use and infill development, habitat and open space conservation, flood protection, public transit and affordable housing?	Question 2 - Should a comprehensive regional plan be prepared by affected jurisdictions in the region to address the need for habitat mitigation, flood protection, and open space preservation?	Question 3 - Should portions of areas such as the Natomas Joint Vision Area, East Area, and Delta Shores be used for low density executive housing?	Question 4 - A balance of both employment uses and retail development. Box 2 - Only retail uses.	Additional thoughts?		
#	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:	Checked Box 1	Checked Box 2
80	NS	Why was Fruitridge Florin left out of Summary Overview. Flood plain - don't place more people in harms way. Keep it as urban reserve - protect the airport. Get it under City control if possible.	S	Subject to analysis if its catch basin value and ground water recharge value during small stream flooding.	NS	Keep a green buffer to southern easement. Its non stop urban through sac int'l. LA: problem - infill in Freeport to same extent.	Y		Y		X	
81	NS	This area should be preserved as land.	S		S	Office/Retail mix option! No more big box, smaller town center option preferred.	Y		Y		X	
82	NS	Do not support development in this area.	S	Adjacent to city and services planning diagram seems artificial.		No big box as entry to city from south maintain green belt between Elk Grove.	Y	need urban service boundary.	Y		X	
83	S	Regional growth approach by the city & county. Ensures healthy and attractive natural environments. Preserve and maintain open space.	S	Jobs located near existing population. Add area of influence currently in the GP. Collaborative effort between jurisdiction support for annexation.	S	Use principals of smart growth. Provide more housing and a diversity of housing types. Creates new attractive neighborhood environment which will reinforce sense of community. Close the gap regional project should annex NOW!	Y		Y		X	
84	S	City should annex and develop Natomas Joint Vision Area.	S	General Plan needs to define future boundaries to the East.		Retail/office mix need to appropriate city need to ensure that we do not plan too much retail so that this big boxes end up eating each other.	N	These are all "regional" issues and should be discussed w/regional partners.	Y			
85	S	Do not develop this area for single family homes.	S		S	Be sensitive to having a balance.	Y		Y		X	
86	S		S		NS		Y		Y/N	Leave to market forces.	X	
87	S	Encourage regional political leader. Buffer schools sphere study.	S	Must - great opportunity annex now.	S	Protect river / access annex golf course, smart growth.	Y	Concurrent w/continuous development may take too much time.	Y			X
88	S	Like the open space buffer annex now.	S		S	Make sure area set aside for schools, like mixed use residential / commercial.	Y		Y		X	
89	S	School district needs to have a buy-in with the smart growth, annex now!	S		S	Schools?	Y		Y			X
90	S	This should be our ultimate growth area after 2030. We need the county to share the vision for a complete Sacramento. We need "Smart Political Leadership".	S	This is a great example of sustainable design. Reuse of quarries and previous industrial uses that are close to existing infrastructure make sense.	S	This should be the true test of "smart growth". I support but doubt we will develop this as it really could be.	Y		Y		X	
91	S	We need to start the annexation into the city now before the county decide to move ahead without us.	S	A must -	S	This is a reg/project - everyone on council should work on this - all principles of growth need to be used.	Y		Y		X	
92	S	More city control over potential development maintain as open space; city more able to manage development and growth than county.	S	Good opportunity site - is trans in proximity? Need to make sure that public transit is accessible and available.	S	Only for retail/office mix - no big box focus.	Y	the city needs to have and adhere to a bold vision for these issues to be a leader in the region.	Y		X	
93	S	Providing it is urban reserve - no leap frog redevelopment no using RT to airport to justify inappropriately timed development - and no development in Flood plain prior to protection for people and habitat. 1 mile buffer ludicrous.	S	Natural infill area but must be supported by increased transit coverage (bus etc) so it supports both city core and Sacramento street.	S	We do not need to repeat North Natomas mistakes - need good jobs/housing balance - no power center with employees who can't live there - no segregated zoning - lots of mixed use.	Y	but March to community drummer, not developer drummer they speculated - don't force public to pay for their risk.	Y	but utilize natural boundaries and needs.	X	
94	S	Must solve flood issues before development and emphasize need to preserve ag in close area.	S	Already in urban area must annex Rosemont at same time.		Need to maintain and improve public access to river west of I-5. Take river road off of levee and move it east.					X	
95	S	Information / study not completed, might be premature to put anything concrete into the GP before study finalized. Concern for environmental issues/open space.	S	Smart Growth / Village centers - high density housing - make sense.	S		Y		Y			
96	S	Land bank for future growth. Greenbelt along sac river / county line.	S	Need more warehouse / light industrial and less housing.	S	Support need employment for retail in south city need executive housing.	Y	must work with county and other cities.	Y		X	
97	NS	How does this work with the habitat constraints.	NS	What does county think of this.	S	This is really the only thing we can do.	Y		Y			
98	NS	Flood issues as well as county issues.	S		S		Y	Regional plans are great.	Y		X	
99	S	Good plan for open space preservation.	S		S		Y		Y		X	
100	NS	No, Natomas botched its "original vision" and so should be maintained as green space and habitat. No building should occur before flood control measures are completed.	S	As long as it doesn't become another Natomas - suburban sprawl. It should include a transit orientation.	NS	Ditto per A/B. Plus it should include office, retail and commercial use.			Y		X	
101	S	Need to have "barriers" for suburban growth sprawl. Must be vibrant - and not traditional development. Needs light rail.	S	Needs to have employment opportunities potential for more low income housing, light rail.	S		Y		Y		X	
102	NS	It's a flood plain and viable agricultural area that needs to be preserved.	S	It's a good idea to take undesirable land and redevelop it in this manner.	NS	It should be left as open space to encourage local agriculture and may be even ag tourism or turned into a park, zoo, etc.	Y		Y	provided it could be appealed.		
103	S	But should depend on progression DNA, future occupancy should not occurred until flood improvements completed.	S		S		Y		Y	but not a whole lot.	X	
104	S		S	I agree with the preliminary conclusions and new direction but would add industrial zoning into the mix of use the industrial areas to attract semi-conductors or bio...industries.	NS	I support the retail option with housing and with land set aside for low density executive housing.	Y		Y/N			X
105	NS	I don't believe this is a good area for growth except near I-5 and light rail corridor. Northern Vision Area should stay open, no access to transit and disconnected from downtown.	S	This is appropriate for development but a much lower priority than other areas like Delta Shores due to lack of transit access.	S	I support development here: primarily housing + employment, not retail. I think office properties should be centered around light rail station, housing elsewhere.	Y		Y		X - neighborhood of retail only.	
106	S	Maintain urban reserve, don't use up all open space. Flood issues may be solved in this area as open space.	S	It is easy access, low impact on open space with water impacts and could support infrastructure with development fees.	S	We need to get away from current "tradehead" retail strategies and bring jobs South. Mixed use is a great asset here and employment, beyond retail is needed.	Y		Y		X	
107	S	Studies, comprehensive should govern eventual use. May be we set it aside, but consider still deciding to not develop sig. areas.	NS	Does not address city boundary well, though concept is good.	S		Y		Y		X	
108	S	Open spaces/Flood protection.	S	Annex now.	S	Under new GP options where is regional park?	Y		Y			
109	S	Evaluate habitat and open space in light of alternative locations for open space uses.	S	Reuse gravel pits similar to Granite Regional Park.	S		Y		Y		X	
110	NS	Why build in a flood area?	S		S		Y		Y		X	
111	S	Need to "partner" with the county, city for regional development.	S	Need jobs to support existing residents.	S	As a job center.	Y		Y		X	
112	S		S	More attractive than gravel pits.	S		Y		Y		X	
113	S	Provides substantial opportunity for city growth and development in a planned, "green", smart process.	S	Great reuse and development plans.	S		Y		Y	yes to single family homes but not mansions.	X	
114	S	Mitigate flood control issues. Alternative transportation.	S	Increasing public safety issues.	S		Y		Y		X	
115	S	Important to continue working towards open space and maintain buffers into the future.	S	Just ok.	S	Important to make room for high end housing for corporate types.	Y		Y		X	
116	S		S	Additional revenue a given.	S	Much more workable community approach.	Y		Y			X

A. Natomas Joint Vision Area			B. East Area New Growth			C. Delta Shores			Question 1 - Should the city create an action strategy on regional issues such as mixed-use and infill development, habitat and open space conservation, flood protection, public transit and affordable housing?	Question 2 - Should a comprehensive regional plan be prepared by affected jurisdictions in the region to address the need for habitat mitigation, flood protection, and open space preservation?	Question 3 - Should portions of areas such as the Natomas Joint Vision Area, East Area, and Delta Shores be used for low density executive housing?	Question 4 Box 1 - A balance of both employment uses and retail development. Box 2 - Only retail uses.		Additional thoughts?	
#	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:	Checked Box 1	Checked Box 2	
117	NS	I think this area should be an urban reserve in areas closest to city boundaries. The areas around the airport and away from the city boundaries should be protected as a no growth area.	S		S		Y		Y		N	some areas.	X		
118	S	To save open space, habitat and ag. County will do a poor job.	S	Plan shown lots terrible - why can't we do a smart growth plan?	NS	Current plan is terrible - Elk Grove North or N. Natomas South. Do it right or not at all! Not Yet!	Y		Y		N		X		
119	S		S		NS	Retain as urban reserve until needed, rather than developing now. Should not compete with infill in urbanized areas (Richards Blvd., Railyards).	Y		Y		N				
120	S	Development should not occur in this area until the Joint Vision Plan is adopted.	S	Create a sustainable, smart growth plan.	NS	This is not a sustainable development should concentrate on infill development.	Y		Y		Y	but integrated into neighborhood similar to Fab 40's.	X		
121	S		S	This doesn't include Fruitridge/Florin - which if it was a separate item I would not be in favor.	S	Changed my mind after group discussion - they are right, we're not ready to develop - leave it alone for 10 years.	Y		Y		Y		X		
122	S		S	Wait for the financial analysis.	NS	Do we need it now? Later!	Y		Y		N		X		
123	S		S		NS	Consider as potential urban/commercial reserve.	Y		Y		N				
124	S		S	But think we should go much further east.	S	We need office/job centers there.	Y		Y		Y		X		
125	S	Can be a good direction. However, final determination is delayed to 2008 as other proposals move forward.	S	Complicated by unincorporated status of area and indeterminate estimate of proposed additional homes.	S	Appears to be best thought out new direction plan. Additional traffic congestion can be problem.	Y		Y		Y	low priority.	X		
126	S	Should include more greenbelt and ag. More low density executive homes on the fringes.	S		S	Low density executive housing is desperately needed in the city.	Y		Y		Y		X		
127	S	It makes sense; it's infill; let's do it right!	S		S		Y		Y		?				
128	S	Because growth near city preferable to Placer and East. Also, shared vision area will not affect high density downtown.	S	Makes natural sense for city "infill".	S	Good mix, with large commercial along I-5 makes economic sense.									
129	S	I support annexation in order to gain control, but I think a larger area should remain permanent open space. Also the flood risks in Natomas are so significant that I don't think we should add more development in this area until that issue is resolved.	S	Habitat has already been damaged or destroyed by gravel pits. This is a logical area for re-use. The mix of housing, office, retail is important with a goal of people being able to live, work in the same community.	S	As described with a good mix of jobs (office) housing and retail this plan makes sense will accommodate some of the needed new housing. It must include office good jobs. I would oppose a more suburban mix of just housing and retail.	Y		Y		Y	but not the Joint Vision Area.	X		I strongly support the new direction for Fruitridge/Florin - this area is in bad need of help, economic revitalization, hope.
130	NS	Edge growth - new growth and flood problem intractable.	S	Infrastructure office developed zone.	S	Edge growth on a "weak edge"	Y		Y		Y		X		
131	S	Best to hold in reserve while critical issues are examined. - Urban Reserve.	S	Create possibility to provide more affordable housing than in CBD or midtown, railyards, etc. Annexation / mixed use.	S	Greater possibility to provide more affordable housing than in CBD etc. some retail/big bldg is needed in area. - More diverse than current employment center.	Y		Y		N		X		
132	S	Hold it is reserve by annexing it then figure out what to do - what about Sutter County?	S	Need plan otherwise it will be hodgepodge like what is going.	S	Needs a development plan like that proposed in office/retail mix should be more office!	Y		Y		Y		X		
133	S		S		S	undecided.	Y		Y		N		X		
134	S	Gives city control while allowing for necessary planning and flood control.	S		S		Y		Y		Y		X		
135	S		S		NS	Should retain a larger employment center component not just min. office with low-wage retail.	Y		Y		N		X		
136	S		S		S	Office retail.	Y		Y	need urban service boundaries maybe.	Y		X		
137	NS	This area should not even be considered for development. Too far away from urban core - puts more pressure in highways 99 & 5.	S	This area would be a good infill area and would give boost to surrounding neighborhoods, great opportunity area.	NS	Sprawling into Elk Grove - don't want to be identified with this area. Keep buffer between Elk Grove and Sacramento.	Y		Y		N		X		
138	S	Moving slowly and cautiously is good. The city still need urban edge suburban growth opportunities for balance but all issues need to be resolved.	S	Very appropriate area for development; previously disturbed and in need of reclamation, outside of the flood plain and generally close in with good access.	S	More jobs and housing choice needed in south area.	Y		Y	but difficult.	Y	but also higher densities in other portions.	X		
139	S	Public safety, parks, neighborhoods - keep open space buffers with mixed use development and flood protection. Work with school districts to have the best.	S	City should annex and develop in smart growth fashion.	S	Should be developed with office/housing and retail mix.	Y		Y		Y		X		
140	S		S		S	Support office/retail option.	Y		Y		Y		X		
141	S		S	Underutilized area close to walt ave LRT - a great opportunity for higher density mixed use.	S	Area needs jobs and housing and retail place emphasis on higher wage employment.	Y		Y		Y	mixed housing types should mean mixed.	X	No!	
142	NS	Job/housing balance - concerned about traffic. Also, flood issues, HCP need to be realistically addressed - Sutter Co dev?	S	Balance with existing uses.	S	need true focus on subregional land use / economic development mix - office / retail / housing.	Y		Y		Y		X		
143	S	I like the 1 mi OS swath along the river.	S	Ensure no probate development W of Freeport Blvd.	S	Improve west of Freeport as pub os along the river.	Y		Y		Y		X		
144	NS	This area is important to preserve open space habitat, ag-related uses. I would like to see no development in Natomas Joint Vision.	S	Would improve quality of life and services for existing residents. Great opportunity for infill development, existing public transit infrastructure.	NS	Too much retail. It will hurt central city redevelopment. Protect Freeport Look and Feel at all costs!	Y	we already do w/blueprint greenprint, etc.	Y		Y	but not in Natomas Joint Vision Area.			Only employment - no big box retail.

Rating Totals	A. Natomas Joint Vision Area	B. East Area New Growth	C. Delta Shores	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	# of Box 1	# of Box 2
S	105	122	99	Y	129	Y	123	78
NS	26	10	30	N	1	N	4	36
Total Votes	131	132	129	130	127	114	113	