

Name: - Caroline Stromberg

I'm not sure which portion of the document my comment applies to.

Native American community, as with other impacted communities, continue to struggle for acknowledgement/assistance for their children, elders, economic development and their future.

Name: - Jay Narayan

Land Use and Urban Design Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

I live in a neighborhood that was formally known as South East. It has been almost two years since we have changed our name to Southeast Village and we would like the General Plan Update to represent that. If you contact Manual Carmona from the neighborhood services dept., he could easily explain the change. Thank you.

Name: - Steve Pyburn

Land Use and Urban Design Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Mobility Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

I applaud the City for their progressive approach to balancing land use planning and mobility. The plan emphasizes alternate mode use in areas where transit service is readily available. As a transportation planner, I am interested in the definitions of Level of Service for city streets. The Mobility section, Policy 1.2.2 includes allows LOS E in "mixed use corridors." However, the Land Use and Urban Design Element does not directly indicate where those corridors are. The land use descriptions require some interpretation to determine in a parcel is truly within a mixed use corridor. For example, Broadway is designated as Urban Corridor Low. By reading the land use descriptions, it is possible to deduce Broadway is a mixed use corridor, and thus subject to LOS E. I have worked on many city land use entitlement projects where such determinations are left to staff's interpretation. Such interpretations can extend the project approval process. It would be beneficial if the Mobility element included a map of where the LOS D and LOS E standards will apply.

Name: - Jay Raj Narayan

Comment is general/applies to entire document

<http://www.ci.madison.wi.us/planning/Grocery%20Store.pdf> <http://groups.dcn.org/dang>

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/supermarket/index.shtml>

http://www.eurekaalert.org/pub_releases/2008-05/ip-gb052008.php

<http://communitybasedplanning.wordpress.com/2008/05/05/dcp-releases-neighborhood->

grocery-storesupermarket-study/ <http://www.owdna.org/History/history6.htm>
<http://couponing.about.com/b/2008/05/05/the-death-of-the-neighborhood-grocery-store.htm> http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6WPG-4KYY3KP-6&_user=10&_rdoc=1&_fmt=&_orig=search&_sort=d&view=c&_acct=C000050221&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=10&md5=fa98d2e8892435edf904ad7d885dc4e9
<http://www.azstarnet.com/opinion/248899>
http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/local/361235_foodvoid01.html

Grocery stores are essential to complete neighborhoods and promoting all or most of the aspects related to smart growth. Please check the following links about what cities have done to bring, or revitalize their neighborhoods with grocery markets that are located in regular neighborhoods. The first link is especially important and I feel it should be added to the master plan as FOOD is one of the basic requirements in our hierarchy of needs and the others being: shelter, clothing, etc. I'm surprised as there was a great emphasis on hungry communities in Sacramento in 2004 with the Hunger Commission and such, but it has been readily dropped over the years with other issues that are related to it seeming to be more important. Going back to the basics, everybody has to eat. it is one of our main reasons for traveling, whether for one item, or ten or more. If we can walk to a store, or bike, or jog, or bike, whatever form of transportation without using gasoline, it will create a chain of effects that will reduce congestion on streets, reduce carbon and pollutants that harm the environment and helping to end global warming, and creating healthier people as they will walk more or receive physical exercise. And the benefits greatly trickle through the entire community as crime will reduce and people learn to shop smarter with their local neighborhood grocery stores or bodegas. I heavily believe all of the General Plan is possible if we think about the cores of the community, and most of the time if not all the time, local grocery stores are the place people want to go. Even if they want one item to purchase such as a candy bar or apple, they have something to do rather than staying at home and watching television. Families, parents and their children identify their local grocers as their special place to shop distinctly belonging to them and their community. Even people that do not live in the area and have to commute have a place to stop in case there is an emergency or they simply need directions. If there are no outlets, it would be highly unexpected to knock on a stranger's house and ask for help! But we have to think about the cost of things going up. Bigger and larger home grown grocery stores in a local neighborhood can help reduce prices. Neighborhoods that do not have a big box retailer can reduce the price without having to travel to Wal Mart for the same benefits. And it doesn't make any sense for the city to promote Wal Mart with all the tax breaks and subsidies they receive when all that money is shipped to Southeast portion of the states and we are left to pick up the tab. There should be a greater emphasis on local business instead of corporations that have no value or ethics. Yet, the way things are going and the truth of how these corporations operate, we still heavily rely on them. It is time to change our ways back to when going to a business was simple and enjoyable, and easy. I can't afford to wait in lines, travel through congested traffic, and waste gas on items that can be provided by my local grocer. I hope this message and grocery stores make it into the General Plan. If it is already a part of the general plan update or there are some aspects of it related to the general plan, it is too vague and there should be stricter

language to what complete neighborhood are, especially on an issue very important as this. There are many, many links that talk about lack of grocery stores, but I have given but a few of the many articles and such that are out there. Please read this and revise the general plan when it comes to food options. Thank you.

Name: - Chris Paros

Economic Development Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

An economic development plan should be required for all communities that are designated as "New Growth Areas". The City needs a policy of committing to an economic growth strategy to compensate for the burden of inclusionary housing on schools and services. This would show a strong commitment from the city to residents in New Growth areas by setting a clear strategy for ensuring long-term economic & community viability so communities will not "fail". There is a real need to address the additional challenges to school ratings, businesses and services that New Growth areas are burdened with. 2) The City has a strong opportunity to quickly increase revenue by establishing a solid economic development plan for South & North Natomas. There are numerous empty, new buildings that can quickly become revenue generators for the city if occupied. A plan is also needed to both compensate for flood insurance impact, home foreclosure challenges and an economic vision for Natomas that optimizes the use of 103 acres should the Arena move. The city-owned land poses an outstanding opportunity for creating a University Research Park, or a golf course or any other business that would spur businesses & homeowners to live in Natomas and bring EC there. This is the strongest path to increasing City revenue. Conversely, should Natomas experience economic decline (similar to the South Area), city revenues would be at high risk for huge decline.

Housing Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

I'm not sure which portion of the document my comment applies to

On behalf of numerous Natomas residents, I submit the following comments: 1) We oppose policy 2.5. Inclusionary housing policy should be implemented city-wide and not only in New Growth areas (NGAs). This policy puts added burden on schools, businesses and services. Policy should be 15% for any project that does not already have 15% in the surrounding 1/2 mile radius. 2) If New Growth Areas are not eliminated, then their schools and services should get a higher ratio of City revenue & resources to compensate for the inequitable burden the NGAs carry. The non-NGA areas can provide their fair share by contributing some of their general fund portion to NGA needs. 3) We highly support more OWNERSHIP inclusionary housing. There needs to be more ability for working families to improve their status & stability. 4) We want inclusionary housing to be more intermixed with market-rate housing. Making large 3-story complexes with 100% low-income apartments is a known failed housing model that failed in Chicago, failed in South Sac and failed in South Natomas. When will the city learn the lessons from its past? Require inclusionary be mixed among the market-rate apartments. 5) A

rule is needed to ensure market-rate housing is built FIRST before the inclusionary element. This is critical to help ensure success of the market-rate housing. 6) Data monitoring is needed to monitor crime and other problems . It is unacceptable that the City cannot reply as to what crime, police calls, & trends are occurring in inclusionary housing. Are the problem tenants migrating to SAc from other areas? This needs to be assessed and addressed. 7) The 10-year plan to end the homeless needs to include clear data gathering that answers questions such as : Is the plan creating a "magnet" affect attracting more homeless people to Sacramento for the benefits? How will that be prevented? What will be done to protect the community if issues occur such as drug dealing, etc? What action will be taken to ensure those with mental and physical ability contribute to the community? Homeless does not equal helpless. There can be litter cleanup or canal trash cleanup efforts. Show some ROI to taxpayers and it will help improve the program. Show that these residents will be contributing to the community too. 8) Condo conversions to rentals need to require notification to the surrounding community with an opportunity for community input. 9) We oppose reducing parking spaces in any Natomas housing until abundant mass transit is available. We have had numerous problems with parked cars getting hit or vandalized because of insufficient parking space within the project. 10) para. 5.1: RESIDENTS NEED TO BE INFORMED OF ALL INCLUSIONARY HOUSING PROJECTS. ANY APPLICATION STREAMLINING MUST MAINTAIN COMMUNITY NOTIFICATION with sufficient time for input. 11) p.188: We oppose allowing group homes by only special permit. Residents need to be notified and have an opportunity for public comment. These need commission approval. 12) policy 3.2, p. 250: Natomas residents ADAMANTLY OPPOSE any developer fee incentives to build medium or high density housing until our levees are fixed and our services can meet the need. We have an overabundance of unfilled apartments now, numerous homes in foreclosure, flood insurance risks and crime problems primarily from young people. General comments: 1) To retain police in the City force, any City Police academy graduates should have a contract clause requiring them to work for the city for at least 5 years. It's unbelievable that cadets are allowed to graduate then quit and go work elsewhere. 2) I request the City establish a quota that requires a majority of City employees live within the City limits. My goal would be 80% minimum. It's critical that people who make decisions for the city also live here too so they experience the consequences.

Name: - Caroline Peck

Land Use and Urban Design Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Mobility Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Public Health and Safety Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Comment is general/applies to entire document

Excellent Plan Overall. I was very pleased to see language relating to walkability and bikeability in the general plan. I think that the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and those who use mass transit should be given at least equal and perhaps a greater percentage of the City's effort and resources as that given to automobiles. This will be helpful to the

environment, the community and the individual. I think that pedestrian and cyclist issues should be included in the public health and safety element as well as in the land use and mobility elements. The reasoning behind this is the following: walking and cycling will increase physical activity and therefore decrease obesity and diabetes, especially important in children; decreased use of automobiles will contribute to better air quality, and therefore decrease asthma and cardiovascular disease such as heart attacks; pedestrians and cyclists need to have safe sidewalks and bike lanes on mixed use corridors and major/minor arterials to prevent injuries, such as the highly publicized UC Davis physician who was hit while jogging on 21st Street and spent months in the ICU and had to drop out of medical school; using alternative transportation is less expensive, leading to increased available income for families, which will elevate their overall health status; health disparities are strongly linked to poverty and race - making alternative transportation safe for ALL will contribute to health equity among Sacramentans.

No name provided

Mobility Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

I have worked in downtown Sacramento for over 20 years. So, although not a resident of Sacramento, I do a lot of shopping and eating in restaurants here. My comment is in regard to the need for improved pedestrian accessibility and safety. Although pedestrian facilities in downtown Sacramento are pretty good (and certainly much better as compared to outlying suburban areas such as Natomas), there is room for improvement - especially regarding pedestrians' safety.

Name: - Angelique Ashby

Part 3 - Community Plan Goals and Policies

I'm not sure which portion of the document my comment applies to

In North Natomas we do not want to be limited to one community center per 35,000 residents. We believe our community was designed to have many more community gathering places and that this drastic of a change from the original plan limits our communities ability to reach its potential. Such a min. limit is not needed and only restricts what we can do... Why would that be of any help in any part of the city - Sacramento does not need restrictions on positive features... Financial burdens limit us enough - why would we put further limitations on ourselves as a city? Please do not include this limiting language as it relates to community centers in Sacramento.

Name: - Curtis Paullins

Part 3 - Community Plan Goals and Policies

Please do not reduce the number of North Natomas community centers slotted in the plan. Its my understanding the current plan includes 4 community centers for North and West Natomas and there is a proposal to limit the community centers to 1 center per 35000 people which is not acceptable. Thank you for your consideration.

Name: - Joan Toomire

I strongly object to changing the Master Plan for Community Centers in Natomas. It is not realistic to think that 2 Community Centers can serve the thousands of people living in North and West Natomas. Families moved to those areas with the expectation that what was promised in the Master Plan would be implemented. So far, they have been short-changed on nearly every front...similar to what happened in South Natomas. Joan Toomire 3001 Funston Drive Sacramento, CA 95833

No Name Provided

Land Use and Urban Design Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Housing Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Education, Recreation and Culture Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Public Health and Safety Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

North Natomas is being severely shortchanged in this plan. We need the 4 community centers we were promised, not 2. There's no rational standard for a conclusion that 1 center per 35,000 people is sufficient. Youth activities are critical to limiting the allure of gangs and crime to bored young people. We need a thoughtful look at inclusionary housing--build appropriate amounts of housing in varied settings, not huge ghettos likely to become master-planned slums, filled with gang members who terrorize the neighborhood and pull down the quality of the schools (see my comment on community centers). Finish the local and regional parks as promised. Provide the adequate police and fire protection that our tax dollars and development fees (paid through our home purchase prices) have already paid for and continue to pay for. The city is running a strong risk of allowing North Natomas to become South Natomas instead of the mixed-income peaceful and prosperous neighborhood it was promised to be. Stamping out nascent crime now through an appropriate mix of police protection, youth engagement and thoughtful (rather than cheap/easy/expedient) inclusionary housing will be much cheaper in the long run than trying to reclaim a declining crime-ridden neighborhood.

Name: - B. Gleason

Education, Recreation and Culture Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Greetings - I am a North Natomas resident writing to protest the General Plan update regarding service level goals for community centers (per ERC 2.2.3 Service Level Goals /

Table ERC 1 in Part 2 of the GP). As proposed, the update now limits community centers to only 1-per-30,000 residents. That is, only two community centers for a built-out North Natomas. With specific regard to North Natomas, the 1:30,000 ratio is troubling. The City expects the General Plan update to supersede all pre-existing neighborhood community and/or financing plans. The current North Natomas Community Plan and North Natomas Finance Plan dictate that North Natomas and West Natomas need four community centers: twice the GP allotment. In short, there's a troubling discrepancy in service level goals between the General Plan's 1-per-30,000 ratio and the N.Natomas Community Plan's 1-per-15,000 ratio (per NN.ERC 1.6 in Part 3 of the GP, Section 12/p. 35). It would appear that the General Plan update may limit the City's obligation to Natomas residents - and this, based on an apparent technicality, i.e. the aforementioned discrepancy & supersession. Further, there is no rationale or explanation given as to why the City believes one community center fulfills needs for 30,000+ residents. The new measurement is still part of the update to the General Plan even though Councilman Ray Tretheway assured a group of North Natomas residents at a June 28, 2008, finance plan meeting that all four community centers would be planned for North Natomas. Again, please do right by these concerns for a better Natomas at this critical juncture in its development. Sincerely, B. Gleason Resident, Natomas Park North Natomas

Name: - Extremely Concerned Citizen

Mobility Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Education, Recreation and Culture Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Part 3 - Community Plan Goals and Policies

Dear General Plan Commission, Let it be known that I have reviewed the revised 2030 General Plan. As it relates to the 1 Community Center per 35,000 residents edit from the original selling point of 4 Community Centers for the Natomas region, I am in complete disagreement with this unsubstantiated proposal. I strongly recommend maintaining the promises originally made to these special tax districts in regards to community center development. Furthermore, I also recommend you consider how this change would affect the long term desirability and resulting tax revenue this region is so poised to produce for the city. I deeply and compassionately urge you to consider the unfied and increasingly growing voice and interest of Natomas residents in these General Plan proposed revisions and the potential political and electoral affects these proposed edits, as they relate to CCs, may have on city organizational structure. I sincerely thank you for your attention to these concerns. Sincerely, Natomas Tax Payer and Voter

Name: - Joe Smith

Economic Development Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Housing Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Can you please revise the plan to spread out inclusionary housing throughout the entire city, it really is a joke to cram it all in the "new growth area's". Further, try being more creative, add some smaller units mixed in with homes and add more ownership opportunities, you are making bigger problems by building 3 story 100% low income projects, do any of these bright planners with MA's look at police reports and trends in crime before developing low income housing, apparently not, look at N Natomas, finally, why is called a master plan, any developer with a high priced lawyer and go before the planning commission and change or modify whatever he wants, again just look at N Natomas.

Name: - Chantha Trinh

Economic Development Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)
Housing Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

We the residents of Natomas Park, a community of approximately 12,000 residents, request the Sacramento City Council establish the following rules: 1. When inclusionary housing units are proposed to be built that are not in the City's existing housing plan, the same number of units will be removed from another planned inclusionary project within the community ("off-site offset"). 2. Require market-rate housing be built first before the inclusionary element. Per Sacramento City code, 15% of market rate housing development is to be inclusionary housing. Zero percent of Zero = Zero. 3. Don't just develop inclusionary housing units in N. Natomas, make sure the entire city follows the 15% rule. These requests arise from our need to reverse 2 dangerous development precedents: 1. Willow Glen inclusionary apartments are being constructed now in the Natomas Meadows PUD before any market rate housing construction has been built (and while single family home development has been mothballed). Zero % of Zero should be Zero. 2. The Arena Seniors project has been allowed to go forward by Staff without a market-rate element. What has happened once will happen again. Our community needs to be economically compensated for the impact of inclusionary housing to our schools, our services and our economy. Natomas is having a tough enough time dealing with the economic impacts from flood insurance & home foreclosures. We emphasize that we are not opposed to inclusionary housing. But we want policy to be implemented in a true, mixed use manner with sufficient services to help compensate for the impacts. We are tired of seeing all affordable housing condensed into large, 3-story complexes with no ownership opportunities. I can be contacted at cxt0000@excite.com (that's 4 zeros)
Thanks, CJ

Name: - Maggie O'Mara

Mobility Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Two-way streets should not have more than 2 through lanes in each direction. One-way streets should not have more than 2 lanes. By the time left and right turn only lanes are

added at intersections, streets with more than 2 lanes in each direction become difficult for pedestrians to cross, especially people with limited mobility, children, and others. The street becomes an unpleasant place to walk, drive or ride a bicycle. Driver speeds increase and it's difficult to enforce the speed limit. The maximum speed limit on any city street should be 35 mph. 40 or 45 mph speed limits have no place in a city that wants to be "green" and encourage multi-modal travel. the intersection vehicle LOS at peak hours should be E, no higher.

Name: - Tristan Godt

Part 3 - Community Plan Goals and Policies

Please reconsider the General Plan update regarding Community Centers, especially for North Natomas. The current North Natomas Community Plan promises four centers for the community. One center per 35,000 residents is not nearly enough. There is no shortage of low-income apartments in our community, which is a burden on our current services. Where will all the children of the low-income apartments go for activities and to keep them out of trouble? We have a huge youth crime problem at present. Our community needs to be economically compensated for the impact of inclusionary housing to our schools, our services and our economy. Why not provide a livable community for our youth, families and seniors and fulfill your obligation to us? Thank you, Tristan Godt Board of Directors Natomas Park Master Association

Name: - Sue Teranishi

Mobility Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Thank you for staying true to the SACOG Blueprint principles of having transportation options! Some specific comments: M1.2 I support the change of LOS E in the CBD and D in general. We need to make it safer for pedestrians and bicyclists in the Central Business District! 1.3 We need to remove barriers to encourage more bicycling and to remove the gaps. Improving connections to transit is also very important. 1.4 Yes, we need to do more with TDM and encourage more people out of driving alone. 2.1 An integrated pedestrian system is so important! We are aging and need to make it safer for walking. Complete Streets needs to be the philosophy of the future as streets are not just for motor vehicles. 2.1.8 Making better connections between housing and destinations is smart. We need to provide shortcuts for bicyclists and pedestrians to encourage more non-motorized travel. 3.1 Yes, we need to have safe, comprehensive and integrated transit systems. Bus stops need to be on sidewalks with safe areas to wait for a bus and not all of them are now. 4.2 We absolutely need to keep a Complete Streets philosophy all over the City and make it safer for walkers and cyclists to get around. 4.4 I support limiting major arterials to a maximum of 4 lanes. I hate the 6 lane arterials that exist in Elk Grove; they promote speeding therefore are not bike or ped friendly 5.1.4 More needs to be done to reduce bike and vehicle conflicts. 5.1.11 Requiring bike facilities in new

developments is very important. i bike to work and would not do it without secure bike parking, showers and lockers where I can shower, store clothing and toiletries overnight. 5.1.13 More information and education for both bicyclists and motorists is needed for everyone's safety! 6.1.1 Appropriate parking should include requiring valet bike parking at many special events to encourage bicycling. 9.1.4 I support the use of pricing to maximize resources to fund new transportation facilities which should include amenities for pedestrians, including sidewalks, landscaping, street furniture, and bicycling improvements, not just roads and expanded transit. Pedestrian and bike improvements are cheaper to provide and yet we're way behind on making them.

Name: - Terry Preston

Mobility Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

M. 1.2.2 – Applaud use of “flexible” LOS standards in multimodal districts M 3.1.12 Direct Access to Stations. - The City should also work to provide pedestrian and bicycle improvements within a quarter mile of major transit stops and as needed on all transit stops to ensure safe, easy walking and biking to transit.

Name: - Nicole Hara

Comment is general/applies to entire document

The current North Natomas Community Plan and North Natomas Finance Plan dictate that North Natomas and West Natomas need four community centers. The General Plan update is proposing to limit community centers to only 1 per 35,000 residents. That is, only two community centers for a built-out North Natomas. I am really finding it difficult to understand what the city is thinking here. We have a younger community with less opportunities than more established neighborhoods. We need the community centers built to keep the youth engaged and out of trouble.

Land Use and Urban Design Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Goal LU 4.5 New Neighborhoods. Ensure that complete new neighborhoods embody the city’s principles of Smart Growth and Sustainability. Housing element H 1-2 The City exceeded the 2000–2007 RHNA need for the very low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income levels, and met 99 percent of its RHNA need for low-income units. In total, over 30,000 units were constructed or rehabilitated between 2000 and 2007, compared to a RHNA target of 19,313 units and a production goal of 14,365 units. Among these units are 718 multifamily units rehabilitated and/or preserved for low- and very lowincome households which do not count towards the RHNA goal, but represent a significant improvement to the existing housing stock for lower income renters. ** Since the city exceeded this, I would suggest that if more very-low, and low income housing is built in North Natomas, integrate it into the neighborhoods, rather than build these giant apartment complexes.

Land Use and Urban Design Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

LU 4.1.9 Residential Diversity. The City shall avoid concentrations of single-use high-density multifamily residential uses (e.g., apartments and condominiums) ** If this is the case, please stop building giant apartment structures in North Natomas. Integration is key here!!!

Land Use and Urban Design Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

LU 2.8.4 Housing Type Distribution. The City shall promote an equitable distribution of housing types for all income groups throughout the city and promote mixed-income developments rather than creating concentrations of below-market-rate housing in certain areas. (RDR/ MPSP) ** Again, please stop building the huge apartment complexes in North Natomas. Small dwellings, with the option to buy would be ideal. Concentration of the very low and low income residents into tightly packed apartment complexes surrounded by middle and upper middle income residents is a recipe for disaster. Integration, small 2-5 unit dwellings mixed in is ideal.

Housing Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

H 2-12 Program 3.2 called for annual analysis of development in North Natomas for compliance with the Community Plan for the area. This analysis was completed in 2003, and data indicated that the development was meeting Community Plan requirements. The City proposes to delete this program to focus effort and resources on other priorities. ** I was uncertain if this meant that the City would abandon the Community Plan for the area. If this is the case, then I suggest taking a step back before doing so. The residents of North Natomas are feeling very frustrated with how development and lack of services in their area is playing out. I think it would be a mistake for the City to say they are deleting the plan. If on the other hand I am just reading this wrong then disregard the comment.

Housing Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

LU 2.8.4 Housing Type Distribution. The City shall promote an equitable distribution of housing types for all income groups throughout the city and promote mixed-income developments rather than creating concentrations of below-market-rate housing in certain areas. (RDR/ MPSP) ** Stop building giant apartment complexes in North Natomas. If you truly want to be consistent, please read this document and follow what you have laid out. Goal LU 4.5 New Neighborhoods. Ensure that complete new neighborhoods embody the city's principles of Smart Growth and Sustainability. Housing element H 1-2 The City exceeded the 2000–2007 RHNA need for the very low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income levels, and met 99 percent of its RHNA need for low-income units. In total, over 30,000 units were constructed or rehabilitated between 2000 and 2007, compared to a RHNA target of 19,313 units and a production goal of 14,365 units. Among these units are 718 multifamily units rehabilitated and/or preserved for low- and very low-income households which do not count towards the RHNA goal, but represent a significant

improvement to the existing housing stock for lower income renters. ** Since we have exceed expectations, perhaps we can stop building the giant apartment complexes in North Natomas and focus on integrated options for families with the option to buy. H 8-25/26 Mixed-Income Housing Program The City of Sacramento adopted the Mixed Income Housing Ordinance (Inclusionary Ordinance) in October 2000, which requires that developments within new growth areas include at least 15 percent of their housing units at prices affordable to low- and very low-income households. An inclusionary housing requirement has the potential to constrain housing production by adding to the cost of building housing if developers must build the required affordable housing at less than cost, donate land, and/or pay in-lieu fees. The City has sought to reduce the cost impact of its ordinance by: □□ Limiting the ordinance's application to new growth areas, including North Natomas, Delta Shores, North Laguna Creek and other lands on southern border of the City of Sacramento, north of interstate 80, the two railyard redevelopment areas, and vacant lands on the City's southeast border; As an example, a single-family development in North Natomas required to comply with the Mixed Income Housing Ordinance can be approved as a moderate density subdivision with smaller housing units at higher densities (an average density of 12 units per net acre and a mix of patio homes, halfplexes, duplexes, bungalows, or second units) to reduce development costs, increase affordability, and allow a developer to comply with the ordinance. Such a development could choose to incorporate its inclusionary units on site or cause to be constructed (often through partnerships with affordable housing developers) a multifamily rental apartment complex offsite of the single-family development. The Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency administers the Mixed Income Housing Ordinance the City and is working on revisions to encourage homeownership outcomes by increasing the affordability target for homeownership units and allowing additional equity sharing for purchasers of inclusionary housing units. ** Reading the above passage I would think the City would be encouraging smaller mixed use options rather than the giant complexes we see all over North Natomas. Please reconsider any further developments that are high density apartment complexes. Integration is the key. If you create complexes that are almost entirely very-low or low income and place them in an area with single family homes and not a whole lot to do, you are creating a recipe for disaster. Think about many small units intermixed with the option to buy.

Housing Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

H 2-12 Program 3.2 called for annual analysis of development in North Natomas for compliance with the Community Plan for the area. This analysis was completed in 2003, and data indicated that the development was meeting Community Plan requirements. The City proposes to delete this program to focus effort and resources on other priorities. H 2-16 Monitor and Coordinate Housing Performance. The City has successfully completed or made progress towards completing all three objectives of this goal. □□ Program 10.2 is similar to Program 3.2 (monitoring of North Natomas Community Plan), which was recommended for deletion. Program 10.2 is also recommended for deletion. ** I am not sure if this means that the City will no longer follow the North Natomas Community Plan or if it just means that some of the goals have been met. I would hope that it is the later. The City has left us high and dry in North Natomas and after seeing all the money I paid

in taxes on the house, and beyond, I would hope that this area would continue to be monitored to ensure that all the money and infrastructure investment in the area is not wasted. If I read this wrong, sorry.

Public Health and Safety Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

PHS 1.1.1 Police Master Plan. The City shall maintain and implement a Police Master Plan to address staffing and facility needs, service goals, and deployment strategies. (MPSP) PHS 1.1.5 Distribution of Facilities. The City shall expand the distribution of police substation type facilities to allow deployment from several smaller facilities located strategically throughout the city and provide facilities in underserved and new growth areas in order to provide appropriate response to all city residents. (MPSP) PHS 1.1.6 Co-Location of Facilities. The City shall seek to colocate police facilities with other City facilities, such as fire stations, to promote efficient use of space and provision of police protection services within dense, urban portions of the city. (MPSP) ** I hope that this ties into the substation promised to North Natomas. Reading it at face value would lead me to believe it does but from the chatter I hear, perhaps I am being naive.

Education, Recreation and Culture Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

ERC 2.2.2 Timing of Services. The City shall ensure that the development of parks and community and recreation facilities and services keeps pace with development and growth within the city. (MPSP/SO) ** I would like to see more work done in the North Natomas area. The City allowed for the development at an accelerated pace, and therefore cannot complain when residents expect that services keep up. As a side note on Community Centers - As proposed, the update now limits community centers to only 1 per 35,000 residents. That is, only two community centers for a built-out North Natomas. The current North Natomas Community Plan and North Natomas Finance Plan dictate that North Natomas and West Natomas need four community centers. I noted in another comment that I hope the city is not scrapping the North Natomas Community Plan. Is it a coincidence that the General Plan calls for the deletion of the Community Plan in the housing element? Please shed a little light on this for me. I hope I am just reading this wrong.

Part 3 - Community Plan Goals and Policies

Sports Complex The Sports Complex consists of a 15+ acre, 19,000-seat arena and an 18.5+ acre, 65,000-seat stadium that will house major professional league sports teams. The complex also includes a 7.3+ acre amphiplaza, 145+ acres of parking, a private loop road, and four private driveway entrances. The existing (2007) Arco Arena is home of the Sacramento Kings, a National Basketball Association franchise team, and the site of other sports, cultural, and entertainment events. ** Is this still happening?

Part 3 - Community Plan Goals and Policies

The Town Center will be adjacent to a proposed light rail station and commercial site. The design of the Town Center will provide easy access to the commercial site and encourage activity to create a 24-hour mixed-use center. Town Center will be high-intensity and include community commercial, high-density residential, high-intensity employment generators, civic and recreation uses. The Town Center will be connected to the sports complex to the south, the community commercial center to the east, and the regional park to the north. ** Is this still being built?

Part 3 - Community Plan Goals and Policies

NN.LU 1.10 Density Near Transit. Because of the interdependence of the community on transit and the desire to promote transit ridership, the City shall allow the residential land areas within ¼ mile of a light rail station or bus transit center to exceed the maximum high-density range (RDR/ MPSP) ** What is slated to be near the east commerce/club center drive transit spot. There is an k-8 school going in right there and it is in a neighborhood. Is this supposed to be across the street at the proposed employment center? I would hope you would not place this right next to the school.

Part 3 - Community Plan Goals and Policies

NN.LU 1.14 Maximum Apartment Complex Size. The City shall ensure the maximum size of an apartment complex is 200 units and 8 acres. High-density residential projects in excess of 200 units and 8 acres must create multiple apartment complexes separated by a local street or other linkage. Apartment complex developers shall promote architectural variety and the use of varied exterior construction materials on adjacent complexes. Also, the height of apartment complexes shall be compatible when adjacent to single-family residences. The City shall promote the placement of one- and two-story multifamily units along streets and other linkages as a visual break. (RDR) **Please do not build more of these apartment complexes. Smaller more integrated options are what is needed now. The concentration of very-low and low income housing in such tight quarters is not the best environment. Give people the option to buy.

Part 3 - Community Plan Goals and Policies

Comment is general/applies to entire document

NN.ERC 1.6 Community Centers. The City shall provide for four community centers: one each in the west, northeast, and southeast quadrants of the Community, and the fourth in the Town Center. Each community center shall serve about 15,000 residents. ** Stay consistent with this statement. How can the general plan update double the number of residents a community center should serve?????? The GP update needs to be revised back to community centers serving 15,000 residents.

Public Health and Safety Element (Part 2 - Citywide Goals and Policies)

Part 3 - Community Plan Goals and Policies

NN PHS 1.2 Police Protection Service. The City shall locate a five-acre police substation in the Town Center. Locating the police station near the regional park enhances the sense of safety in the park. Prior to development, the City Police Department must verify adequate police protection facilities and services, including equipment and personnel, exists to serve the project, or will be provided, to maintain a police protection service standard of 1.60 police officers per 1,000 residents and 1.0 non-sworn personnel for every 1.60 police officers added either through a funded program or as a condition of approval for the project. The Police Department requires a police substation to be provided prior to 60 percent of the land being developed within the North and South Natomas areas. The station provides service to the subregion of North and South Natomas and is able and projected to accommodate 220 officers and non-sworn personnel. (MPSP) NN PHS 1.3 Police Protection. The City shall provide excellent fire and police protection to the residents, workers, and visitors to the North Natomas Community. (SO) ** Where is this??? I live in North Natomas and I can tell you it is a great community that needs permanent police stationed in the area with services available.