10

REPORT TO COUNCIL
City of Sacramento

915 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2671
www.CityofSacramento.org

CONSENT
November 22, 2005

Honorable Mayor and
Members of the City Council

Subject: Planning Issues Report and Vision & Guiding Principles for the General Plan Update (M05-005)

Location/Council District: Citywide/All Districts

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Council: 1) Approve the resolution of acceptance for the Planning Issues Report, which has been revised per Council's recommendations; and 2) Approve the resolution formally adopting the General Plan Vision & Guiding Principles containing Council's recommended changes, which also directs staff to return to Council with several workshops on key General Plan policy issues.

Contact: Steve Peterson, Principal Planner, 808-5981; Desmond Parrington, Associate Planner, 808-5044

Presenters: Steve Peterson, Principal Planner, 808-5981; Desmond Parrington, Associate Planner, 808-5044

Department: Development Services

Division: Planning

Organization No: 4827

Summary:

After review of the revised versions of the Planning Issues Report and the Vision & Guiding Principles, Council unanimously approved an intent motion to accept the Planning Issues Report and to adopt the Vision & Guiding Principles with Council's recommended changes.

The changes to the revised versions of the Planning Issues Report and the Guiding Principles are identified in an underline/strikeout format in the attachments. Attachment 1 contains Council's changes to the Planning Issues Report. Attachment 2 contains Council's recommended changes to the version of the Vision & Guiding Principles that was previously revised by staff, the General Plan Advisory Committee, Planning Commission and other boards and committees.

The Council-recommended changes to the Planning Issues Report (Attachment 1) were made in the following sections:

- Public safety/crime/police service issue: addition of police, fire and emergency services (p. 4)
- Natural resource protection issue: addition of native flora and fauna (p. 4)
- Table 1, Community Character & Design, Bullet # 6: addition of improved safety (p. 10)

The changes to the Vision & Guiding Principles (Attachment 2) were made in the following locations:

- Vision: Economy and jobs (p. 1)
- Vision: Sidewalks and connectivity (p. 1)
- Vision: Conventional and high speed passenger rail (p. 1)
- Vision: Urban heat islands (p. 2)
- Guiding Principle – Housing: Homeless bullet addition (p. 4)
- Guiding Principle – Public Health and Safety: Volunteerism bullet (p. 5)
- Guiding Principle – Services and Facilities: End homelessness change (p. 6)

Committee/Commission Action:

The Planning Issues Report and the revised Vision & Guiding Principles were approved by the General Plan Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission, and the Development Oversight Commission.

Background Information:

This report is designed to fulfill the intent motion adopted by Council on November 8, 2005. A full description of the background related to the Planning Issues Report and the Vision & Guiding Principles for the General Plan is included in the staff report on the issue for the Council meeting on November 8, 2005.

Financial Considerations:

None.

Environmental Considerations:

The Planning Issues Report and the Vision & Guiding Principles are not projects under Section 21065 of CEQA and CEQA Guidelines Section 15378 (b)(2). These reports are therefore covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3)).

Policy Considerations:

The Planning Issues Report and Vision & Guiding Principles as amended by Council are consistent with the City's Smart Growth Principles as well as with Council's 2005 Strategic Action Plan.

Emerging Small Business Development (ESBD):

No goods or services are being purchased.

Respectfully submitted by:

Carol Shearly
Director of Planning

Recommendation Approved:

ROBERT P. THOMAS
City Manager

Table of Contents:

Pg 1-3	Report
Pg 4-102	Attachment 1 - Revised Planning Issues Report as Amended by Council
Pg 103-110	Attachment 2 - Revised Vision & Guiding Principles as Amended by Council
Pg 111	Resolution of Acceptance for the Planning Issues Report
Pg 112-113	Resolution for Adoption of the Vision & Guiding Principles

ATTACHMENT 1

PLANNING ISSUES REPORT SACRAMENTO GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

Prepared for:

City of Sacramento

Prepared by:

EIP Associates

and

Mintier & Associates

August 22, 2005

Amended November 9, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES 1

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE SOURCES 6

MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES 7

MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES FROM THE TOWN HALL FORUMS 29

LIST OF TABLES

1. Matrix of Planning Issues 10

2. Matrix of Planning Issues from the Town Hall Forums 31

PLANNING ISSUES REPORT
SACRAMENTO GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
Revised Public Review Draft
Prepared August 22, 2005
Revised November 9, 2005

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to define and describe the key physical, environmental, economic, cultural, and social issues to be addressed in the General Plan Update (GPU). The report is based on early input into the GPU from several sources, including the first round of Town Hall Forums, General Plan Focus Group interviews, the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and the GPU Technical Background Report (TBR).

The information in this Planning Issues Report (Phase 3 of the GPU) will be used to shape the Vision and Guiding Principles Report (Phase 4 of the GPU). These two reports will in turn provide a framework for Phase 5 (Growth and Development Alternatives) and Phase 6 (General Plan Policy – Draft General Plan) of the GPU. Phase 5 will identify and assess alternative land use scenarios within the context of the defined issues and vision and principles. The alternatives will be defined at a citywide scale and for targeted "areas of opportunity." Phase 6 will set forth the goals, policies, and programs for each of the General Plan elements based on the defined issues from this report (Phase 3), the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles Report from Phase 4, and the preferred growth and land use development strategy from Phase 5.

This report first describes 14 ***key issues*** to be addressed in the GPU identified by the Consulting Team based on a review of input from the community, advisory committees, City staff and the Consulting Team. Following this is a description of the sources of input used in preparing this report. Finally, there are two matrices that provide: 1) a list of all the major issues from the various input sources; and 2) a summary of the issues identified in the first round of Town Hall Forums.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The following is a summary of the key issues and major themes that emerged from a review of all the input from the community, advisory committees, City staff and the Consulting Team.

• Smart Growth

The City of Sacramento adopted a set of Smart Growth Principles in 2001. These principles promote compact development, higher residential densities, mixed-uses, a range of transportation choices, walkable neighborhoods, quality schools, and open space protection. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments' Blueprint project advocated a similar set of Smart Growth Principles for the region. These regional and City-adopted Smart Growth Principles encompass many of the other issues mentioned

frequently by community members as important issues to be addressed in the General Plan. Those interviewed as part of the General Plan Focus Groups stressed the importance of implementing Smart Growth principles. These Smart Growth principles will need to be incorporated throughout the various elements of the new plan. However, it is recognized that some public concern may exist regarding how and where some of the principles are implemented, such as higher densities, and the implications for protecting community character.

- **Sustainability and Livability**

Sustainability is a "whole systems" approach to community development that balances environmental, economic, and social equity concerns. It overlaps with the concepts of livability and Smart Growth principles. In practice, sustainability typically encompasses renewable energy sources, water conservation, waste recycling, green building technology, community design, walkability, and public health. Urban form can play an important role in public health by promoting walking and other forms of exercise. Sustainability and livability goals are key components of the City Council's Strategic Plan, adopted in March 2005. The importance of these goals was acknowledged in several sources of community input.

- **Affordable housing**

Affordable housing is one the most critical issues facing Sacramento and other cities throughout California. Housing prices are rising much more rapidly than incomes, pricing out young families and much of our work force. Producing affordable housing requires an adequate land supply with public services and a range of housing types, including higher density housing, to meet the needs of all economic segments. In the Town Hall Forums, participants ranked the distribution of affordable housing throughout the city and the amount of affordable housing third and sixth, respectively, as the most important issues to be addressed in the General Plan. Affordable housing was one of the top 16 issues identified by those interviewed as part of the General Plan Focus Group participants. Providing affordable housing is also one of the four major goals in the City Council's Strategic Plan, adopted in March 2005.

- **Mixed-use, higher-density development/infill**

Much of Sacramento's projected growth must be accommodated by infill and reuse within our existing urban area. Carefully designed higher-density and mixed-use development can make efficient use of land and existing infrastructure, revitalize neighborhoods, and promote the use of alternative modes of transportation. At the same time, infill and higher-density development create concerns about neighborhood compatibility, congestion, and deficient infrastructure in older neighborhoods. Town Hall Forum participants ranked mixed-use, higher-density development around light rail stations and along commercial corridors second among issues to be addressed in the General Plan. Related to this, Town Hall participants ranked streetscape quality, including sidewalks and trees fifth among issues to be addressed in the Plan. Infill was one of the top 16 issues identified by those interviewed as part of the General Plan Focus Group participants. Another issue mentioned was the design, height, and scale

of new higher-density development particularly in the central city and in existing neighborhoods.

- **Economic development**

A healthy, vibrant community depends on a healthy economy. Sustaining economic growth and creating jobs in parallel with population growth requires an educated workforce, high quality of life, supportive local government attitudes, available and well-located land, and high quality infrastructure. Town Hall Forum participants ranked jobs near housing and cultural and entertainment attractions in Downtown ninth and fourteenth, respectively, among issues to be addressed in the General Plan. Economic development was one of the top 16 issues identified by General Plan Focus Groups participants. Expanding economic development throughout the city is one of the four major goals of the City Council's Strategic Plan, adopted in March 2005.

- **Level of Service (LOS) for roadways**

Communities use level-of-service (LOS) standards to measure traffic conditions and guide decisions on needed roadway improvements. LOS A reflects free flowing traffic conditions, LOS F the most congested level. Maintaining high level of service standards for roadways to achieve low levels of congestion conflicts with encouraging higher densities of development and alternative modes of transportation. The current LOS standard of "C" in the City's General Plan for all collectors and arterials does not allow the City to balance land use decisions with traffic flow considerations. Town Hall Forum participants ranked congestion on major streets and neighborhood traffic and speeding seventh and twelfth, respectively, among issues to be addressed in the General Plan. City staff identified level of service standards for roadways as one of the top issues to be addressed in the General Plan.

- **Service standards for public facilities**

While level-of-service standards are routinely used by communities to set performance policy for roadways and parks, level-of-service standards are used much less frequently in setting policy for such other facilities and services as police, fire, libraries, and infrastructure such as water, wastewater and drainage. Establishing a more comprehensive set of level-of-service standards would provide a more systematic approach to requiring project-related improvements, including perhaps different standards for urban versus suburban areas. It would also help in budgeting for improvements to facilities and for staffing levels, although operation and maintenance of these levels of service, as well as providing new services and infrastructure, are currently a major budgetary constraint. City staff identified level of service standards as one of the top issues to be addressed in the General Plan.

- **Alternative transportation modes**

While increasing the overall mobility of Sacramento residents is important, the need to provide safe and convenient alternatives to the automobile was also a major theme running through comments from all sources of input. The primary alternatives are public transit, bicycling, and walking. Town Hall Forum participants ranked congestion on major

streets and improving air quality seventh and eleventh, respectively, among issues to be addressed in the General Plan. Town Hall participants also ranked walkable neighborhoods and light rail expansion fourth and tenth, respectively, among issues to be addressed in the General Plan. Focus Group participants identified traffic congestion and more transit access among the top 16 issues to be addressed in the General Plan.

- **Public safety/crime/police service**

Town Hall Forum participants ranked safe neighborhoods the highest among all issues to be addressed in the General Plan. Crime and personal safety was an issue mentioned repeatedly by General Plan Focus Group participants. In addition, disaster preparedness for both manmade and natural disasters, such as flooding, was a critical issue identified by both staff and the public. Improving and expanding public safety is one of the four major goals in the City Council's Strategic Plan, adopted in March 2005. Addressing these concerns is not just an issue of police, fire and emergency services, ~~enforcement~~ but also neighborhood cohesiveness and organization and the physical design and maintenance of neighborhoods and public places.

- **Air quality**

Air quality is a major concern for residents of Sacramento and as well as residents of the rest of the Central Valley. Poor air quality is a significant heath risk, a quality of life issue, and a constraint on economic development. While stationary sources of air pollution are a concern, the major source of air pollution in Sacramento is motor vehicles. Town Hall Forum participants ranked improving air quality eleventh among issues to be addressed in the General Plan. Focus Group participants identified air quality as one of the top 16 issues to be addressed in the General Plan. Promoting alternatives to the private automobile such as transit, biking, and walking and urban forms that support these alternatives are keys to addressing air quality issues.

- **Open space/farmland protection**

Protecting agricultural and open space land was ranked eighth by Town Hall Forum participants among issues to be addressed in the General Plan. Town Hall Forum participants ranked protecting the Sacramento River, American River, and creeks thirteenth among issues to addressed in the General Plan. Numerous comments from those interviewed as part of the General Plan Focus Group participants also were concerned with open space issues, including particularly the Sacramento and American River corridors. In light of future projected population growth, protection of open space and farmland will likely require the consideration of higher densities and more compact future development.

- **Natural Resource Protection**

Protection of natural resources was identified as an important issue by City staff, and mentioned as an issue of concern by Town Hall Forum participants and General Plan Advisory Committee members. Natural habitats, which ~~that~~ are home to native flora and fauna as well as protected species, are diminishing, and it has become increasingly difficult to preserve these natural resources due to high mitigation costs and increasing

pressure to accommodate future growth. A balance between natural resource protection and providing for future populations will need to be made, which will likely require the consideration of higher densities and more compact development. Management of the urban forest was also raised as an important issue by City staff. The City's existing urban forest needs to be carefully managed and preserved for future generations.

- **General Plan implementation**

The effectiveness of a general plan is only as good as its implementation. A major theme in the early input in the General Plan Update from all sources is a concern for how the vision and policies of the new General Plan will be carried out and how these will impact decisions that are made by both staff and Council. This is not only a question of how much specific direction the plan itself provides but also a question of the City's continuing and consistent commitment to implementing the General Plan and effective political leadership.

- **Streamlined permit processing**

A key aspect of general plan implementation is City processing of private development entitlements, covering the range from General Plan amendments to building permits. The City has been criticized by the development community and the public for a slow and cumbersome permit process. These criticisms were voiced in the Focus Group interviews and at the Town Hall Forums. City staff also identified streamlining and zoning code implementation as one of the top issues for the General Plan. The City has taken steps to address this issue through the creation of the Development Oversight Commission to identify measures to streamline permit-processing. The General Plan can facilitate streamlining the development process by identifying issues up front, creating transparent expectations, and achievable standards for developers and the City. With more easily understood requirements and guidance, the need for technical studies required under the California Environmental Quality Act may be reduced.

Conclusion

What is apparent from a review of the top 14 issues is that many of the issues overlap and are closely related. Smart growth, sustainability, and livability are related umbrella concepts that encompass and involve many of the other issues such as mixed-use, higher density development/infill, and alternative transportation modes. By incorporating smart growth principles and sustainability/livability concepts, many of the key issues such as affordable housing, economic development, alternative transportation modes, public safety, air quality, open space/farmland protection, and natural resource protection would be addressed and the adverse effects minimized. Incorporating these principles and concepts also affect the key issues of establishing different LOS for roadways and service standards for public facilities. Establishing and implementing the level of service standards are also constrained by the City's funding for capital improvement projects. Smart growth principles and sustainability/livability concepts would be most effectively implemented by addressing the key issues related to effective general plan implementation and streamlined permit processing.

The 14 key issues will be addressed during the formation of the vision and guiding principles, which will provide a framework for and direct the formulation of alternative land uses for Sacramento. These key issues and ideas will also be encompassed and addressed within the updated General Plan policies.

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE SOURCES

The following is a description of the sources used in compiling this report. The information from these sources is summarized in Table 1 Matrix of Planning Issues.

1) GPU Focus Group Interviews

As part of Phase 1 of the General Plan Update, the City's General Plan Consultants and City Staff conducted a series of focus group interviews in January 2005. The City-selected focus group members are key community stakeholders who represent a broad range of community interests (e.g., neighborhoods, social services, business, development, environmental, and public interest). Focus group members were interviewed individually or in groups of two or three. In three cases, individuals who were unable to participate in the interviews submitted written comments. A total of twenty-five focus group members provided input.

The interviews were organized around a standard set of questions but provided interviewees ample opportunity to offer additional comments. There were several different sets of questions that were asked of focus group members depending on their affiliation. Summaries of the focus group interviews are available in the *Summary of Focus Group Interviews* document in Appendix A of this document.

2) GPAC Group Interviews

The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) is a 25-member group appointed by the City Council to assist City staff and the Consulting Team during the GPU. Eight members were appointed by City Council District and 17 members were appointed at-large. On April 4, 2005, the GPAC members broke into five groups and responded to the same set of questions used in the Focus Group interviews. These responses are summarized in the *Key Summary Points of All Groups and Context* document in Appendix B of this document.

3) Technical Background Report (TBR) Findings and Other Subconsultant Issues

The *Public Review Draft Technical Background Report* was published in June 2005. Each of the topical sections within the chapters of the TBR concludes with a short list of findings. These findings are used as a source for issues in the Issues Matrix. In addition, several members of the Consulting Team compiled a list of additional key issues for the Issues Matrix.

4) City Development Services Staff and Other Department Issues

Since the beginning of the GPU project, City Development Services Department staff has worked on a list of issues to be addressed in the GPU. The list has been expanded

and revised by City staff since Fall 2004. The final list of 68 issues was completed on February 8, 2005 and shown in Appendix B. Two other City departments identified additional key issues in follow-up memos also provided in Appendix C.

5) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is a committee of approximately 40 representatives from different City departments and several non-City agencies. The purpose of the TAC is to provide technical input in the GPU. At meetings in February, March, and April 2005, the TAC developed a list of issues that it felt needed to be addressed in the GPU as shown in Appendix C.

6) Town Hall Forums

The first round of 14 GPU Town Hall Forums was held at locations throughout Sacramento during May and June 2005. Participants at the Town Hall Forums completed surveys identifying the five most important issues to be addressed in the updated General Plan. Participants also completed two mapping exercises responding to a range of questions about their neighborhoods and the City as a whole. The results of the forums documenting key issues were summarized in a separate report.

MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

Table 1 Matrix of Planning Issues consists of three components: 1) description of planning issues; 2) source of the issue; and 3) where in the GPU process the issues will be addressed.

The first column of the table describes the planning issues that have been identified to date, and are grouped in the broader categories of Community Development (land use, community character and design, population and demographics, housing, economic development, and major development areas), Mobility/Transportation (roadways, transit services and railways, bikeways and pedestrian facilities), Public Facilities (sewer/storm drain, reclaimed water and domestic water, solid waste/recycling, energy, and telecommunication), Public Services (police and fire protection, parks and recreation, schools, libraries, community centers, and human services), Environmental Resources (sustainability, natural/biological resources, water resources and quality, cultural resources, mineral resources, air quality, and scenic resources), Public Health and Safety (geologic and seismic hazards, flood hazards, fire hazards, noise, hazardous materials, and emergency response), Other (environmental justice/social equality, effective political leadership/will, and fiscal/financial), GPU process, and GPU format. The second part of Table 1 identifies the source of the issue: the GPU focus group interviews; GPAC group interviews; TBR findings and the consulting team; City staff; and the TAC. Many of the issues were mentioned by more than one source. Lastly, Table 1 also shows where in the GPU process each issue will be addressed. Issues can be addressed in the vision/guiding principles, alternatives phase, at the general plan policy phase, and/or in the Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan.

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT											
Land Use											
1.	Urbanization has resulted in a loss of open space and agricultural land in the Sacramento area. Balancing protection of open space and agricultural land with accommodation of future population growth may require higher density and infill development.			√	√		√		√	√	
2.	In addition to sustaining downtown as the center of the State and local governments, there is a desire for downtown to become a 24-hour walkable and vibrant destination complete with housing, jobs, entertainment, and cultural/art facilities. Important catalyst sites exist that should be developed, especially the Railyards.	√					√		√	√	
3.	The waterfront represents an underutilized amenity, and there is the desire to increase access to the rivers through riverfront development, while still preserving the natural features of the rivers.	√	√				√		√	√	
4.	There are potential benefits and challenges in incorporating mixed-use, higher-density development around light rail stations and along commercial corridors. Adequate public infrastructure and services will be needed, and compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods and community support must be considered.				√	√	√	√	√	√	
5.	The Blueprint preferred growth scenario, which provides conceptual guidance for the General Plan Update, was approved by all participating jurisdictions in the six-county region. The preferred scenario promotes compact mixed-use development with a mix of densities. Implementing the Blueprint's Smart Growth Principles will influence all elements of the General Plan and parts of Sacramento.	√		√			√		√	√	
6.	While infill development provides many benefits such as economic revitalization, adequate public infrastructure and services, as well as	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
	compatibility with adjacent uses need to be considered. There are also questions of whether infill development should be implemented throughout the City or only in certain strategic areas, and at what densities.										
7.	Both infill and Greenfield growth will be necessary to accommodate future growth. How to achieve balance between these types of development should be addressed in the Plan.				√				√	√	
8.	While strong support exists for implementing Smart Growth principles within the City, compatibility with existing neighborhood character will be an issue.	√	√		√			√	√	√	
9.	There is an opportunity to more efficiently use public facilities such as parks, libraries, and schools through joint use agreements (detention basins).				√					√	
10.	Areas in rural transition areas, such as the Lemon Hill and Robla areas, currently contain deep lots that are difficult for developers to build standard products on. As a result, these lots remain undeveloped.				√					√	
11.	Certain regional issues cross over City boundaries (such as air quality and regional circulation traffic conditions). Some of these issues are outside the ability of the City alone to rectify, but the City can do its share to address them, working collaboratively with other government entities.				√					√	
	Community Character and Design										
1.	Existing developments are of variable character and quality, and some are not compatible with adjacent uses at times.		√							√	
2.	In light of the increasing number of proposals for taller buildings in downtown, design standards and building height limits may be necessary to protect view corridors and adjacent historic districts. The form and structure of new development should be considered, including the possibility of fewer but taller buildings vs. larger number of mid-rise buildings.			√	√		√		√	√	
3.	Some developments within the City have not maintained the streetscape quality. Some areas lack amenities such as sidewalks, trees, and other pedestrian-oriented features.						√			√	
4.	Additional infill and Greenfield development can impact the existing character of an area, threatening Sacramento's small town feel. Some feel that	√			√		√	√	√	√	

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
	preserving the small town feeling is important.										
5.	With the increasing amount of development, historic buildings and places are being threatened. Approaches addressing historic preservation on a Citywide basis should be considered in the plan.						√			√	√
6.	The Sacramento and American River corridors provide dramatic visual and open space elements within the City, yet flood control and transportation facilities have reduced the visual and physical connections to these resources. The visual/physical barriers created by levees, railroads, freeways, and street corridors need to be minimized, and the river corridors need to be opened up for more physical and visual access as well as for improved safety.			√			√			√	
7.	One of the most frequently noted characteristics of Sacramento's older neighborhoods is the magnificent mature trees that form a shady canopy over the City's downtown streets. In spite of the real need for shade with Sacramento's hot summer climate, the regular planting of large canopy street trees has not been replicated in most developments since World War II.			√			√			√	
8.	The older neighborhoods in Sacramento provide excellent examples of highly accessible and interconnected areas that safely and efficiently accommodate a mixture of cars, transit, bicycles and pedestrians. In other areas the combination of auto-oriented subdivision design and physical barriers created by freeways, rail lines, and major arterials serve to fragment the City and divide neighborhoods. New neighborhoods need to be better connected for all modes of transportation, and connections between existing neighborhoods should be improved.			√			√		√	√	
9.	Urban form and the structure of new development in the Central Business District should consider compatibility with existing structures.				√					√	
10.	Existing neighborhood identity and urban form could be adversely affected if new development and infill is not carefully planned. With entirely new developments, neighborhood identity needs to be created.	√		√					√	√	
11.	New development is encroaching upon open space resources and greenbelt/buffers.				√			√	√	√	√

16

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
12.	With increased mixed-use and high-density developments, there is a need for Citywide development standards and design review.				√					√	
	Population and Demographics										
1.	The City is projected to have 650,000 residents by 2030. This figure includes the current City boundaries, the Panhandle, and the Natomas Joint Vision Area. This amount of growth reflects an average of 8,000 additional residents every year, for a total growth of 200,000 new residents between 2005 and 2030.			√					√	√	
2.	As the population growth rate continues to increase, additional residents will need to be accommodated, which will require additional land area.			√			√		√	√	
3.	Sacramento's population is aging, changing the demand patterns for transit, housing, and public services.	√		√			√		√	√	
4.	There is a need to provide for a socially and economically diverse population by providing a range of jobs, transportation and housing options, and other service needs.	√		√				√	√	√	
5.	The City is projected to have 450,000 employees by 2030. This level of growth reflects roughly 60,000 new jobs per decade, or a total of 180,000 new jobs between 2000 and 2030. This increase in employees is driven by growth in services (professional, health, education, and business), government, retail trade, and life sciences.			√						√	
	Housing										
1.	As housing prices increase, more residents are unable to afford housing in the City.	√	√	√	√		√		√	√	
2.	There is concern for a high concentration of affordable housing in any one area. Affordable housing should be equitably distributed throughout the City in neighborhoods with a mixture of housing types.			√		√	√		√	√	
3.	There is strong support for different housing choices and types for residents.	√	√			√	√	√	√	√	
4.	Additional housing in downtown will require additional services (e.g., parks, grocery stores, schools) for the expanding residential population.		√				√	√	√	√	

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
5.	Homelessness is a growing problem, and government programs and services are unable to meet the needs or effectively serve this population.	√	√					√		√	
6.	As new development, infill development, and revitalization occurs, housing prices increase and squeeze out the less affluent residents. Gentrification of existing neighborhoods is a concern.				√			√		√	
	Economic Development										
1.	Growth trends in California and the region will support strong population and housing growth in the City. The regional economy is largely tied to rapid population growth brought about by inexpensive housing in relation to the Bay Area. The City's status as the State capital also serves as an economic engine for the City and the Region.			√			√		√	√	
2.	The region's manufacturing base is "holding on" as California's base dwindles.			√			√			√	
3.	The region is well-positioned to expand in the life sciences cluster.			√			√			√	
4.	All indicators point to the need to evolve labor force capabilities.			√			√			√	
5.	There is general concern that the City maintains a strong local economy with a broad range of jobs, while still being able to compete regionally by attracting desirable businesses.	√	√		√	√				√	
6.	Many job centers are currently located away or are separated from existing housing developments, and most residents need to commute.		√				√	√	√	√	
7.	Many older commercial corridors are deteriorating, and are in need of revitalization to accommodate future economic growth.			√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
8.	New large, chain stores are being built in all parts of the City, often replacing small businesses. Small businesses provide a large source of jobs, while contributing to the City's unique character.						√			√	
9.	There is wide support for additional cultural and art facilities, as well as entertainment attractions in downtown.	√					√		√	√	
10.	There are deteriorated properties and/or buildings in many parts of the City, which can be an obstacle to revitalizing neighborhoods.			√			√			√	
11.	There is currently an oversupply of commercial and office land in certain			√	√				√	√	

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
	areas, which could be redesignated for housing and mixed-use development.										
12.	Industrial reserve land is needed to support projected employment growth.				√				√	√	
13.	The City competes in a broad regional market for office development. Only specialized users deriving special benefit from proximity to the State government, finance, and other key CBD functions will pay the premiums associated with a location in the CBD. The role of the City within the region with regard to providing premium and other types of office space needs to be considered.			√	√				√	√	
14.	Increased employment in the services, government, retail trade, and life sciences sectors will generate new demand for office, industrial, retail, and institutional space.			√					√	√	
15.	Increasing demand for entertainment and regional shopping should favor urban, diverse areas such as downtown.			√			√		√	√	
16.	The City can compete effectively for economic development and can enhance its role through meaningful regional collaboration.			√			√			√	
17.	Overall land supply in the City may be adequate in terms of accommodating demand through 2030, assuming the annexation and development of the Natomas Joint Vision Area and the Panhandle.			√			√		√	√	
18.	Realization of development potential will require the City and the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency to engage in an intensive process of reusing vacant infill and underutilized parcels scattered throughout the City.			√			√		√	√	
19.	With the increasing support for smart growth developments, the City needs to identify appropriate locations for auto-oriented uses that include regional retail and big box developments, and auto malls.			√	√				√	√	
20.	Tourism currently is a strong contributor to the City's economy, and there are opportunities to improve this industry.			√		√			√	√	
21.	Future demographics will create demand for smaller and higher density housing units.			√			√		√	√	
22.	The desire for affordability in the City will increase the demand for smaller, denser housing.			√			√		√	√	

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
	Major Development Areas										
1.	Planning for the Downtown Union Pacific Railyards area has been ongoing for many years. The most recent proposal indicates a great interest in residential development as part of the project.	√		√			√		√	√	
2.	Some residents would like to see a mixed-use development implemented in the Richards Boulevard area, while others would like it to become part of the proposed Gold Rush Park.			√			√		√	√	
3.	The Delta Shores site in South Sacramento represents the largest undeveloped area within the City. The appropriate mix of land uses still needs to be decided.	√		√			√		√	√	
4.	The Natomas Joint Vision area represents the largest expansion area for the City of Sacramento. The City is in ongoing discussions with the County on the appropriate mix of uses.	√					√		√	√	
5.	Because of its size and location, the Executive Airport might be a candidate for redevelopment as a large-scale, mixed-use project.					√			√	√	
MOBILITY/TRANSPORTATION											
	General										
1.	There are not enough alternatives to the automobile.		√						√	√	
2.	With changing demographics, there could be change in mode split increasing transit rider ship.			√	√				√	√	
	Roadways										
1.	Traffic congestion on major streets is increasing and expressed as a concern.	√	√	√			√		√	√	√
2.	The Sacramento and American Rivers are impediments to the overall regional transportation system, and bridges would improve the system. However, bridges would have a great impact on the surrounding neighborhoods. There are proposals for two bridges connecting West Sacramento with Sacramento, and one bridge over the American River.	√	√		√		√			√	
3.	Of the 250 roadway segments in Sacramento studied for the GPU, 50 are considered congested or highly congested, with LOS standards of E or F. Of			√			√			√	

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
	the remainder, 90 operate at LOS C or better and 110 operate at LOS D. Of the 50 study roadways reported to operate at LOS E or F, almost half (21 segments) are freeway segments.										
4.	Traffic volumes are increasing, which has caused additional traffic and speeding in neighborhoods, adversely affecting the quality of life.					√	√			√	√
5.	The City's current goal is LOS C for all roadways and intersections within the City. To maintain LOS C conditions within the City, many roadways will need to be widened, which will create longer crossing distances for pedestrians and wider roadways for bicyclists to traverse. To meet its adopted Smart Growth principles, the City will be re-evaluating the LOS policy during the General Plan Update.	√	√	√	√	√	√			√	√
6.	There have been a number of street abandonments within the Central City, and there is a desire to protect the Central City grid. Additional street abandonment should be considered based on merit and benefit to the City.				√					√	
7.	Street standards should be reevaluated as some roadways have been built to accommodate more traffic than has actually occurred.				√					√	
8.	Maximum parking requirements should be considered to prevent too much parking in certain areas of the City, such as transit stations.				√					√	
9.	There are six- to eight-lane arterials that bisect parts of the North Natomas Community Plan near transit stations. These arterials create barriers for pedestrians, and are inconsistent with the transit oriented development in the area.				√					√	
10.	Roadway phasing issues such as missing sidewalks and lack of bicycle facilities can be problematic in Greenfield areas.			√						√	
	Transit Services & Railways										
1.	RT is the primary transit service provider for the City with fixed route bus and light rail transit service. RT served 27 million passengers in 2002 and reported an increase in rider ship of three percent for buses and 15 percent for light rail transit within the 2003-2004 fiscal year.			√						√	
2.	Planned improvements for RT service include the South Sacramento Corridor			√			√			√	

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
	Phase 2 Project that would extend service from the existing Meadowview station, for a distance of approximately five miles, to the intersection of Calvine Road and Auberry Drive. Four new stations would be provided at Franklin Boulevard, Center Parkway, Cosumnes River College, and Calvine/Auberry. The planned Downtown/Natomas/Airport Project would extend service between downtown Sacramento and the Sacramento International Airport. Planned light rail expansion should increase daily rider ship.										
3.	There is a conflict in existing policy between supporting transit in the downtown and the current parking policies which create a supply of parking that does not result in a significant disincentive to automobile use.			√	√					√	
4.	Transit is not always accessible or available to everyone within the City.	√					√			√	
5.	The Amtrak route connecting Sacramento to the Bay Area is one of the fastest growing corridors in the U.S., and expansion of Amtrak services and facilities may be necessary to accommodate future growth.	√					√			√	
	Bikeways and Pedestrian Facilities										
1.	Approximately two percent of City residents commute to work by bicycle. Additional improvements and expansions to the bikeways could increase the number of residents that commute by bicycle.			√			√			√	
2.	The City's existing bikeway system is not connected or continuous. With an interconnected and continuous system, bicyclists can reach more areas of the City.	√	√				√			√	
3.	Currently, not all neighborhoods are walkable; pedestrian amenities such as sidewalks, landscaping, and narrow streets contribute to the walkability of an area.		√				√	√	√	√	
4.	Many streets and neighborhoods lack pedestrian facilities.	√								√	
5.	Current General Plan policies on crossing safety, pedestrian zone overlays, and access to services are not specific. More specific policies should be considered to improve citywide pedestrian conditions.			√						√	

22

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
	GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
PUBLIC UTILITIES (INFRASTRUCTURE)										
General										
1. There are some people that feel existing public facilities are inadequate to serve their needs.		√							√	
2. If infill development or redevelopment is appropriate, there is a question of whether these types of developments can be supported without public subsidies.				√	√				√	
3. Different infrastructure standards have resulted in a lack of continuity between some parts of the City.				√					√	
4. There are infrastructure deficiencies in new annexation areas.				√	√				√	√
5. Existing utility service standards may need to be modified to be compatible with the infill, mixed-use, and higher density developments that are being proposed for urban areas.				√					√	
Sewer/Storm Drain										
1. During large storm events surface outflows from inlets and manholes can occur in the combined sewer system (CSS).			√						√	√
2. Future regional combined sewer mitigation projects for the CSS are necessary to allow new development to proceed. Implementation and timing of these projects are issues to consider for future development to proceed.				√					√	
3. Thresholds exist within the CSS that will define timing and implementation of mitigation projects to facilitate future development. Development projections will have to be defined to determine thresholds.				√					√	
4. The Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) provides sewage treatment for the entire Policy Area with its wastewater treatment plant just south of the City Limits. The Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant has an existing permitted capacity of 181 million gallons per day (mgd) for dry weather flows and 392 mgd for wet weather flow levels. Currently, wastewater flows are 165 mgd for dry weather flows and 240 mgd for wet weather flows. At full build out, which is scheduled to occur sometime after			√			√			√	√

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
	2010, the plant will have a peak wet weather capacity of 600 mgd.										
5.	Parts of the trunk sewer system within the City are having problems due to infiltration/inflow, surcharged pipes, illegal taps, and lack of facilities.			√			√			√	
6.	Current onsite drainage systems, located primarily in North Sacramento but outside of North Natomas, that are approved to allow development are not adequate as long term solutions and will be obsolete when regional drainage solutions are in place. Current systems are piecemealed and won't connect to future drainage infrastructure.				√					√	
7.	No drainage development fee exists similar to water and sewer development fees, in North Sacramento but outside of North Natomas. Thus, no capital improvement funds exist to build large regional drainage infrastructure projects that would serve future development.				√					√	
8.	Currently, there is undersized drainage infrastructure or no infrastructure at all in some areas located primarily in North Sacramento but outside of North Natomas. Future development will have to mitigate and fund regional solutions to alleviate potential problems.				√					√	
	Reclaimed and Domestic Water										
1.	The City's water entitlements are sufficient to serve the entire City (including future expansions of the City Limits) and also provide water to other local water purveyors in need of additional water supply.			√			√			√	√
2.	Although the City is focused on developing surface water as its primary source of water supply (due to concern over depleting the groundwater supply), the groundwater well system provides flexibility in providing domestic water to the City, especially in years when there are low river flows.			√						√	√
3.	Within the water distribution system, deficiencies have been identified in portions of the Community Plan areas of the Central City, North Sacramento and South Sacramento.			√			√			√	√
4.	Reclaimed water is not used within the City. The City and SRCSD produced a preliminary feasibility analysis that suggested, based on economics alone, that it would not be cost effective at this time.			√						√	√

42

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
	GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
Solid Waste / Recycling										
1. Although the landfills that serve the City have adequate capacity to accept waste generated within the City, there is an opportunity to improve recycling programs and to reduce the solid waste stream.			√						√	√
Energy										
1. There is general support for increased energy efficiency to reduce energy consumption.	√	√		√	√	√			√	√
2. There is support for developing green building standards.		√		√		√			√	
Telecommunication										
1. Availability of high speed internet is important to residents, businesses, and public agencies.			√	√					√	
PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES										
General										
1. Existing public service standards may need to be modified to be compatible with the infill, mixed-use, and higher density developments that are being proposed for urban areas.				√					√	
Public Safety - Police & Fire Protection										
1. The Sacramento Police Department does not have an adopted response time standard.			√			√			√	√
2. As population continues to grow, there are concerns for maintaining emergency response times and ambulance services.			√			√			√	√
3. New police substations may be needed in new growth areas in the North, Cnetral, and South portions of the City.			√	√		√			√	
4. A major concern of residents is for reducing crime and increasing personal safety. Good urban design and planning practices could contribute to this.	√	√					√	√		
5. There is an opportunity to make neighborhoods more safe and comfortable for all.						√	√	√		
6. The Sacramento Fire Department typically considers paramedic response			√			√			√	

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
	times to an incident in eight minutes or less, 90 percent of the time, an acceptable level of service. The average response time ranges from four to five minutes for emergency calls.										
7.	Land has been set aside for future fire stations including: Shasta/Bruceville, Arena Boulevard/El Centro, and a possible relocation of Station 3 to Crossfield/Lindbergh at Sacramento International Airport.[1]			√			√			√	
	Parks and Recreation										
1.	The Sacramento's Parks and Recreation Master Plan identifies specific areas that are underserved for citywide/regionally serving facilities. These areas include: ▪ Railyards and riverfront areas in Central Sacramento ▪ Meadowview and North Laguna areas of South Sacramento ▪ Robla and Valley View areas of North Sacramento.			√			√			√	
2.	The Sacramento's Parks and Recreation Master Plan identifies the following areas as currently being underserved for neighborhood and community parks: ▪ Land Park ▪ East Broadway ▪ North Sacramento ▪ South Sacramento ▪ East Sacramento ▪ Central City			√			√			√	
3.	There is a need for additional park facilities and potentially a change in standards to adequately serve current and future residents. These facilities also need to be maintained.						√			√	√
4.	There is a need for additional and improved recreational programs.						√			√	
5.	The current minimum park size on a citywide basis is five acres, which may not be possible to achieve in infill areas such as the Central City. There is a need for policies that allow for smaller, more urban parks, and consider			√	√					√	

1 Chong, Rod, Deputy Chief. Sacramento City Fire Department. Written communication. May 2005.

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
	revising the definition of park space to include civic spaces and urban hardscapes, particularly in the Central City and other infill areas.										
6.	The American River Parkway is a valued asset of the community, and many people want to see it preserved.			√			√			√	
7.	There is support for an addition of a regional park (e.g., Gold Rush Park) in the City.	√					√		√	√	
	Schools										
1.	There is concern for the quality of schools within Sacramento.	√	√	√			√	√			
2.	The Sacramento City Unified School District defines a school as overcrowded when its enrollment reaches 90 percent of its capacity. By this measure, most of the school districts serving the Policy Area are overcrowded, namely: ▪ More than half the schools within Sacramento City Unified School District are overcrowded. ▪ All the schools within Del Paso Heights School District are operating at capacity. ▪ Elk Grove Unified School District contains 17 schools within the Policy Area that are at or above capacity. ▪ One high school in Grant Union School District is operating at above capacity. ▪ Natomas Unified School District has four schools operating at or above capacity.			√			√		√	√	
	Human Services										
1.	There is a need for additional human service programs to serve the increasing homeless, youth, and senior populations.	√		√						√	
2.	Approximately 21 percent of the City's population have disabilities, which is expected to increase in future years, and may impact the provision of transit, housing, and social services.				√				√	√	
	ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES										
	Sustainability										

27

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
1.	All new development should be sustainable, while reducing resource consumption.				√			√	√	√	√
	Natural/Biological Resources										
1.	Though the majority of the Policy Area is currently (2005) in residential, commercial, and other urban development, valuable plant and wildlife habitat still exists. These natural habitats are located primarily in the northern, southern and eastern portions of the Policy Area, but also occur within the City along river and stream corridors and in a number of undeveloped parcels within the City and Policy Area boundaries.			√			√			√	√
2.	Development within the boundaries of the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan area must comply with the provisions described in the HCP and pay a mitigation fee sufficient to cover the costs of acquiring, restoring and managing one-half acre of habitat for every acre of land developed. Areas outside this area in the Joint Vision Area are not covered by the HCP.			√			√			√	√
3.	Undeveloped grasslands in the Policy Area have a high probability of supporting vernal pools or other seasonal wetlands and the listed plant and wildlife species associated with them. These grasslands are most common in undeveloped portions of North Sacramento and Natomas, East Sacramento and South Sacramento that lie largely outside of current urban limits. Undeveloped lots within otherwise developed areas are capable of supporting these resources as well.			√			√			√	√
4.	Wetlands subject to Corps jurisdiction within the Policy Area are primarily associated with the Sacramento and American Rivers and their tributaries, and/or their floodplains. However, vernal pools, seasonal wetlands and isolated ponds are present in undeveloped portions of the Policy Area, primarily outside the current urban limits, but in undeveloped lots within otherwise developed areas as well.			√			√			√	√
5.	Approval from the City of Sacramento, pursuant to the City's Tree Ordinance, must be obtained prior to the removal of any trees, particularly native trees or Heritage trees in the Policy Area.			√			√			√	√

28

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
6.	There is great support for protecting existing trees and expanding the urban tree canopy.	√	√	√			√			√	√
7.	There is great support for protecting the environmental quality of the City.		√							√	√
	Water Resources and Quality										
1.	There is great support for protecting the Sacramento River, American River, and creeks in the City.		√	√			√			√	√
2.	There is a general concern over existing water quality.		√				√			√	√
3.	An increase in the urbanized areas in and adjacent to the Policy Area has increased the potential for pollutant discharges to surface water and groundwater.			√			√			√	√
4.	Increases in groundwater use have created a cone of depression in the northeastern portion of the Policy Area, and an overall decrease in groundwater levels in the past 30 years.			√			√			√	√
5.	Drainage requirements for urban infill areas and transit oriented development sites where higher densities require more acreage for mitigation, thereby limiting the amount of total development, may need to be modified.				√					√	√
6.	There are currently no standards regulating development adjacent to historic or modified creek channels such as Magpie Creek.				√					√	
	Cultural Resources										
1.	The majority of the identified and designated historic resources and landmarks in the City are located within the Central City grid. There are approximately 27 City designated historic districts in the City and two Special Planning Districts where historic resources have been identified and protection is in place. There are approximately 99 State registered historic resources, with 56 of those registered as national historic resources. These historic resources need to be protected.			√			√			√	√
2.	The City's current Preservation Element anticipates future historic/cultural resources survey and inventory efforts on a City-wide basis. A large number of additional areas are being reviewed for future consideration as historic			√			√			√	

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
	resources/districts that could impact future development.						√			√	
3.	A large portion of the City has not been surveyed for historic resources and was not included in the analysis of potential resources and districts.			√						√	
4.	A reconnaissance level historic resources survey is currently not required as part of a new or update of a community plan. This requirement should be considered in order to inform the planning of the area, as well as to determine landmarks, historic designations, and historic district plans.				√					√	
5.	There are approximately 80 known significant archaeological resource sites within the policy area. These resources need to be protected.			√			√			√	√
	Mineral Resources										
1.	The State Mining and Geology Board has defined an area within the City and Policy Area as Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2), which indicates the likelihood for occurrence of significant mineral deposits is high. The classification may be a factor in the discovery and development of mineral deposits that would tend to be economically beneficial to society. The MRZ-2 area begins just east of the Sacramento Executive Airport and extends east towards Rancho Cordova, south of the American River. These areas should be protected.			√			√			√	√
	Air Quality										
1.	Air quality in the City of Sacramento has steadily improved over the last two decades. However, the City and County of Sacramento still do not attain certain State and federal air quality standards. New air quality standards have been created that will require new efforts by the regulatory air quality agencies. Future population growth will make attaining these standards challenging and meteorology and topography in the Sacramento region adds to this challenge. There is a need to improve existing air quality.	√	√	√	√		√	√		√	√
2.	Regional efforts, as well as policies adopted by the City of Sacramento, indicate that there is acknowledgement of the linkage between land use, transportation and air quality.			√			√			√	√

3a

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
Scenic Resources											
1.	Views of the Sacramento Policy Area consist mainly of an urban and built environment, with parkland interspersed in the City portion and rural expanses on the outer boundaries of the City. Views onto and across the City to the east include views of the foothills and mountains that are situated beyond the City and adjacent communities. Distinguishable visual features include: ▪ An abundance of trees in almost every area; ▪ The Sacramento and American Rivers; ▪ Capitol Mall; ▪ The portion of State Route 160 south of the City Limits; ▪ The American River Parkway; and ▪ The Sacramento River Greenway. These scenic resources need to be protected.			√			√			√	√
PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY											
Geologic and Seismic Hazards											
1.	Areas susceptible to liquefaction hazards include the Central City, Pocket, and North and South Natomas.			√			√			√	√
2.	Areas of the City that may be vulnerable to hazards associated with waves generated by seismic activity are primarily along the Sacramento and American rivers.			√			√			√	√
3.	Seismically induced failure or damage to Folsom Dam and Nimbus Dam could inundate portions of the City.			√			√			√	√
Flood Hazards											
1.	Over the course of the Sacramento's past, floods have been the most frequent and considerable natural hazard that has affected the City. Three different types of floods that include flash, riverine, and urban stormwater often occur as a result of severe weather and excessive rainfall, either in the City or in areas upstream of the City. Increased protection from flooding is a priority.			√			√			√	√
2.	Within the City, 12,000 acres are outside the 500-year floodplain, 36,000 acres			√			√			√	√

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
	are protected from the 100-year flood by levees, and 15,000 acres are within the 100-year floodplain.										
3.	Most of the Policy Area will be protected from the 100-year flood event due to improvements to the American and Sacramento River levee system.			√			√			√	√
	Fire Hazards										
1.	Older buildings, constructed prior to requirements for fire-resistant construction materials, internal sprinklers, and other fire safety systems, are more susceptible to structural fires.			√					√	√	√
2.	According to the City of Sacramento Multi-Hazard Emergency Plan, the areas along the American River Parkway from Watt Avenue to the Sacramento River and along the Garden Highway in the Natomas area are susceptible to wildlife fires.			√						√	√
	Noise										
1.	Neighborhood noise levels need to be minimized.			√			√		√	√	√
2.	Airport related noise (Sac Int'l and Executive Airports) need to be minimized to reduce adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods.						√			√	√
	Hazardous Materials										
1.	Most of the soil and groundwater contamination in the Policy Area is related to leaking underground fuel storage tanks, which are either being investigated or remediated under the oversight of Sacramento County Environmental Management Department or Regional Water Quality Control Board staff. Some contamination has also occurred from historic uses related to transportation (e.g., railyards) and materials processing, but these are limited in extent. Potential exposure to these materials should be minimized.			√			√			√	√
	Emergency Response										
1.	The City of Sacramento has a Multi-Hazard Emergency Plan that addresses the City's planned response to extraordinary emergency situations associated with natural disasters, technological incidents, and nuclear defense operations for areas within the City's jurisdictional boundaries. It provides operational			√			√			√	√

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
	concepts related to various emergency situations, identifies components of the local emergency management organization, and describes the City's overall responsibilities for protecting life and property during an emergency. The plan also identifies possible sources of outside support (through mutual aid and specific statutory authorities) from other jurisdictions, and the private sector. Implementation of this plan provides for adequate emergency response.										
OTHER											
	Environmental Justice/Social Equality										
1.	The location of desirable (parks) and undesirable (transfer stations) uses are not evenly distributed among neighborhoods.	√	√		√	√			√	√	
2.	Social services and affordable housing are currently not evenly distributed throughout the City.				√					√	
	Effective political leadership/will										
1.	Effective political leadership is essential to implementing the General Plan and Smart Growth Principles.	√	√								
	Fiscal & Financial										
1.	The City recognizes that it must address a "built in" gap between revenues and costs. Recent steps to capture new revenues, reorganize City departments, and reduce department budgets probably have already achieved the greatest returns for the City and may only offer diminishing returns over the next several years. Meanwhile, growth in City labor costs continues to exert pressure on the General Fund, this year in particular because of higher healthcare and retirement payments. Similar trends confront virtually every California city and county.			√	√	√	√			√	
2.	The City has recognized that the following budget items have service deficiencies for which operating funds will need to be identified: ▪ Regional parks as they are developed ▪ Deferred maintenance on City facilities ▪ Road network, in particular roadway resurfacing			√			√			√	

TABLE 1
MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES

	Description of Issues	Source of Issue						Where in Process Issue Will be Addressed			
		GPU Focus Group Interviews	GPAC Group Interviews	TBR Findings and Other Consulting Team Issues	City Development Services Staff and Other Dept. Issues	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings	Town Hall Forums (THF)	Vision/Guiding Principles	Alternatives	General Plan Policy	EIR
	▪ Library branches as they are expanded or constructed ▪ Police and fire facilities.										
3.	The City has recognized that the following infrastructure groups have facility deficiencies for which capital project funds will need to be identified: ▪ Sewer and storm drains. ▪ Regional park development, including parks in the South Area, North Natomas, and Granite Regional Park. ▪ Water and sewer pipes. ▪ Libraries in parts of town where branches are small or nonexistent, such as the Pocket, East Sacramento, and South Sacramento.			√			√			√	
	Other										
1.	There is a desire to streamline permit processing (e.g., CEQA).	√	√		√	√				√	√
2.	Many people felt that articulating the vision for Sacramento's growth was important.	√	√					√	√	√	
3.	Many people were concerned that the General Plan would not be implemented effectively.		√		√	√				√	
4.	There was a concern for maintaining the existing quality of life.		√		√			√		√	
5.	There was concern for the health and fitness of Sacramento residents.				√	√		√	√		
GPU PROCESS											
1.	There are questions on how to address General Plan Amendments/ major projects during the interim GPU process.				√	√				√	
GPU FORMAT											
1.	There are questions about how the Community Plan would be integrated within the General Plan.				√					√	
2.	There is a desire for flexibility in implementing general plan policies.				√					√	

MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES FROM THE TOWN HALL FORUMS

In one of the exercises in the Town Hall Forums, participants were asked to take a survey and choose the top five issues that Sacramento was facing from a list. Table 2 shows how many total votes there were for each issue across all 14 Town Hall Forums. The overall ranking of how important the issue is also shown. Additionally, the table also lists the "other" issues that participants felt were important but were not part of the survey.

TABLE 2

MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES FROM THE TOWN HALL FORUMS

ISSUES:	Total # of votes	Rank based on total # of votes
Land Use	*561*	
Agricultural and open space land protection	183	8
Role of the Downtown in the region	126	17
Mixed-use, higher density development around light rail stations and along commercial corridors	252	2
Major Development Areas	*233*	
Downtown Union Pacific Railyards	131	15
Richards Boulevard (Downtown)	21	42
Delta Shores (South Sacramento)	27	39
Natomas Joint Vision Area	54	33
Community Character and Design	*420*	
Building heights in Downtown	50	35
Streetscape quality, including sidewalks and trees	198	5
Preserving small town feeling	72	30
Protecting historic buildings and places	100	24
Population and Demographics	*172*	
Population growth rate	63	31
Providing for an aging population	109	21
Housing	*558*	
Amount of affordable housing	197	6
Distribution of affordable housing throughout the city	204	3
Housing choices and types	116	18
Downtown housing	41	37
Economic Development	*561*	
Jobs near housing	179	9
Commercial corridor revitalization	74	29
Retaining and encouraging small businesses	94	25
Cultural and entertainment attractions in Downtown	135	14
Deteriorated properties or buildings	79	27
Resource Conservation	*116*	
Energy conservation	78	28
Green buildings	38	38
Natural Resources	*428*	
Tree preservation	102	23
Protecting the Sacramento River, American River, and creeks	155	13
Improving air quality	171	11
Roadways	*418*	
Congestion on major streets	193	7
Bridges across the American and Sacramento Rivers	61	32
Neighborhood traffic and speeding	164	12
Transit Services	*304*	
Light rail expansion	172	10
Transit accessibility	109	21
Amtrak service expansion	23	41
Bikeways and Pedestrian Facilities	*314*	
Connectivity and continuity in the bikeway system	113	19
Walkable neighborhoods	201	4
Public Safety	*482*	
Fire and police response times	128	16
New police substations	27	39
Safe neighborhoods	276	1

TABLE 2

MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES FROM THE TOWN HALL FORUMS

ISSUES:	Total # of votes	Rank based on total # of votes
Flood protection	51	34
Parks and Recreation	***160***	
Park facilities	110	20
Recreation programs	50	35
Noise	***106***	
Neighborhood noise levels	87	26
Airport related noise (Sac International and Executive Airports)	19	43
OTHER ISSUES: (please identify):	**Area A - George Sim Center**	
Avondale neighborhood front side yard	1	52
Numerous cars parked on street	1	52
Mixed-use does not work in every situation	1	52
Energy security/self sufficiency	1	52
Better schools	1	52
More entertainment/after school programs	1	52
Community food security(access to nutritious, affordable, culturally appropriate food)	1	52
Larger community centers	1	52
Options to purchase houses (low income)	1	52
Cultural programs for youth	1	52
OTHER ISSUES: (please identify):	**Area D - Kennedy H.S.**	
City ownership of shopping	1	52
Library	3	45
Sports Arena	2	46
Community center	1	52
Neighborhood pre-school program	1	52
Ethnic communities (I.e. Chinatown, etc.)	1	52
Homeless population	1	52
Unified transit system (road, bike, rail, bus, walk)	1	52
No fast food drive-thrus in neighborhoods)	1	52
OTHER ISSUES: (please identify):	**Area 1CP - Meadowview Center**	
Integrated neighborhood income categories and race	1	52
Broken down cars	1	52
Keep effective airport open	1	52
More community centers	1	52
Jobs	1	52
Aging population	1	52
Schools	1	52
Restrooms @ Light rail stations	1	52
Enforcement of Codes (ex. leash on dogs)	2	46
Homelessness	1	52
OTHER ISSUES: (please identify):	**Area I - Natomas H.S.**	
Homelessness	2	46
Youth resources	1	52
Low income housing for seniors	1	52
Retaining Sacramento Kings	1	52
More Churches	1	52
After school programs	2	46
Hospital in Natomas	2	46
More community retail in South Natomas	1	52
Keep Northgate Blvd. undivided	1	52
Adequate low density housing	1	52

TABLE 2

MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES FROM THE TOWN HALL FORUMS

ISSUES:	Total # of votes	Rank based on total # of votes
OTHER ISSUES: (please identify):	**Area A - Hart Senior Center**	
10TH & K redevelopment site	1	52
Integration of businesses into neighborhood/community	1	52
Community benefit from major development	1	52
Supportive housing for homeless and disabled	2	46
Permanent affordable housing	1	52
Business hours of operation	1	52
Diversity of use cultural centers/churches, etc.	1	52
Access to medical services	1	52
Open space protection is directly linked to upward density around transit. Use innovative policy measures such as transferable dev credit.	1	52
Quality & diversity of architecture in the region	1	52
Change to form based zoning	1	52
Street cars	1	52
Downtown parking (lack of)	4	44
Better Schools	1	52
Nexus of human services and local use planning as result of growth	1	52
Street lights	1	52
More visible striped crosswalks	1	52
More roundabouts in midtown	1	52
Sustainability - econ., social, & env.	1	52
Greenspace designs	1	52
OTHER ISSUES: (please identify):	**Area G - Robertson Center**	
Mixed Land use (care dealers in residential areas)	1	52
Community Center in Robla School (plan for population increase)	1	52
Youth recreation programs	1	52
Minority retail business (contractors, jobs North Park)	1	52
Infill - lots plan (Del Paso and Oak Park)	1	52
City service	1	52
Jobs for youth	1	52
Sidewalks	1	52
Distribution of public funds	1	52
Train sounding horn (late night and early morning)	1	52
Graffiti in neighborhood	1	52
Damage to greenwood elementary	1	52
Connection to community groups	1	52
Sponsorships for small businesses	1	52
City support for cultural programs	1	52
restrooms for parks/upgrade facilities	1	52
Gangs	1	52
Update community centers	1	52
Theatres/parks/swimming/skating	1	52
Move loaves and fishes to safer place	1	52
OTHER ISSUES: (please identify):	**Area B - Clunie Center**	
Mixed-use, higher density	1	52
Recreational bikeways with access to major employment centers	1	52
Highways: reducing negative impact	1	52
School quality downtown	1	52
Freight train noise level	1	52
Maintain and improve bus service	1	52

TABLE 2

MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES FROM THE TOWN HALL FORUMS

ISSUES:	Total # of votes	Rank based on total # of votes
McMansions	1	52
Park maintenance/street	1	52
Lack of ordinances enforcement	1	52
Need for form based zoning (east sac)	1	52
More well paid working people	1	52
Implement AB2767	1	52
Construct vertical curbs on reconstruction projects	1	52
Maintain and protecting residential character of neighborhoods	1	52
Transportation infrastructure (expansion, quality, access)	1	52
Libraries	1	52
More awareness of oil peak	1	52
Health care friendly communities/facilities	1	52
Unleashed dogs	1	52
Clogged drain holes/fallen tree branches	1	52
Parking downtown needs to be more user-friendly to attract shoppers Malls and business parks in the suburbs offer free parking with easy access to major thorough fares	1	52
Streets need to be more user friendly, and allow all modes of transportation, including trucks, to move freely without having to endure barriers which damage vehicles and impede safe passage.	1	52
Working at home and operating small businesses in residential areas should be encouraged to reduce commuter traffic provided such activities do not degrade the peace and tranquility of their neighbors.	1	52
Employers with large staff should be encouraged to use flex time and other staggered work schedules to reduce commuter traffic peaks.	1	52
City support services should utilize satellite substations from which to dispatch staff to reduce response time, pollution, and travel expense.	1	52
Solid waste collection and processing should be done close to the point of origin to reduce air pollution from collection vehicles and costs for driver time.	1	52
The urban forest program should be expanded to include the entire city Permits to remove trees should be contingent on the planting of replacement trees The city should make trees available at a nominal cost.	1	52
Joint use facilities should be encouraged merging public and private resources to provide extended use Large developments should include facilities for after business hours use by seniors, for childcare, and for young adult and adult recreation.	1	52
Alternative energy sources such as fuel cells, and photovoltaic should be utilized to make residential and commercial buildings energy dependent.	1	52
Neighborhood Parks and Community Centers should be established throughout the city to provide for recreation and social needs of all age groups.	1	52
OTHER ISSUES: (please identify):	**Area H - Ben All Center**	
Rental properties not taken care of	1	52
Bigger grocery store	1	52
Shopping centers	1	52
More neighborhood events	1	52
Illegal dumping	1	52

TABLE 2

MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES FROM THE TOWN HALL FORUMS

ISSUES:	Total # of votes	Rank based on total # of votes
Dilapidated housing	1	52
Drug Dealing	1	52
Bus infrastructure	1	52
Cleaning of the street	1	52
Location of halfway houses, etc.	1	52
Build neighborhoods not just housing	1	52
ROBLA community center	1	52
Park facilities that promote a variety of activities for diverse groups including but not limited to jogging paths and playgrounds	1	52
No residential recycling centers	1	52
Cultural/art entertainment in north sac arts district	1	52
No more rehab housing	1	52
Education/schools	1	52
Low flying helicopters	1	52
Grants Russian charter school	1	52
Nice grocery store in our area	1	52
Less businesses built in our area	1	52
No cannabis club within two blocks of my home	1	52
More houses not commercial businesses	1	52
OTHER ISSUES: (please identify):	**Area C - Sierra 2 Center**	
Homelessness	1	52
Shopping/eating/business in neighborhoods	1	52
B-80 traffic	1	52
Bicycle friendly streets - midtown/downtown	1	52
Encouraging smart growth/infill development	1	52
Preserving natural land and unique habitat	1	52
New developments should not flood existing neighborhoods with traffic	1	52
Having sufficient government revenues to fund a high quality of life in Sacramento	1	52
Mix generation opportunities	1	52
Volunteerism	1	52
Arts encouragement	1	52
Health - increased physical activity and access to healthy foods	1	52
Creating and offering community gardens - promoting organic	1	52
OTHER ISSUES: (please identify):	**Area 3CP - Cosumnes River College**	
Wildlife Conservation	1	52
More community/senior centers	1	52
Safe Accessibility to places	1	52
Mixed-use in parks	1	52
OTHER ISSUES: (please identify):	**Area E - Coloma Center**	
Freight train noise	1	52
Light rail safety	1	52
Lights in streets	1	52
Regional park (Richards)	1	52
Protect/enhance wildlife habitat	1	52
Civility - respectfulness	1	52
Revitalizing redevelopment areas other than downtown	1	52
Diversifying housing production in redevelopment zones other than downtown	1	52
Improving employment and education in redevelopment zones other than downtown	1	52

TABLE 2

MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES FROM THE TOWN HALL FORUMS

ISSUES:	Total # of votes	Rank based on total # of votes
Robbery	1	52
Skateboard parks	1	52
Homeless / mental health concerns	1	52
Re-open school yards for recreation	1	52
Keep Sacramento from uncontrolled growth	1	52
Health care facilities	1	52
"Peak Oil" - declining energy resources	1	52
Code Enforcement	1	52
Homeless	1	52
West end recycling facilities should be located around town instead of one main area, air quality issues of traffic moving across town, large truck traffic in one area and related problems from that industry saturates the east area	1	52
Form based planning	1	52
Equitable infrastructure investment for all neighborhoods clearly defining economic development in redevelopment areas other than downtown	1	52
Overall planning - let planners do real planning	1	52
Mitigate impact of county land use decisions on city residents	1	52
Railroad engine / horn noise	1	52
Sound wall along Highway 50 south side	1	52
Clean up alleys, other places Attracting higher wage employers and providing, training to meet these employer's needs.	1	52
Better urban design - improving public schools (SCUSD)	1	52
Keep east sac as it is - no traffic increase, no building size increase, no apartments, providing for the needs of the homeless	1	52
UCD "blue lights" and expansion	1	52
Speeding - downtown housing in office buildings	1	52
Need to reopen school yards for kids and adults to recreate	1	52
OTHER ISSUES: (please identify):	**Area J - Natomas Charter School**	
Do not change General Plan	1	52
Concern of Fast Food/Big Box business are located	1	52
Regional cooperation	1	52
Maintain affordable utilities services for community	1	52
Maintain Witter Ranch mitigation area	1	52
Schools - meet needs of neighborhood (turnkey)	1	52
Parks (turnkey)	1	52
Low density housing	1	52
Build colleges	1	52
Arco Arena (taxes)	1	52
Discourage too much high density	1	52
More activities for youth/teens	1	52
Inadequate retail availability	1	52
New high quality - high density units	1	52
Infill older neighborhoods	1	52
Del Paso Road (@ I-5 quality of restaurants / choices / non chain or fast food)	1	52
Urban forest	1	52
Development of gold rush park	1	52
Development of Natomas reg. Plan	1	52
Small shops / outdoor mall	1	52
Scale between commercial and residential development	1	52

TABLE 2

MATRIX OF PLANNING ISSUES FROM THE TOWN HALL FORUMS

ISSUES:	Total # of votes	Rank based on total # of votes
Infrastructure, phase 8, EIS, CALED, Ecosystem/habitat protection	1	52
Exercise too counter productive, ridiculous to simplify complex issues: should rate choices	1	52
OTHER ISSUES: (please identify):	**Area 2CP - Charles Mack School**	
Accessibility to a variety of good/retail outlets	1	52
Restoring existing homes	1	52
Attracting business into existing areas	1	52
Enforcing existing ordinances	1	52

APPENDIX A

SACRAMENTO GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
SUMMARY OF FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS
January 2005

As part of Phase 1 of the General Plan Update, the City's General Plan Consultants and City Staff conducted a focus group interview process in January 2005. The City developed a list and formally invited individuals to be interviewed. The focus group members were selected specifically as key community stakeholders that represent a broad range of community interests (e.g., neighborhoods, social services, business, development, environmental, and public interest). Focus group members were interviewed individually or in a group of two or three. In three cases, individuals who were unable to participate in the interviews submitted written comments. A total of twenty-five focus group members provided input.

The interviews were organized around a standard set of questions but provided interviewees ample opportunity to offer additional comments. There were several different sets of questions that were asked of focus group members depending on their affiliation. The summary presented below only addresses the common questions that were asked of everyone, and attempts to capture the most common themes that ran through the responses for the common questions. More detailed summaries of the focus group interviews are available in the two appendices to this document (Appendix A and Appendix B) that separately summarize the focus group interviews for groups and individuals. The appendices contain much more detailed and specific information for the broad range of questions and issues that were addressed.

The following is a summary of the issues that were most commonly brought up by the interviewees in the questions that were common to all.

Sacramento's Assets & Strengths

- Rivers, American River Parkway, parks/open space, trees
- Heritage, historical districts, old town feel
- Neighborhoods
- Livability/quality of life
- Downtown
- Small town feel – grid street pattern, trees, people
- Cultural and economic diversity
- Location – close to mountains
- Weather/climate

Sacramento's Weaknesses & Drawbacks

- Poor air quality
- Traffic congestion
- Lack of public transportation
- Lack of community vision/ civic leadership
  Cumbersome and time-consuming development entitlement and permitting process

- Growing lack of affordable housing
- Homelessness

The Most Important Issues the City Needs to Address

- Air quality
- Traffic congestion
- Infill development
- Economic development
- Affordable housing
- Homelessness
- Streamlining the permit process
- Implementing Smart Growth policies/concepts
- Downtown development
- Increased public/arts/cultural venues downtown
- Identity of city and role of city in the region
- How to handle growth
- Schools/education
- Crime/personal safety
- Neighborhood identity/revitalization
- More transit access

List of Focus Group Interviewees:

- Michael Ault, Downtown Sacramento Partnership
- Anita Barnes, LaFamilia Counseling Center
- Linda Bennett, Sacramento Association of Realtors
- Mary Brill, Sacramento County Alliance of Neighborhoods
- Tim Brown, Loaves and Fishes
- David Butler, Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce
- Tom Burruss, South Sacramento Business Coalition
- Greta Canon, Seniors Advocate
- Dannetta Garcia, League of Women Voters of Sacramento County
- Richard Green, Stockton Boulevard Partnership
- Paul Harriman, Area 1 Neighborhood Advisory Group
- Faye Kennedy, Center for Collaborative Planning
- Laura Leonelli, Southeast Asian Assistance Center
- Jim Lofgren & Corey Koehler, Sacramento Valley Apartment Association
- Bina Lofkovoitz, Youth Services Providers Network
- Ryan Loofbourrow, City and County Committee for the Homeless
- Paul Petrovich & Phil Harvey, Petrovich Developers
- Randall W. Sater, A. Teichert & Son, Inc.
- Walt Seifert, Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates
- Velma Sykes, The Observer Media Group
- David Taylor, David Taylor Interests Inc.
- Allen Warren, New Faze Development
- Robert Waste, CSUS Dept. of Public Policy & Administration

SACRAMENTO GENERAL PLAN
FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW SUMMARIES
Questions for Groups
January 2005

List of Groups Interviewed:

- Michael Ault, Downtown Sacramento Partnership
- Mary Brill, Sacramento County Alliance of Neighborhoods and Paul Harriman, Area 1 Neighborhood Advisory Group
- Tim Brown, Loaves and Fishes, Anita Barnes, LaFamilia Counseling Center, and Ryan Loofbourrow, City and County Committee for the Homeless
- Tom Burruss, South Sacramento Business Coalition, and Richard Green, Stockton Boulevard Partnership
- Faye Kennedy, Center for Collaborative Planning, Velma Sykes, The Observer Media Group, and Laura Leonelli, Southeast Asian Assistance Center
- Bina Lofkovoitz, Youth Services Providers Network, and Greta Canon, Seniors Advocate
- Walt Seifert, Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates

General

[All Groups]

3. What would you describe as City's strengths or assets?

- Small town feel
- Trees
- Neighborhoods
- Diversity
- Weather (outdoor eating)
- Location (close to mountains)
- East Sac neighborhood – looks good; sense of neighborhood stronger (newspapers); short walk to grocery stores
- Very interested in central business district redevelopment
- Sacramento offers a wonderful opportunity to work with historical architecture and pedestrian scale of the central city.
- Sacramento has strong central city neighborhoods
- Clean city
- City Council responsive to community
- Excellent livability
- Great neighborhoods
- Great new restaurants
- Arts community
- Diversity

- Great Parks
- Diversity – population, economics, strong middle class
- Weather
- Affordable
- Culture of activism – community engagement
- More PBID's than any other city in America
- Climate
- Rivers (fishing)
- Friendly people
- Neighborhoods (lg. East Sacramento)
- Diverse community
- Sense of community within neighborhoods
- Cultural diversity - lots of energy and creativity in immigrant community
- Location – accessibility (multimodal accessible)
- Rivers

4. What are its weaknesses? Where are improvements needed?

- Poor air quality
- Heat
- Traffic congestion – but really not so bad in neighborhoods or downtown compared to other cities
- More lively downtown
- More cultural things to do
- Museum district/ maybe a state museum "Smithsonian for California"
- Riverfront development that will interface with high density that will support bicycles
- City doing well with smart growth emphasis compared to county/ other cities
- Riverfront plan
- Regional parks
- Change L.O.S. for transportation – interferes with housing density that supports bicycles
- Improvements needed to the building and permitting processes
- Develop a more streamlined approach to encouraging living in the central core
- Traffic congestion – need better public transportation
- Neighborhood services has become competitive instead of people working together cooperatively.
- Housing affordability
- It is important to decentralize city services to increase responsiveness.
- Not enough retail
- More youth friendly places. Not as friendly to families with older children.
- Schools as part of neighborhoods
- Parks and Recreation need to be more for youth
- Diversity works against community
- Lacks a vision as a community
- Lacks leadership
- Obstacles to development

- Economic Development lacks focus, Planning Department-doesn't do planning, Building Department is awful
- Lack of identity
- Small town attitude
- Sports, Restaurants, NBA
- The City Council needs to stick to their commitment of mixed housing types. Does the City have the commitment to stick to it?
- Lacks good transportation network
- Transportation
- Lack of public transportation/transit
- Lack of bike facilities
- Lack of pedestrian connections/sidewalks
- Lack of gutters and drainage
- Permitting process is too cumbersome (building, sign permits) – inconsistent guidance from City staff
- Not enough attention to homelessness (City & County)
- Not enough resources
- Not enough water pressure in some areas
- Homelessness increasing - particularly families and elderly
- Lack of jail space
- Need an overarching vision
- Vision vacuum – sort of a flea market

5. What are Sacramento's important resources to protect and/or enhance?

- Rivers
- Parkway (American River and Sacramento)
- Make lower American River useable (homeless problem) - change with U.P. railyards?
- Crime/safety issues need to be looked at in the downtown area – people have fear of coming downtown
- Different emphasis on transportation – away from single occupied vehicle
- American River Parkway
- Downtown Waterfront
- Rail yards
- Treescape environments
- People
- Preserving the integrity of neighborhoods. We forget our fragile/weaker neighborhoods
- Park system
- Open space system
- Schools as part of neighborhoods
- Community centers
- Open space resources
- Parks - inadequate
- Waterways – not enough activities, underutilized
- SRO units - used to be 3,000 families; only 800 SRO now

- Very low income facilities are very poorly maintained and managed (Marshall Hotel)
- Vacant buildings that could be used for housing are not utilized
- HUD-funded facilities - contracts up after 20 years -- 80 owners are opting out
- Need first right of acquisition for non-profits
- More social services for SRO residents
- Losing –opt out for MF--Need to preserve rivers
- Need neighborhood-based services/ neighborhood policing

6. What are the most important issues the City needs to address?

- Infill development
- Form of new development – disappointed in Natomas; would like to see villages / more mixed use/ better connections between uses and less walls.
- Clean up the air – if possible, would make this the #1 priority.
- Concerned about overall growth in region
- All suburbs have very bad bike and pedestrian connections
- Measure A – S. connector is a compromise; HOV lanes are bad – more capacity
- Being more customer service-oriented toward private development
- The process is intrusive, complicated, confusing
- I believe we lose people due to it
- Transportation to youth programs a major issue.
- Getting school districts involved
- Getting information from the people in the community and not just the ones that come to the meetings
- Hiring youth as interns
- The process should have specific engagement elements for young people
- Economic development – (E.D. folks don't have plan)
- Make streets safe from crime – people are afraid to walk the streets. Not enough resources to police (livable)
- Progressive infill projects
- Follow through on smart growth
- Education – poor school systems-we are not training thinkers, education is key to prosperity
- Housing for all income levels
- Infill
- First time home buyers
- Vacant properties (residential)
- Targeting infill
- Streamlining permitting
- Develop vacant storefronts in DT - need right businesses
- Toxic issues for many vacant lots
- Waterfront
- We fail at completing and implementing projects that we need in the downtown
- Interface with County and surrounding communities on Stockton, Franklin, Florin areas. Is City thinking of Annexing?
- Do we connect across borders?
- Disabled accessibility

- Identity for neighborhoods – "City of Villages"
- What does every neighborhood need? Does PLACE^{3}S identify deficient/gaps

7. How do we involve residents/business owners etc. in this planning effort?

- Article about general plan in SABA monthly newsletter
- Workshops on transportation
- Quarterly SABA membership meetings
- In addition to ongoing efforts, work with businesses and organizations to recruit and submit support from their memberships
- Let people know how they will benefit
- Need a "carrot" to offer people to get them to participate (e.g., tickets, donations)
- Get out to youth: Get into classrooms, middle and high school, hire young people to get input from other youth
- Conduct focus groups
- Conduct after school programs
- Get out to the community rather than expecting them to come to meetings (e.g., Area 4 Agency on aging used a van exhibit for educational outreach
- People need to see this as on-going and not just one short affair
- People have to see something in it that will benefit them or there neighborhood
- Business associations (Franklin BA, Franklin RAC)
- Executive committees for DTP
- Police, NSD, SHRA, neighborhood associations
- Faith community
- Make sure you have something of value at every meeting
- Connect dots to Blueprint – build on Blueprint
- Cannot wait two years for plan to be done

B. Service Providers

List of Groups Interviewed:

- Tim Brown, Loaves and Fishes, Anita Barnes, LaFamilia Counseling Center, and Ryan Loofbourrow, City and County Committee for the Homeless
- Bina Lofkovoitz, Youth Services Providers Network, and Greta Canon, Seniors Advocate

1. Do you see key issues with providing essential services for the City in the coming years? Cite examples.

- Transportation to youth programs is a major issue
- Transportation for seniors
- For kids who walk to school safety is an issue
- The working relationship between school districts, city and county must be improved
- The school district needs to be at the table for this planning process
- Fed & State funding cuts
- Services for future residents of DT.
- More families under pressure –financial
- Need more jobs

- Fewer social services are in the area
- Gentrification/ redevelopment – displaces low income/ homeless
- Preservation ordinance (historical structures) creates obstacles
- Mixed income housing and Housing Trust Fund

2. What major improvements, if any, are required to adequately serve future growth?

- Shared housing – need more
- L&F clean & sober program
- Affordable housing - co-housing
- Open space
- Good transportation
- Transit-oriented growth
- Disabled accessibility
- High density
- Downtown residential
- End homelessness in 10 years - Prop 63 mental health $ should help
- More lively downtown
- 10 years ago did not bank land for (affordable) housing

C. Organizations (Arts, Cultural, Community, and Civic Organizations/Groups)

List of Groups Interviewed:

- Bina Lofkovoitz, Youth Services Providers Network, and Greta Canon, Seniors Advocate

1. Do you see any issues with providing these types of services for the City in the coming years? Cite examples.

2. How do we most effectively involve other organizations in this planning effort?

- Communicate through churches
- For African American churches, Pastor Williams – St. Paul Baptist Church, Oak Park
- Talk to other organizing groups such as:
- ACORN, SVOC, ACT, but remember they already have their own agendas.
- NUSA – a group that deals with Latinos
- Luther Burbank High School principal
- What about internet survey?

E. Business Owners

List of Groups Interviewed:

- Michael Ault, Downtown Sacramento Partnership

1. How does working with/in the City of Sacramento compare with your experience in other cities?

- Each city is different in the way they do things
- We don't take full advantage of our potential (city and process for development)
- The process is intrusive, complicated, confusing
- I believe we lose people due to it

2. What do you appreciate about working in the City?

- Unified commitment for progress in the city
- The cooperative relationship with city economic development has provided a
- greater opportunity for progress and brings validation to our efforts.

3. What are the impediments you see for opening a new business or expanding your existing business in Sacramento in the future?

- Not knowing who to call or deal with from the City
- Permitting
- Not understanding the market

4. How do we most effectively involve business owners in this planning effort?

- Re-engage folks in this process by working with established businesses and organizations

F. Residents

List of Groups Interviewed:

- Mary Brill, Sacramento County Alliance of Neighborhoods and Paul Harriman, Area 1 Neighborhood Advisory Group

1. How do you view your current access to Sacramento's decision makers?

2. Do you feel existing regulations are adequate to protect the assets you value for the future?

3. How do we most effectively involve residents in this planning effort?

- Ask people to be planners
- Connect with neighborhoods – ask residents what they like/dislike about their neighborhoods
- Keep it simple – visual preference survey (Portland – causes and effects slide show)
- One hour presentation: What works in Sacramento, how it could work
- Review of other cities – what works and does not work
- Connectors - word of mouth
- Not CBOs (e.g., churches)
- Need to reach informal networks
- Ask resident questions

4. Are there key individuals/groups that you would consider essential to include in this process?

- NAG – (Monday) Ray Kerridge & Mike McKeever

5. What do you feel is the most effective method to reach people with information about this process? (i.e., website, mailings, news media)

G. Environmental Groups

List of Groups Interviewed:

- Walt Seifert, Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates

1. What do you feel are the City's greatest environmental resources?

- Trees are great asset (protect them)

2. Do you feel that these resources are being adequately protected? How would you protect them?

- City is doing a good job of protecting bicycle resources except for one way streets
- Barriers are a problem: need more bridges across rivers, crossings of railroad tracks, freeways
- Increase safety – reduce LOS levels

3. Are there any sources of information such as studies/reports that would help to characterize the environmental resources of the City?

- National Study of Bicycling and Walking prepared about 12 years ago (Department of Transportation)
- Bike Utopia – see Sacbike.org

Other Comments

[All Groups]

- Transportation and Air Quality Collaborative
- Importance of traditional street grid for pedestrians and cyclists
- Second unit size of 700 sq. ft. may be too small; should look into size flexibility and also parking requirements
- People would be open to multiple use along Franklin and maybe some other community corridors
- Riverfront good place for multiple use projects
- Prop 63 – mental health issues –Steinberg
- Homeless composition: 20-25 % are from outside of Sacramento
- Shared housing model – City has been restricting – L&F is operating in gray area
- Good neighbor policies
- Safe neighborhoods
- Outside play areas
- Good transportation, bike friendly

- Neighborhoods friendly for disabled
- Infill – high density
- Thriving community and businesses
- Downtown Sac should be something we are proud of – no chains, unique character
- Multi unit businesses with residential on top
- Improve riverfront
- Affordable housing
- Andy Plescia – Vision for ED "City of Villages"
- Laura Hall – Santa Rosa form-based codes "smart codes"

SACRAMENTO GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW SUMMARIES
Questions for Individuals
January 2005

List of Individuals Interviewed:

- Linda Bennett, Sacramento Association of Realtors
- David Butler, Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce
- Dannetta Garcia ,League of Women Voters of Sacramento County
- Jim Lofgren & Corey Koehler ,Sacramento Valley Apartment Association
- Paul Petrovich & Phil Harvey, Petrovich Developers
- Randall W. Sater, A. Teichert & Son, Inc., Urban Land Institute
- David Taylor, David Taylor Interests Inc.
- Allen Warren, New Faze Development
- Robert Waste, CSUS Dept. of Public Policy & Administration

Current

1. How has Sacramento changed over the last 5 to 10 years, or longer? Has this been positive or negative change?

Positive:

- Downtown revitalization/development (4)
- Economic and employment diversification (from base closures and otherwise) (3)
- Better quality of development
- Increased housing values.
- Traffic planning and new building projects.
- Expanded public discussion of community issues
- Natomas development
- New development in Meadowview
- It's become more interesting – more dining and entertainment choices
- Quality of housing and management has improved
- Reinvestment in rental
- Property vales and rents gone up (positive indicator)

Negative:

- How long it takes to process building permits (plan checking and abandonment process horrible)
- Problems with the city entitlement process.
- Long wait times for building permits.
- Too long to get product to market; got worse three years ago
- Suburban development

- Suburban/urban interplay has been negative (i.e., traffic and schools have gotten worse)
- Traffic congestion is getting worse
- Homelessness
- The City Council and Board of Supervisors are doing a good job, but need to focus more on infrastructure. Need more new bridges across the river. Need to build the infrastructure before opposition crystallizes. Leaders need to have the foresight to see what will be needed in the city.
- Not enough has changed: South Sac, Meadowview, railyards; Sac State still not linked to community, arts & culture; Sacramento has an inferiority complex
- There has not been quality growth. There's been too much emphasis on bricks and mortar, projects here and there. The tail is wagging the economic dog. There is no emphasis on attracting quality jobs and growing the economic pie.
- Planning department is ok; Economic Development Department is dysfunctional, only wants big national names
- Tough to do affordable housing in this climate.
- Rapid growth, now playing catch up
- Reinvestment in rental property
- Difficult for government to keep up and manage growth
- Some problems with aging properties. How to fix what's already been built.

2. What do you see as the City's most important assets and resources to protect?

- Rivers, American River Parkway, parks/open space, trees (7)
- Heritage, historical districts, old town feel (4)
- Neighborhoods (3), but not at expense of balkanizing
- Livability/quality of life (2)
- Downtown (2)
- Core of Sacramento feels like small town –grid street pattern, trees – a comfortable city to live in
- Sacramento has the amenities and respect of a big city, but a small town feel.
- Main Street feel.
- Outdoor activities
- Sierra and the coastal range
- Climate – four seasons
- Cultural Diversity
- Accessibility
- State Capitol
- State
- Underserved communities e.g., Meadowview
- Medical Centers (e.g., U.C. Davis)
- Cross cultural – people get along well
- Public transportation – accessibility
- Libraries
- Strong business climate
- Be clear about what's important and what's not important to protect
- Own identity

- Sacramento has large economic base in suburbs
- Knowing your neighbor
- Walkalble

3. What are the most important issues facing Sacramento residents today? Are these issues the City can or should take a strong role in? What improvements can be made?

- Air quality (4)
- Schools (3), improve schools to attract suburban residents
- Downtown as destination/more attractions (3); esp. at night; without turning it into a carnival
- more residential in Downtown (plus grocery stores and schools)
- Traffic congestion (3)
- Housing affordability (2)
- Traffic and housing are high priority issues for infill development
- New incentives for infill
- Reliable transportation – safe, dependable and affordable (RT is not frequent or safe)
- Free downtown transportation (20 block radius)
- Lack of visionary political leadership
- Need more consistency from Mayor and City Council – need more vision/commitment/priorities (e.g., downtown arena) – need more follow through
- Lack of corporate headquarters
- Lack of generous philanthropists
- Lack of economic strategy - they will do no partnering without immediate tangible benefits.
- Entrenched parochial attitude – the city is too Sacracentric
- Homelessness
- Public accessibility/walkability – being able to walk to grocery store, etc. – self-contained communities, particularly for those with fewer resources
- Neighborhood preservation
- Citywide policy versus local neighborhood
- Diversity (assimilation of people)
- Problem in processing projects – need to set clearer rules (e.g. historic structures)
- Smart growth principles are key: apply them in core of city
- Build upon infrastructure already in place
- Cost of living
- Crime
- Range of housing types
- Job growth issues – are housing prices pricing us out of the job growth? Must be able to attract quality employers.
- Transportation – need a plan to maintain the in place infrastructure
- Road maintenance money hard to come by
- Diversity should mean the opportunity for all residents to enjoy Main Street living
- Rental home customization makes more home-like

Future

4. What do you think are the three biggest growth-related challenges Sacramento will face over the next 25 years?

- Air quality
- Congestion
- Population diversity, in terms of education. Diversity is an asset, but managing education for all is a challenge.
- Maintaining a true sense of place as California's capital, and not becoming one big strip mall.
- Growth without a vision
- Not capitalizing on growth
- Clearing out bureaucracy that prevents Smart Growth
- Poverty increasing
- Influx of the poor (former residents, e.g., military)
- Not being able to serve all walks of life
- Infill is not the full answer. It is not an alternative to other types of growth, i.e., Natomas
- Don't have to change prevailing wage- make sure it doesn't go away(?)
- Focus is too much on traffic – Need to look at LOS in GP
- Accommodation of growth. Implementation of SACOG Blueprint
- Fiscal soundness
- Arriving and defining its role in the region
- Need to invest in core area
- We are being shortsighted and need to address long term.
- Issues will be compounded if we don't act on them now
- Create a framework that will last and not have to be fixed or recreated
- Maintain competitive residential attraction in suburbs (key is schools and work force generation)
- Water and urban tree canopy of the trees
- How do you grow in the north without adding to problems of: transportation, air quality, aging neighborhoods
- East Sac improves with age, but not all neighborhoods do
- Sometimes government gets in the way of natural events
- How do you deliver and maintain best vision for each neighborhood.

5. What three major improvements would you like to see in Sacramento in the next 25 years?

- One more bridge over the Sacramento River
- One more bridge over the American River
- Railyard development that is multifunctional possibly including a CSUS sub-campus
- Westfield Mall should open up J Street Mall so that it does not look like a fortress. At present, it does not invite you in.
- Have City Hall facilitate growth, so that the best quality and quantity takes place.
- Improve political leadership

- Bring jobs and prosperity to underrepresented areas
- Better plan for social/economic equity
- An economic plan that focuses on job creation in key industries
- Reuse older buildings (Arco Arena) for housing and employment training
- Every homeless person should have a bike
- More backbone infrastructure and regional transit facilities: combined sewer system, light rail
- Need another professional sports team or make sure we retain the Kings
- More higher educational institutions
- Mather as a secondary passenger hub
- Museums/parks
- Iconic role of city center of region
- Increase public venues downtown (e.g., performing arts, educational institutions, Governors' mansion, entertainment facility-build on capital's presence)
- Clearer policy on homelessness and follow through with where to house
- Improve residential neighborhoods and Downtown core. However, capacity for housing in the downtown is limited to 10-15,000 max.
- Accessible and livable new development
- More walkable development
- More transit access
- Improve public transportation, especially connecting suburban areas to the down-town; we also need more transportation locations
- Clean air – improvements (turn Highways 80/50/99 into clean air corridor)
- Uniform and consistent regulations - change drives people out of business (e.g, AOA compliance, Prop 65)
- Transportation – systems and roadways (including public transportation)
- Rental property owners concerned about increased fees – they do not want to be seen as a revenue source
- The rental housing industry is treated like second class citizen even though we provide a major service and have a huge economic impact

6. What do you feel are the three most important things Sacramento can do to manage its growth in the next 25 years?

- Incentives for living closer to job sites and development that supports this idea (too many small employment centers)
- Provide infrastructure to attract higher caliber employers.
- Offer educational opportunities
- Regional cooperation.
- Reduce barriers to private investment
- Implement SACOG Blueprint – higher density, multifamily
- Focus investment on essential infrastructure (e.g., Roseville, Portland (Pearl District))
- Encourage multi-unit for sale housing
- Sacramento can't mange overall growth.
- Juvenile justice
- Homelessness

- Sustainable communities
- Infill needs to be exempt from traffic and inclusionary housing
- Time for city to grow up
- Look at "quality of life bond issue"
- The city needs to take an active role in identifying areas to accommodate growth. Whatever share of the next 1 million people are not accommodated in the geographic center of the region will tend to migrate towards the suburban fringe.
- Make more connections from neighborhoods to the core-downtown where people come for events
- Accessible and livable new development
- Not enough walkable development
- More transit access
- Affordable housing ordinance – Inclusionary wants to work with private and public funds for the implementation of more affordable housing projects
- Housing in downtown – housing trust fund
- More energy efficient buildings
- Universal design
- Partner with SHRA and/or other entities to get creative in funding affordable housing
- Mandate a mix of housing sizes in new development

General Plan

7. Are you familiar with the City's current General Plan? How?

- No (2)
- Some (3)
- Yes (4)

8. Do you feel that the current General Plan has functioned well? Provide examples of what had and has not worked?

- Too much residential around the airport. Why is residential so close to the airport and industrial is farther away?
- The fact that it hasn't been updated indicates that it has not functioned well and it provides no overall framework.
- No sense of priorities.
- Sacramento has hosted too many planning charrettes – too much "silo planning" (many isolated projects not connected by a framework).
- Focused too much on financial issues
- Hasn't addressed the masses
- Failed plan - failed in the human element
- Simplify it
- Too many policy layers
- R Street market wouldn't exist if M1 zoning was not exempt from housing
- Band aid approach
- Going to a big box ordinance – if vacant for 12 months, have to postpone/LOC (?) for tearing building down

- Visioning has been overly extensive and implementation of development not always consistent.
- Not particularly relevant. Since the GP isn't applicable to the masses, it's a failed plan.
- Useful, but doesn't have measurable objectives. It has been useful in terms of the housing element and meeting our fair share requirements.
- It is a plan that should have the flexibility to change and not be set in stone (i.e., big box stores have arrived since the Natomas plan was created). The plan should lay out clear zoning rules.

9. Do you see this General Plan Update process as one that will make an important difference to the City? In what way?

- Yes, it could make a difference, depending on the results. The goal should be to streamline government and to create certainty for growth.
- Yes, as long as leadership has the political will to stand by the plan and not amend it at every turn
- Yes, if political leadership supports and implements the General Plan and doesn't continually amend it.
- Specific plan streamline
- No, only will be as important as the discussion that we have with everyone.
- If you have to go for a special permit, fine, but don't add "19 additional points" where people can attack you
- Good Process: Citrus Heights, Rocklin, Davis, Folsom, and Vacaville (the rules are clear); bad Process: Elk Grove and Woodland
- Opportunity to identify new growth areas as well as infill opportunities. Also opportunities to implement Blueprint principles
- Yes, focus on larger issues not details. It is an opportunity to have conversation with various interests and gives us a chance to implement smart growth plans. He doesn't like building and planning staff – too old school, with a different set of objectives and they say no to good projects.
- Internet means we can share information about urban experiences and exchange ideas – info technology should improve decision making

10. Relative to your particular concerns/issues, what would you like to get out of this General Plan Update?

- Need to strengthen government
- More efficient government.
- Engage in discussions about our future - big picture
- Infrastructure is the key. You cannot put in infrastructure after the fact. A good example is the light rail along Truxel. It is needed, but is disturbing a great deal of people.
- It is important to also involve people at all levels.
- Clear economic development strategy (with regional context)
- Simplify policy and regulatory
- Reduce barriers to private investment
- Create certainty

- Clear focus downtown core, sub-area core identity, Greenhaven and Meadowview
- There is no sense of place in some parts of the city. South Sacramento for instance – because of silo-style planning there is no vision
- Smart growth strategies could provide the missing "core" for every neighborhood in Sacramento
- Smart Growth – building on existing infrastructure in urban core (not suburban development)
- A new element that addresses a sustainable society, inclusive of people that are less fortunate
- Would like the neighborhood shopping center concept (8-10 acre sites) included
- Should have flexibility to have proper amount of neighborhood shopping
- Planning dialogue on future growth areas
- Improve transportation: Light rail, trains, buses
- Focus on downtown core as center of region
- More focus on underutilized areas
- Incentives for infill (e.g., increase densities)
- Infill and affordable housing
- Continue on workforce housing
- Need to streamline process
- North Natomas – has no connectivity (we blew it) – bait and switched
- Need to build high quality residential neighborhoods
- More strategic planning, less broad brush solutions
- Nurture and support assets and team players
- Develop rules and procedures to address those not on the team.

11. Who else should be involved in the General Plan Update?

- Jon Chase, President of West Natomas Community Association, 654-6840
- ULI
- John Lambeth
- Lea Fat
- Bruce Starkweather
- Rick Jennings (Meadowview)
- North Sac. Family Center (North Sacramento)
- Pat Fong Kachida
- Stella Hispanic Chamber
- Loaves & Fishes
- WIN Corporation (near Loaves &Fishes)
- VA/retired vets
- Indigent population
- Mike McKeever
- Affordable housing advocates
- Legal Services of Northern California (Brian Augusta and Bill Kennedy)
- Congress of Neighborhood
- Mary Brill
- SHRA
- CADA

- Greg Taylor
- Property Management. FPI Management, Ray Stone Management, Hank Fisher Properties, St. Anton LLC.
- BOAMA
- BIA
- SAR

Smart Growth

12. Do you understand the concept of "Smart Growth"? How do you think Sacramento City residents/business owners will respond to Smart Growth as a guiding principle for this general plan update?

- Familiar with Smart Growth. It is growth that accommodates the livability and viability of the community. It takes into account infrastructures such as schools/education and the fire department.
- Walkable communities are important (e.g., Elk Grove)
- The term "smart growth" is a turn off (smarmy term) and gives the impression that the policy makers are smarter than everyone else.
- Land Park is a good example of smart growth. We all want things nearby, but we want it at Wal-Mart prices. It's important to understand needs, not just wants.
- Smart Growth is a wasted phrase. Overused. We were supposed to do this a long time ago not after the fact. Sacramento lost its opportunity to use the term.
- Should "reinvent Sacramento" using what vacant land is left.
- In general, they will be supportive so long as increased density is not proposed near them. This will be the City's greatest challenge: "nimbyism"
- If the definition matches what everyone talks about, it's a great asset.
- The best places to do it are where you have least resistance and biggest impact (i.e., Del Paso Heights, Meadowview, Oak Park, etc.)
- "Quality of life" instead
- "Sustainable Growth" better term
- It's a buzz word. Get beyond the buzzwords and talk specifics
- For some people there is no smart growth – all growth is bad
- Maintain aesthetics – trees, open space
- Need to define what you want
- Trade offs and costs

Other Comments

- If you listen to the populace, you usually know what you need to do. Smart growth is accommodating people's needs.
- Time is most important to people.
- Safety is another underrated issue. Personal safety while riding mass transit, or having your child walk to school.
- Railyard – great opportunity to develop epicenter of region, places that define our region. Also a possible location for a new arena (the "Roundhouse").
- Figure out what's broken and fix it
- Infill projects not important unless safe
- We are shutting the door on the poor
- GP amendments are routine, not just for major changes
- Over 100 projects backed up in design review
- Need to process infill projects quickly-- quality goes down with more time
- Neighborhood shopping centers are the community's glue

- Las Vegas is a good example of how to do things right – They assign plan checkers to work hand-in-hand with infill developers
- With the emphasis on increasing densities, encourage City to consider an evaluation of aging infrastructure
- Be bold but be honest in vision and staffing
- Sacramento needs to make a "big splash". Replace Portland as model (Utah has done it)
- Sacramento should be a leader.
- Energy conservation-use tree canopy for solar cooling
- Housing Trust Fund
- Look at Portland as a model
- Infill coordinator needs to have power
- No incentives for anyone to look at the city as a whole
- Green buildings
- It's an improvement to have GPU team coming out and seeking RHA input. However RHA resources to participate are limited
- Educate people on the cost of smart growth and the tradeoffs. Focus on marketing what Smart Growth is. Make it part of the elementary school curriculum.
- We are subsidizing motorist (e.g., free parking)
- Transit and bicycling compete for same dollars. Transit gets 30-40% of transportation money, but bikes gets 1%.
- Need to sell density
- End of oil – what implications?
- Workers have bigger parking spaces than offices
- Think 50 year timeframe

APPENDIX B

GPAC INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Key Summary Points of All Groups and Context

As part of Phase 1 of the General Plan Update, the City's General Plan consultants and City staff interviewed the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) members. GPAC members were asked a series of questions, and the key summary points are shown below.

Key Questions:

What do you think are the three biggest growth-related challenges Sacramento will face over the next 25 years?

- Transportation alternatives/air quality
- Equitable distribution of high quality economic development, including institutional, commercial, residential development and services
- Affordable housing/infill
- The resolve to implement the plan
- How do you convince people to make different decisions regarding lifestyle so we can pay for improvements. For example, how to finance without compromising the overall objectives such as preventing sprawl.
- Transportation/circulation
- Walkable and livable communities
- Jobs – lots of people don't work here
- Environmental quality including open space, air quality, water quality, and natural resources

What three major improvements would you like to see in Sacramento in the next 25 years?

- Create vibrant/24-hour downtown
- Create more incentives for the creation of transportation options
- Railyards
- Transit alternatives/expansion (including inter-modal transit station and high speed rail)
- Great streets/streetscapes (both residential and commercial); improved safety; and revitalization of blighted areas (both residential and commercial)
- Support local and regional businesses
- Bridging barriers
- Downtown as the economic engine of area and housing downtown
- More greenbelts with bike trails liked together to create a network

Do you feel that the current General Plan has functioned well? Provide examples of what had and has not worked?

- Lacks implementation strategy
- No, it has not. It doesn't offer specific goals and deliverables
- No, relied too much on community plans, did not promote infill and no implementation
- General Plan is outdated.
- No, not user-friendly

Do you see this General Plan Update process as one that will make an important difference to the City? In what way?

- City leadership has made a commitment to value high participation
- Yes.
- Create discussion and ownership
- Address regional and border issues
- Balance/address equity issues (social; infrastructure)
- Yes, General Plan should set a vision and lead to more efficient processing
- If there is a great General Plan, will it be implemented and upheld through resources, staff and leadership
- Yes, will help foster neighborhood identity – the process will deepen understanding

Relative to your particular concerns/issues, what would you like to get out of this General Plan Update?

- A usable document!
- Reduce dependence on autos
- Vibrant downtown
- Safe/clean city
- Broad range of opportunities/options and choices
- Flexible, visionary plan
- Balance of mobility modes
- Good design leading to a form-based code and design guidelines
- Assurance that the General Plan is what we want and it is clear for future residents
- General Plan will become a blueprint to guide the future/provide future direction

Policy Context – What Happens Next?

Your input along with the results from the first phase of Town Hall Forums will be incorporated into the Planning Issues Report. Your input will also be used in developing of Vision and Guiding Principles.

You will be able to see how your input was incorporated when you review both the Planning Issues Report and the Vision and Guiding Principles. For example, you will be able to assess whether the draft Vision and Guiding Principles adequately addresses the issues you've raised here. You will be able to make recommendations to staff on this document before it goes to Council.

Through your review of the draft policies and General Plan, you will be able to evaluate whether goals, policies, and objectives have been developed that effectively address these and the other issues that the community has raised. You will have the opportunity to make recommendations to staff on these issues, which will also be conveyed to City Council.

Below is a list of key documents that you will see over the course of the General Plan update.

Key documents:

- ✓ Background Report
- ✓ Planning Issues Report
- ✓ Vision and Guiding Principles
- ✓ Alternatives Report
- ✓ Draft General Plan and Policies
- ✓ Environment Impact Report (EIR)
- ✓ Finance and Implementation Plan
- ✓ Final General Plan and EIR

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - Summary

INTERVIEWEE: Community Design Subcommittee
INTERVIEWERS: Larry Mintier
DATE OF INTERVIEW: 4/4/05

Current

1. How has Sacramento changed over the last 5 to 10 years, or longer? Has this been positive or negative change?
   - Housing costs (-)
   - RT expansion (+)
   - Congestion (-)
   - Lack of accessibility to RT (-)
   - Midtown revitalization e.g. restaurants (+)
   - Housing mix in downtown (+)
   - Becoming big city (+)
   - Small town mentality (-)
   - Small town feeling (+)
   - Increased diversity (+)
   - Population growth (-)

2. What do you see as the City's most important assets and resources to protect?
   - Rivers
   - Trees
   - Diverse housing stock – good stock
   - Neighborhood identity
   - Open space/wetlands
   - Parks
   - Capitol
   - Diversity

3. What are the most important issues facing Sacramento residents today? Are these issues the City can or should take a strong role in? What improvements can be made?

   - Lack of affordable housing
   - Traffic & transportation
   - Poor school/education infrastructure
   - Political vision/lack of
   - Political courage
   - Homelessness (social justice/equity)

Future

4. What do you think are the three biggest growth-related challenges Sacramento will face over the next 25 years?
   - Transportation alternatives/AQ
   - Education infrastructure
   - Density NIMBYism

5. What three major improvements would you like to see in Sacramento in the next 25 years?
   - Create vibrant/24 hour downtown
   - Increased transit use/more alternatives (bike, walking)
   - Increased cultural amenities
   - Increased physical and visual to river

6. What do you feel are the three most important things Sacramento can do to manage its growth in the next 25 years?
   - Encourage infill - Mixed-use / residential, commercial
   - Logical expansion of city – adequate land supply
   - Old infrastructure in infill areas

General Plan

7. Are you familiar with the City's current General Plan? How?
   - Yes
   - Yes
   - No
   - No

8. Do you feel that the current General Plan has functioned well? Provide examples of what had and has not worked?
   - Lacks implementation strategy
   - Lack of political will
   - Currently, no. Out of date
   - Not visionary enough
   - Not flexible enough to accommodate mixed use
   - Too literal

9. Do you see this General Plan Update process as one that will make an important difference to the City? In what way?
   - Yes

10. Relative to your particular concerns/issues, what would you like to get out of this General Plan Update?
    - Reduced dependence on automobiles
    - Vibrant downtown
    - Safe, clean city
    - Broad range of opportunities/options/choices

11. Who else should be involved in the General Plan Update?
    - N/A - everyone

Smart Growth

12. Do you understand the concept of "Smart Growth"? How do you think Sacramento City residents/business owners will respond to Smart Growth as a guiding principle for this general plan update?
    - SACOG blazed trail
    - "Livability"
    - Not everyone believes in all Smart Growth principles
    - Sustainability

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - Summary

INTERVIEWEE: Housing and Infrastructure Subcommittee
INTERVIEWERS: Celia Yniguez
DATE OF INTERVIEW: 4/4/05

Current

1. How has Sacramento changed over the last 5 to 10 years, or longer? Has this been positive or negative change?
   - More development – suburban development more than urban
   - N. Natomas is a travesty

2. What do you see as the City's most important assets and resources to protect?
   - Sacramento and American rivers
   - City as government center
   - Historic land marks and buildings
   - Air
   - Open space/agricultural land
   - Downtown/midtown and neighborhoods
   - Vintage architecture – bungalows, Victorians, etc.

3. What are the most important issues facing Sacramento residents today? Are these issues the City can or should take a strong role in? What improvements can be made?
   - How can people work, live and play in the same county
   - Are their enough jobs and housing options for residents
   - Safety/crime. Personal crime is different, especially in downtown/South Sacramento area – linked to sprawl
   - People associate crime with density or urban areas
   - Segregation of communities socio/economic exists
   - Housing explosion of new Greenfield development. New homes not owner occupied.
   - Controlling inventory of housing leading to high rates of S.F. rentals
   - Control of O.S./Green development
   - Slum lords
   - City SH
   - Tighter control of housing inventory into rental
   - Affordable housing
   - Needs huge political will on many issues – leadership

Future

4. What do you think are the three biggest growth-related challenges Sacramento will face over the next 25 years?
   - Air pollution
   - Lack of mobility (bus, freeway, LRT, Pedestrian, bike, handicap, elderly)
   - Sprawl of growth
   - How to convince people to make different decisions regarding lifestyle so we can pay for improvements/services. How to finance without compromising the overall objectives – prevent sprawl – share.
   - Gentrification

5. What three major improvements would you like to see in Sacramento in the next 25 years?
   - Support local/businesses/regional
   - Denser development in downtown
   - More housing options for modest income
   - More housing options for everyone
   - Sustain development – housing, jobs, services throughout the City
   - Bring culture downtown. Consolidate cultural institutions downtown
   - Maintain ethnic communities e.g. unique neighborhoods
   - Preserve Stockton blvd.

6. What do you feel are the three most important things Sacramento can do to manage its growth in the next 25 years?

General Plan

7. Are you familiar with the City's current General Plan? How?

8. Do you feel that the current General Plan has functioned well? Provide examples of what had and has not worked?
   - General Plan is outdated
   - No traffic LOS – does not work for downtown
   - Planning function does not work, does not provide vision/direction for the City

9. Do you see this General Plan Update process as one that will make an important difference to the City? In what way?
   - If there is a great General Plan, will it be implemented? Upheld? Resources/staff leadership
   - General Plan should set a vision – leads to more efficient processing
   - As long as General Plan/consultant accurately reflects community input

10. Relative to your particular concerns/issues, what would you like to get out of this General Plan Update?
    - Assurance the plan is what we want and it is clear for future residents
    - Form based zoning? Better implementation
    - City get a better site plan e g. consolidated site for fee
    - Customer service oriented – rethink how plan functions (is happening now)
    - Opportunity for the city to be educated – community involvement

11. Who else should be involved in the General Plan Update?

Smart Growth

12. Do you understand the concept of "Smart Growth"? How do you think Sacramento City residents/business owners will respond to Smart Growth as a guiding principle for this general plan update?

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

INTERVIEWEE: Land Use Subcommittee
INTERVIEWERS: Bill Ziebron
DATE OF INTERVIEW: 4/4/05

Current

1. How has Sacramento changed over the last 5 to 10 years, or longer? Has this been positive or negative change?

2. What do you see as the City's most important assets and resources to protect?

3. What are the most important issues facing Sacramento residents today? Are these issues the City can or should take a strong role in? What improvements can be made?

Future

4. What do you think are the three biggest growth-related challenges Sacramento will face over the next 25 years?
   - Traffic/circulation (mobility)
   - Walkable – livable communities
   - Jobs – lot's of people don't work here
   - Air & water quality
   - Natural resources
   - Environmental quality/open space
   - Population
   - Quality of life
   - Incorporation of S.G principles
   - Community identity – how do we create and know what it is?
   - Crime
   - Affordable housing

5. What three major improvements would you like to see in Sacramento in the next 25 years?
   - "Bridging" barriers
   - Downtown as the economic engine of are and housing downtown
   - More greenbelts with bike trails linked together - network
   - Well-planned infill (housing)
   - Diversity of housing type
   - More bridges across the Sacramento river
   - Connectivity/infrastructure
   - Better urban design

6. What do you feel are the three most important things Sacramento can do to manage its growth in the next 25 years?

General Plan

7. Are you familiar with the City's current General Plan? How?

8. Do you feel that the current General Plan has functioned well? Provide examples of what had and has not worked?
   - Not user friendly
   - Amended numerous times
   - Didn't anticipate development
   - Too general; doesn't reconcile issues i.e. infill development, demolition of housing stock
   - Doesn't function as "driver" or "tool"
   - Represents older, out-dated ways of thinking about land use, etc.
   - Is repository/foundation

9. Do you see this General Plan Update process as one that will make an important difference to the City? In what way?
   - Neighborhood identity – process deepens understanding
   - Outreach will create broader awareness/understanding of issue
   - Land uses could provide more flexibility
   - Process could deepen our connection to city we live in = identity
   - Whole greater than sum of parts – everybody contributing a little bit will influence whole

10. Relative to your particular concerns/issues, what would you like to get out of this General Plan Update?
    - Policy to influence/facilitate focus-based zoning
    - Developers knowing "rules" and what is acceptable – reduce friction
    - General plan becomes blueprint to guide/drive direction/future
    - Circulation to benefit livability (cycling, walking, street design, etc.
    - General plan should be Sacramento oriented – supports success of existing local business, not just new businesses
    - "Business friendly"
    - Facilitate "right development"; streamline environmental review for this
    - Encourage and provide incentive for innovation i.e. where it is welcome
    - To be a good ancestor, to be conscious and thoughtful 30-40-50 years +
    - Compelling, bold ideas
    - Allow 2nd unites to be counted as affordable housing

11. Who else should be involved in the General Plan Update?

Smart Growth

12. Do you understand the concept of "Smart Growth"? How do you think Sacramento City residents/business owners will respond to Smart Growth as a guiding principle for this general plan update?

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

INTERVIEWEE: Mobility Subcommittee
INTERVIEWERS: Desmond Parrington
DATE OF INTERVIEW: 4/4/05

Current

1. How has Sacramento changed over the last 5 to 10 years, or longer? Has this been positive or negative change?
    - Growth in outer areas – tract housing (-)
    - Riverfront improvements (+)
    - Light Rail (+,-)
    - Create options (+)
    - Encourages sprawl (-)
    - Poor routes; poor station planning (-)
    - Worsening congestion/worse air quality (-)
    - New infill downtown (+)
    - Higher home prices; gentrification (-)
    - Over-concentration of social services in Sacramento and not in other cities

2. What do you see as the City's most important assets and resources to protect?
    - Diversity
    - Rivers
    - Tower theatre; memorial auditorium
    - J, K. T streets
    - Old Sacramento
    - Small town feel
    - Urban forest
    - Defined neighborhoods
    - Historic architecture/preservation
    - Major parks; American river parkway
    - Neighborhood activism

3. What are the most important issues facing Sacramento residents today? Are these issues the City can or should take a strong role in? What improvements can be made?
    - Balance growth and transportation
    - Increased traffic/transportation choices
    - Water/air quality
    - Aging urban canopy
    - Infill vs. Greenfield development
    - Access and parking
    - Regional pressures

Future

4. What do you think are the three biggest growth-related challenges Sacramento will face over the next 25 years?
    - Transportation/air quality
    - Affordable housing/infill
    - Water quality
    - Economic development
    - Resolve to implement plan

5. What three major improvements would you like to see in Sacramento in the next 25 years?
    - Transit alternatives/expansion
    - Railyards
    - Great streets/streetscape (residential and commercial)
    - Improved safety
    - Revitalization of blighted areas (residential and commercial)
    - Underground I-5
    - Inter-modal transit station/high speed rail 9

6. What do you feel are the three most important things Sacramento can do to manage its growth in the next 25 years?

General Plan

7. Are you familiar with the City's current General Plan? How?

8. Do you feel that the current General Plan has functioned well? Provide examples of what had and has not worked?
    - Too many changes
    - Okay; not great
    - Needs to be updated (should have been updated earlier

9. Do you see this General Plan Update process as one that will make an important difference to the City? In what way?
    - Creates discussion and ownership
    - Address regional/border issues
    - Balance/address equity issues (social; infrastructure)
    - Public Safety
    - Discussion re: cost of services of infill vs. Greenfield

10. Relative to your particular concerns/issues, what would you like to get out of this General Plan Update?
    - Flexible, visionary plan
    - Form-based code
    - Involving under-represented groups
    - Change LOS standard (Level of service for autos)
    - Balance of mobility modes

- Design guidelines and good design
- Make us a leader in region on regional issues
- More development focus/coordination along river

11. Who else should be involved in the General Plan Update?

Smart Growth

12. Do you understand the concept of "Smart Growth"? How do you think Sacramento City residents/business owners will respond to Smart Growth as a guiding principle for this general plan update?

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - Summary

INTERVIEWEE: Parks, Open Space Health and Safety
INTERVIEWERS: Karen Baker
DATE OF INTERVIEW: 4/4/05

Current

1. How has Sacramento changed over the last 5 to 10 years, or longer? Has this been positive or negative change?
    - It's bigger – more traffic (-)
    - More diversity downtown (+)
    - Suburban mills have gotten bigger (+, -)
    - Less open space/more development (-)
    - Redev/infill – inside Sacramento (+)
    - Too much sprawl – N. Natomas (-)
    - Not enough change in Souith Sacramento (-)
    - Housing prices up (+ for homeowners, - for non)

2. What do you see as the City's most important assets and resources to protect?
    - Two rivers
    - Diversity
    - Government buildings
    - Historical buildings
    - City as a crossroad
    - Canopy's in larger parks
    - Small town feel in a lot of our neighborhoods
    - Independent & small business owners
    - Midtown: diversity of household
    - Sacramento is a gateway to a lot of great places

3. What are the most important issues facing Sacramento residents today? Are these issues the City can or should take a strong role in? What improvements can be made?
    - Infrastructure challenges (transportation of water, sewer, bridges)
    - Clay pipes are breaking
    - Water meters
    - Energy efficiency/green developments
    - Canopy – new builders aren't planting canopy producing trees

Future

4. What do you think are the three biggest growth-related challenges Sacramento will face over the next 25 years?
    - Equitable distribution of high quality economic development including institutional, commercial, residential developmental services
    - Senior issues – affordable housing, access to services, transportation
    - Maintaining diversity – squeezed out by growth?
    - 33ansportation – inadequate public options
    - Density of housing – getting community acceptance of smart growth
    - Open space – enough parks

5. What three major improvements would you like to see in Sacramento in the next 25 years?
    - Create more incentives for the creation of transportation options
    - Creating community villages
    - Building of more affordable housing – & diverse options
    - Make developers pay their fair share – in addressing infrastructure needs
    - Build more diverse housing and services in downtown
    - Offer universal pre-school
    - More police

6. What do you feel are the three most important things Sacramento can do to manage its growth in the next 25 years?

    - Political will to adhere to guiding documents
    - Defining growth boundaries
    - Becoming "one" with the rivers (Bike trails, retail, housing)
    - Prioritize in-fill development/re-development
    - Make in-fill easier
    - Creating live/work communities

General Plan

7. Are you familiar with the City's current General Plan? How?
    - Somewhat/moderately
    - No
    - Have read elements
    - Show the public the General Plan – visual

8. Do you feel that the current General Plan has functioned well? Provide examples of what had and has not worked?
    - No - doesn't offer specific goals, deliverables
    - Token policies in Parks/open space area
    - Lot's of "continue to support" language
    - It's not followed or clear enough

92

9. Do you see this General Plan Update process as one that will make an important difference to the City? In what way?
    - City leadership has made a commitment to Value high participation
    - Yes – Participation value is high
    - It will be followed
    - We are on a crest of change with our society

10. Relative to your particular concerns/issues, what would you like to get out of this General Plan Update?
    - A usable document
    - Good transportation alternatives
    - A plan that meets the growth demands
    - A blueprint for a livable (not just for development) city that is a model
    - Learn how to make people more active/civically engaged

11. Who else should be involved in the General Plan Update?
    - Everyone!
    - Get high school students involved now
    - Getting neighboring cities/counties and state environmental agencies involved

Smart Growth

12. Do you understand the concept of "Smart Growth"? How do you think Sacramento City residents/business owners will respond to Smart Growth as a guiding principle for this general plan update?
    - Yes – we understand Smart Growth
    - There are some that don't get it (the maps of blueprint helps educate)
    - People will respond all over the map

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C1

2/8/05

General Plan Policy Issues **DRAFT**

Development Services Department

As part of the General Plan Update process, Sacramento's Development Services staff compiled a list of General Plan policy issues to be considered in later phases of the work program.

Purpose: To identify policy issues and provide policy direction on the key physical, environmental, economic, cultural and social issues affecting the General Plan. These issues will be forwarded to the General Plan Policy Team and sent to the consultant as input in their Planning Issues Report.

Planning/Land Use/Community Design

1. How to integrate the General Plan/Community Plan land use categories into a consolidated General Plan Map and classification system? Define urban forms for the city's neighborhoods and districts?

2. How will the individual, existing community plans be incorporated into the General Plan? Will they be abbreviated and incorporated as summary documents in the technical appendices, or will they be included verbatim as they exist today? Will new plans be created for "unplanned" areas such as East Broadway and Land Park?

3. There is a need for vertical integration between the General Plan, Community Plans and Zoning Ordinance. Will this occur as part of the General Plan Update, or as a subsequent implementation measure?

4. How to build flexibility into the Plan that allows changes in market conditions without compromising the goals and policies of the Plan? **

5. Which Community Plan areas (some do not have plans) to include in General Plan? Does GP policy prevail in cases of conflicting Community Plan policies?

6. Which policies and development standards conflict with traditional neighborhood development? What form based or new codes should be considered in developing the new Plan? **

7. Annexation areas – how to integrate dissimilar areas under common standards? How to support the distinctions and differences of neighborhoods or historically separate communities? **

8. Citywide Design Review - With proposed increases in mixed use, and high intensity development, come the need for high-level development standards and design review. There are regular requests from the public, and from the Council, for citywide design review. Should we take design review citywide, use a historic resources survey, and avoid environmental review on historic property?

9. Joint-use standards (shared land uses/functions) are an important strategy that needs to be elevated.

10. We need to identify a consistent tracking system to track and monitor future plan amendments.

11. The General Plan should identify both smart growth/TOD development opportunity sites, as well as identify where "other" uses such as regional retail, auto sales, big box, industrial, etc. should be located.

12. The General Plan should identify appropriate densities both within TOD and urban infill areas, as well as greenfields/other infill areas. Do we want dense, urban densities throughout the City, or only in key areas?

13. The General Plan should identify policies and strategies for deep lot development (e.g. Lemon Hill and Robla areas).

14. Conversion of industrial lands to residential need to be addressed in light of a broader economic development strategy and vision for the City.

15. Consider including, as a matter of policy/procedure, that as part of the development of a new or updating an old Community Plan, that a key component include a Reconnaisance level historic resources survey (literature search on history of area's development and basic "windshield" survey of properties in area) to inform the planning and development considerations for that area, including future Intensive surveys to establish Landmark or Historic District designations and related Historic District Plans.

16. Gentrification of existing communities (balancing affordable housing with infill/redevelopment objectives) should be addressed in as a general policy, and as part of the Housing Element.

17. Consider policies that include height restrictions in the CBD that recognize view corridors and adjacent historic districts.

Economic Development

18. How to revitalize commercial corridors and integrate economic development and land use objectives? The City should identify long-term goals and strategies for economic development, including: land use, infrastructure-financing, jobs housing balance and retail needs. (See IKEA in West Sacramento.) **

19. How much industrial reserve land is needed to support projected basic employment growth? **

20. Office land need – what is the role of the city in the region with regard to premium office space and other tiers of office development?

21. Marketing the city as a destination, for tourism, convention, business – is that an explicit goal with urban planning consequences – parking, hotels, facilities?

22. In addition to Smart Growth and TOD development, the City needs to identify the appropriate locations for auto oriented uses (e.g., regional retail, big box, auto malls etc)

Housing

23. The Housing Element should include a strategy for affordable housing and changing demographics. **

General Plan Amendment Applications

24. How to address the processing of major requests for plan amendments including EC in North Natomas during the Update? **

25. What processing protocols are needed for processing general plan amendment applications filed during the update? How broadly should it be defined (size or location of request)? How to batch/group applications for policy review within general plan land use alternatives selected next summer?

26. How to coordinate city-initiated projects during with the Update? (e.g. Riverfront Master Plan/Railyards and other Central City projects)

27. How to address rezoning requests during the General Plan Update process? How to be effective while development activity continues?

Identification of Areas of Opportunity for Reuse

28. Which projects should be considered 'committed' versus pending (e.g. development agreements/approvals versus pre applications) as the focus of land use reevaluations?

29. What are the criteria for identifying Areas of Opportunity for Reuse (e.g. infrastructure and service capacity or changes, economic blight, landowner cooperation, demographic and market demand, developable land supply, parcelization and ownership)? **

30. What are the city's priorities for identifying 15 areas of opportunity for reuse (e.g. greenfield, infill, transit and commercial corridors)? **

Border Issues/Regional Cooperation

31. What policies should the city pursue to address buffers/urban edges, special district and tax conflicts? Can the General Plan be used for developing a MSR for the Sphere of Influence Request for NJV? How do we define polices to promote regional cooperation?

32. How do we deal with governance to address regional issues (e.g. TOD)?

33. Safety coordination – city, county, state – what are the emerging directions for ensuring good service delivery. Are there urban designs and planning policy (including managing cross jurisdictional areas) that foster positive safety at the community level?

34. Identify county service issues in unincorporated areas adjacent to the City (e.g., Frutridge and Arden/Arcade Areas). **

35. Include in the Plan update process and opportunity for collaboration with regional agencies including RT/SMUD/School Districts.

Streamline project-level CEQA reviews

36. The General Plan Update should streamline the standards for triggering traffic and other environmental studies for projects. **

37. How does the General Plan create more certainty in the development process to promote infill development?

Mobility/Transportation

38. What are the transportation goals, beyond just level of service standards; what is the mix and transportation orientation of the plan? **

39. What is the optimum transportation system that improves mobility by enhancing travel choice, accessibility and travel times? Consider The Air Quality/Transportation Collaborative features and performance indicators.

40. Include a strategy for transit station planning, including Transit for Livable Communities (TLC). The strategy should include: minimum densities, minimum FAR, maximum parking, transit supportive uses and impacts on existing neighborhoods. **

41. Consider incorporating an Air Quality Element and related policies. This element may have implications on land use and transportation components of the Plan.

42. The Circulation Element should address bridges proposed as part of the West Sacramento General Plan. **

43. Where in the General Plan will we identify a connection between new growth and where and transportation/accessibility infrastructure. Will we identify a transportation plan that supports a centers and corridors intensification strategy?

44. Look at changing demographics for changes in mode split and increases in transit ridership based on changing demographics.

45. Provide policy direction for the preservation of Central City grid/alley system/platting. This language could be included in both the Circulation and Preservation Elements. Street abandonment should be considered based on merit and benefit to the City (rather than a simple lack of potential impacts). Public benefits must exceed those that would have been provided without the proposed vacation.

46. The NNCP has six and eight lane arterials bisecting the areas near the transit stations, which not only creates barriers for peds, but was also a major factor in undermining some of the transit oriented land uses around them (attracting regional shopping centers etc.) TOD's aren't at all compatible with freeways and wide arterials, and should be separated by some minimum distance (perhaps several miles?)

Social Issues

47. How do issues of social equity, environmental justice and affordable housing get addressed in the update.

48. Policies to promote a fair share distribution of social services and affordable housing throughout the city's neighborhoods and region.

Infrastructure and Finance

49. City improvements related to infill and redevelopment require a policy strategy and a financing strategy. City improvements could stimulate infill rather than subsidizing infill. Does the City help "pave the way" for the underserved infill areas with community infrastructure and facility improvements that lead the development? Can this be supported by public bonds or funding dedications for long term strategic improvements? (Will the consultant address this or is this more detailed than the basic infrastructure assessment/financing plan in the consultant contract?) **

50. Different infrastructure standards historically result in a lack of continuity between some parts of the city. Do infrastructure plans need to be adopted to ensure continuity in the City? **

51. Telecom issues should be incorporated as part of utilities/infrastructure analysis (e.g., under grounding of utilities, wi-fi, etc.).

52. Additional police stations may be needed in the following locations:

- South Area (Delta Shores)
- Central City (CBD/Railyards/Richards)
- East Area (Especially if Rosemont is annexed)

Urban Development/Service Standards

53. Traffic - The current level of service goal of LOS C is suburban, particularly relative to other jurisdictions in the region. LOS C requires significant infrastructure improvements, resulting in increased development costs. **

54. Street Standards/Design - The City should re-evaluate how roadways are designed and sized. Some streets have been overbuilt (See Azavedo, Pocket Road and Rush River Drive) to accommodate more traffic than actually resulted. Additionally, current street standards limit front on lots and curb cuts on streets with greater than 2,500 ADT. This standard results in sound walls and back-on lots on many arterial and collector streets (See North Natomas). Land Park Drive, Riverside and McKinley Park Drive could not be replicated today. Street standards and threshold levels of service need to be understood together. Recently adopted street standards need to be reviewed and forwarded to the consultant **

55. Urban Park Standards -The current minimum park size on a citywide basis is 5 acres. This may not be practical or feasible in infill areas, particularly in the Central City. There is a need to identify policies that allow for smaller, more urban parks. Reevaluate definition of park space to include civic spaces, and

"urban hardscapes", particularly in the Central City and TOD infill areas.

56. Master Plans/Service Elements/Service Standard Modifications - Departments may need to modify their current master planning documents and associated service standards to recognize the proposed "urban" land use policies in the General Plan (e.g., smaller fire trucks for smaller streets, smaller park requirements etc.). **

57. Minimum Project Development Standards - Identify minimum development standards, such as FAR, proximate to LRT stations and other urban infill areas to ensure efficient and cost effective use of land.

58. Drainage requirements may need to be modified at TOD and urban infill areas where higher densities require more acreage for mitigation, which limits the amount of development on a given site.

59. Maximum parking requirements should be identified to prevent "over parking" in key areas, particularly near transit.

60. Provide examples of wide/overbuilt streets that have been converted to more pedestrian friendly scale (e.g., Freeport Blvd., Azavedo etc.)

Energy/Conservation/Sustainability

61. Consider incorporating an Energy Element and related sustainable green building design in the General Plan.

62. Provide policies for development adjacent to historic and modified creek channels so that they become assets rather than liabilities (see: Magpie Creek Goals and Policies).

Implementation

63. Implementation - how will the plan be implemented? It is necessary to identify collaboration with other service providers, districts, and jurisdictions.

64. The General Plan should identify policy direction for the treatment of development applications during the period between plan adoption and the implementation phase of the plan.

Growth Strategy

65. The plan should identify a relationship between the development of new, suburban greenfields (e.g. Natomas Joint Vision) and infill development. There should be a connection between the two. Implementation - how will the plan be

implemented? It is necessary to identify collaboration with other service providers, districts, and jurisdictions.

66. The growth pattern for the CBD should identify the form and structure of new development. For example, do we want fewer, but taller office towers, or should we plan for a larger number of mid-rise buildings?

67. Should new growth areas accommodate a range of housing (e.g., from single family to multi family and mixed use), or should we plan for a consistent mix of densities throughout the City. (i.e. "smart growth" everywhere VS a Duany style transect)?

68. Perhaps the new General Plan could include some policies for transit implementation related to the acquisition of land in new growth areas so that future opportunities won't be lost perhaps by developer impact fees or some other mechanism. Even if we don't build any more LR, dedicated lanes for BRT would be possible. (This should also be address in the Circulation section).

** - Priority issues (staff identified)
Bolded language was incorporated into the list on November 29, 2004

APPENDIX C2

As part of the General Plan Update process, Sacramento's Parks and Recreation Department staff identified planning issues to be considered in later phases of the work program.

Related Core Values/Guiding Principles from the City Parks & Recreation Master Plan

The adopted *2005-2010 Parks and Recreation Master Plan* is based on valuing equally:

1. **Human Growth and Development** (developing the City's "Human Assets") by providing for **Engagement, Safety, Relationships** and **Personal Development**); and

2. **Protecting the City's Green Infrastructure**.

The balance and interaction between the expression of these values can provide for high levels of livability, sustainability, economic vitality and public safety, and should be driving forces for the City's land use vision for the future. The General Plan should define a compelling vision and the principles that will guide decisions about land use and development in the future. ***"The living City"*** should be central to this vision and these principles.

Paradigm Shifting

The future of the "River City" will, to a large degree, be decided by the vision created by this planning effort. The planning principles in the SACOG Blueprint define a large work program to rethink the preferred downtown of Sacramento. This is what is most exciting about the effort.

As an example: What if our waterways, other natural assets and public spaces were used to shape development, rather than the other way around? We could emphasize the opportunities these natural assets also provide for economic development (such as tourism and enhanced property values), and how public spaces interface positively with employment, housing and transportation. Development should face to our Rivers rather than away from them, and riparian corridors and watersheds should be protected and managed for their multiple public values. We could exchange maximum setbacks from the waterways and other natural areas for greater building height, and insure additional "public benefits" are provided when exceeding certain height or density thresholds. Major planning concepts embodied in the Blueprint, "Design with Nature" and "Conservation Subdivisions" should become core values/guiding principles for our City.

The Project for Public Spaces promotes important ways of thinking about public places, including:

- Making places "human": creating outdoor spaces in which people like to linger and that they intuitively like, feel comfortable in and connect to.
- Layering attractions that gather people in.

- If downtowns and neighborhoods aren't appealing, we can't compete for residents or businesses.

In addition, building heights could be "stair stepped" to provide viewsheds, and building even more on the City's railway history to provide a narrow gauge rail system through downtown and to various River access points could be a unique attraction to the area.

Systems Thinking

Community Plans should consider carefully the connectivity and positive interrelationships between various physical and nonphysical/social elements of the larger system that is our City and our region. These include, but are not limited to: transportation, circulation, natural systems, employment, housing, public facilities/services, land use, visual corridors, open space, gathering places, and social structures/institutions, etc. The reconsideration of the Railyards/ Richards Blvd. Area Plans offers a timely opportunity to review these important elements and confirm the vision they enable.

Human Growth and Development

Can the General Plan Update include a "Human Services Element", as is being prepared for the County General Plan Update? We particularly should ensure a good environment for raising children, and the "Human Growth and Development Model" can provide a basis for this. A similar model with the foundational elements of Relationships, Personal Development, Engagement and Safety could be used as a centerpiece for the General Plan (see Attachment A).

Also, we should consider Promoting Health and Fitness as a guiding principle for the General Plan, and work with local health industry professionals to develop this idea more extensively.

Sacramento as a Destination

We should consider adding tourism/visitorship to our City to the more "usual" land use planning equation of jobs, housing and transportation, and as a key element of the City's economic development strategy. Unique development, based on the historic, natural and economic opportunities offered in Sacramento should be thoroughly explored. "Making Places for Celebration" is a guiding principle of the Riverfront Master Plan that highlights increasing interest in Festivals and other public events. Why not introduce something that will "brand" Sacramento as more than just the State Capital? What about a world class white water course running through a busy, mixed use area of downtown?

People Scale Parkway Boulevards

In keeping with the theme of creating "places where people want to linger", the Riverfront Master Plan envisions "parkway streets" as those with enhanced landscape and pedestrian facilities, and that hopefully become great public places. This is a concept that need not conflict with building up, as there are numerous examples of great public places in many of the world's largest cities.

Building Up (Skyline and Intensification)
While we may have to provide smaller green spaces and public places where development density will increase, we should not assume that these smaller spaces can completely take the place of larger expanses of green space. The denser development becomes, the more access to the natural world is needed.

Raising the City skyline is inevitable, and we should consider what people might want to be looking across to or down on. Green space within the viewshed will be highly desirable from an economic and aesthetic point of view. We should also consider the introduction of rooftop parks/green spaces (e.g. over parking and other structures) where development will be intensifying.

Open Space Planning
We should employ a natural systems understanding and use the General Plan to establish the "grand vision" for open space in our region. There is considerable public support locally for this as a priority for Sacramento's public agenda (evidenced in various polls conducted over the last few years) that would provide funding for land purchase and management.

Adoption of the *2005-2010 Parks and Recreation Master Plan* included approval of Policy 11.7: "Define a system of open space, buffers and viewsheds that act as neighborhood gateways, and as visual and physical community separators and greenbelts to define the limits of urban growth." This means concentrating development and containing sprawl as a guiding principle of the General Plan, while areas that are "people scale" need not be a conflicting objective.

Scope of General Plan Levels of Service (LOS)
Is the General Plan an appropriate place for established Service Levels for the Urban Forest, Recreation and Human Services, Parks Maintenance or Special Events?

Equity
We should use the General Plan to directly address inequities in services and facilities. Issues of particular importance in this arena for Parks and Recreation Services currently are older vs. newer areas of the City, and gender equity.

Quality of Life/Sustainability/Livability
Can we develop definitions and measurable indicators of these concepts and measure them over time? The Parks and Recreation Department has begun to work on a "Quality of Life Index" for our services, and will be working with Neighborhood Services to develop a Livability Index/Definition that we assume would be used to frame the General Plan as well.

Infrastructure
What will priorities be for future infrastructure investment? We would advocate for a balance in providing for more traditional infrastructure (streets, sewer, water

conveyance, etc.) and "green infrastructure" (the integrated network of watersheds, airsheds, woodlands, wildlife habitat, greenways, parks, working farms, ranches, forests, urban trees and parkways, and other open spaces). And the funding to properly operate and maintain these facilities. We also suggest creating room for high canopy Urban Forest along Parkway Boulevards.

APPENDIX C3

As part of the General Plan Update process, Sacramento's Utilities Department staff identified the following planning issues to be considered in later phases of the work program.

Drainage: Mainly North Sacramento (outside of North Natomas)

1) Current on-site drainage systems (approved to allow development) are not adequate as long term solutions and will be obsolete when regional drainage solutions are in place. Current systems are piecemealed and won't connect to future drainage infrastructure.

2) No drainage development fee exists similar to water and sewer development fee. Thus, no CIP funds exist to build large regional drainage infrastructure projects that would serve future development.

3) Future development will have to mitigate and fund regional solutions to undersized or nonexistent drainage infrastructure.

Combined Sewer System: Entire Combined Sewer Area of the City

1) Future regional combined sewer mitigation projects are necessary to allow new development to proceed (development that will add ESD's that don't currently exist as part of existing land use). Implementation and timing of these projects are issues to consider for future development to proceed.

2) Thresholds exist within the combined system that will define timing and implementation of mitigation projects to facilitate future development. Development projections will have to be defined to determine thresholds.

Flood Control: Magpie Creek Area

1) This is an issue area where future development will have to develop mitigation plans to build within the Magpie Creek Area. Fortunately an authorized federal project has been funded in this area.

APPENDIX C4

As part of the General Plan Update process, the General Plan Technical Advisory Committee identified the following planning issues to be considered in later phases of the work program.

1. Transportation and Mobility – LOS C
2. Sustainability/Environment
3. General Plan amendment processing protocol
4. Density and Design
5. Streamlining – code reform, environmental review
6. Economic Development
7. Financing
8. Development standards, other levels of service
9. Housing Affordability and Mix
10. Infill and Reinvestment
11. Urban Form/Open Space buffers

ATTACHMENT 2
Recommended Revisions to the Vision and Guiding Principles
SACRAMENTO GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
Revised per Council's Comments on 11/08/05

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this document is to set out a Vision that captures the City's key values and aspirations for Sacramento's future. The Vision Statement paints a picture of what Sacramento will be twenty-five years from now. The second part of this document sets out Guiding Principles that flow from the Vision Statement. These principles establish policy benchmarks for the rest of the General Plan Update process. The principles, along with the issues identified in the *Planning Issues Report*[1], will be used to help define how growth will occur, as well as direct the development of land use alternatives and updated General Plan policies. The alternatives will be defined at a citywide scale and for targeted "areas of opportunity." The Vision and Guiding Principles are applicable to the context of the City as a whole as well as its community plan areas and neighborhoods. The Vision and Guiding Principles is informed by recently adopted City policy related to smart growth and sustainable development and an extensive community involvement program that includes public input from the first phase of town hall forums, focus group interviews, and the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), a 25-member citizen's committee appointed by the Mayor and City Council.

VISION STATEMENT

The guiding vision of the General Plan is that **Sacramento will be the most livable city in America.**

As California's capital, Sacramento will continue to play its traditional role in the region as the primary center of government, employment, and culture. Downtown Sacramento will vibrate with arts, culture, entertainment, and a 24-hour population.

The city's economy will continue to strengthen, diversify, and ~~globalize~~play a larger role in the global economy. Building on the skills of our workforce, Sacramento's economy will provide~~, while providing~~ a broad range of jobs in all industry sectors, including those related to small and local businesses.

Every neighborhood will be a desirable place to live because of its walkable streets, extensive tree canopy, range of housing choices, mixed use neighborhood centers, great schools, parks and recreation facilities, and easy access to Downtown and jobs.

Sacramento will be linked to the rest of the region by an extensive, efficient and safe network of roadways, bridges, mass transit, bikeways, ~~and~~ pedestrian trails, and sidewalks. It will be linked

[1] The Planning Issues Report identifies major issue categories to be addressed in the new General Plan. Copies of the document are available from the Planning Division or on the Internet at www sacgp org.

to the rest of California and the world by an international airport, ~~passenger~~ conventional and high-speed passenger rail, interstate highways, and high-speed communication systems.

Sacramento will continue to celebrate its cultural and ethnic diversity and ensure the equitable treatment of all neighborhoods and groups. Sacramento will protect its historic and cultural resources and its natural environment and will increase access to its riverfront and open spaces for the enjoyment of its growing population.

Sacramento will promote the health and well-being of the community and will plan for the long-term safety of its citizens.

Finally, to help address the causes of global warming and the urban heat island effect, Sacramento will be a model of sustainable development in its planning, ~~and~~ its use of urban heat island reduction measures, and its conservation of energy, water, and other natural resources.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Land Use

- Provide a diversity of neighborhood environments, from the *traditional*[2] downtown core to well-integrated new growth areas.
- Create a vibrant downtown that serves as a regional destination for the arts, culture, and entertainment while accommodating residents that live, work, and gather in the city center.
- Focus higher density developments and mixed-use projects in areas adjacent to transit stations, along transit corridors and commercial corridors, near job centers, and in strategic opportunity areas throughout the city.
- Use the existing assets of infrastructure and public facilities to increase infill and re-use, while maintaining important qualities of community character.
- Promote livable and well-designed neighborhoods that are walkable and complete, with a mix of uses and services to support improved health and the needs of families, youth, seniors, and a growing population.
- Utilize *sustainable development*[3] and land use planning practices that provide for the needs of existing residents and businesses while preserving choices for future generations.

Community Design

- Create vibrant public places that serve as gathering places, town centers, and villages for the community.
- Promote the development of complete neighborhoods both in infill and new growth areas that foster a sense of place.
- Protect and replicate the pattern and character of Sacramento's unique and traditional neighborhoods.
- Promote designs for development that are compatible with the scale and character of Sacramento's existing neighborhoods.
- Locate and design buildings, streetscapes, and public spaces that contribute to walkable neighborhoods.
- Promote developments that foster accessibility and connectivity between areas and safely and efficiently accommodate a mixture of cars, transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

---

[2] The term traditional refers to the urban grid pattern that is characteristic of older central cities.

[3] Sustainable development practices refer to the use of architectural and planning methods that address the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Specific examples include the use of solar panels for energy conservation, placing jobs near housing to reduce vehicle trips, and infill development in urban areas to reduce the consumption of agricultural land.

- Recognize and preserve those areas of the City with a 'sense of place' that are based largely upon their historical and cultural resources.

Housing

- Provide a mix of housing to meet the needs of current and future residents, including an equitable distribution of affordable housing, throughout the city.

- Include a mix of housing types within neighborhoods to promote a diversity of household types and housing choices for residents of all ages and income levels in order to promote stable neighborhoods ~~and reduce homelessness~~.

- Work to end homelessness in Sacramento by providing affordable housing opportunities and services.

Mobility

- Develop a balanced, integrated, multi-modal transportation system that is efficient and safe with frequent service connecting every neighborhood to the rest of the city and the region.

- Provide a variety of transportation choices that promote accessible alternatives to the automobile including walking, bicycling, and taking transit.

- Expand and improve existing transit systems to encourage higher ridership that will lead to less dependence on the automobile and fossil fuels, and to better air quality.

Economic Development

- Promote the City as the civic, cultural, and economic hub of the region and the Central Valley.

- Promote strategic development of vacant, underutilized, and infill land, especially along transportation and commercial corridors, to improve the city's economic outlook.

- Create and maintain a broad range of jobs that are accessible to all residents that provide opportunities for advancement.

- Improve the jobs-housing balance by siting housing near employment centers.

- Develop a vibrant 24-hour downtown that is a destination for the region and California.

- Work with educational institutions to promote the skill and talent of Sacramento's workforce in order to attract high quality jobs.

- Develop the city's waterfront to provide a world class urban experience for residents, workers, and visitors.

- Focus investment and revitalization in distressed neighborhoods.

Public Health and Safety

- Foster safe neighborhoods through good community and environmental design that promotes a mix of uses, active streets, improved air quality, and security.

- Improve coordination among residents and businesses and police, fire, planning, transportation, and other City departments to address security issues and achieve safe neighborhoods.

- Minimize Sacramento's vulnerability to natural and manmade disasters and strengthen the City's emergency response capabilities including improving flood protection through the strengthening of our levees and modernizing Folsom Dam.

- Promote exercise and activity by all age groups through the development of walkable neighborhoods and recreational facilities and programs.

- Promote opportunities for community education and involvement through volunteerism and civic engagement.

Environmental Resources

- Encourage sustainable levels of energy and resource consumption through efficient land-use, transportation, building design, construction techniques, waste management, and other infrastructure systems.

- Preserve open space, farmland, natural resources, and environmentally-sensitive areas to maintain community identity.

- Preserve and protect important historic and cultural resources that serve as significant, visible reminders of the City's social and architectural history.

- Improve and expand the urban forest that contributes to the uniqueness of Sacramento: the City of Trees.

- Continue to improve air and water quality to ensure a healthy community and region.

- Continue to ensure the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.

Parks and Recreation

- Maximize public access to and use of the Sacramento and American Rivers and the City's other open space resources.

- Expand and improve existing pedestrian paths and bikeways to promote health, recreation, and connectivity between neighborhoods.

- Provide innovative parks and recreational and sports facilities for all of Sacramento's existing and new neighborhoods.

- Promote Sacramento as a cultural destination with arts and open space amenities throughout the city.

Services and Facilities

- Provide quality public services, facilities, and infrastructure that are distributed equitably throughout the city.
- Support high quality education and schools.
- Promote joint-use of public facilities to optimize the use of public funds.
- Develop facilities, services, and partnerships to ~~significantly reduce~~ help end homelessness~~the homeless population~~.

DEVELOPMENT OF VISION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The initial public participation components of the General Plan Update (GPU) process, which includes the GPU Focus Group interviews, GPAC interviews, and the first round of Town Hall Forums, have engaged a broad representation of Sacramento's public in thinking about what Sacramento's future can be and ways to achieve it. The Town Hall Forums provided participants an opportunity to identify on survey forms what they felt are the five most important issues to be addressed in the updated General Plan. In addition to issues, public input also provided insight to what participants in the process value.

Across all 14 forums, the five most highly ranked issues are as follows (note that issues 4 and 5 were ranked the same):

1. Safe neighborhoods
2. Mixed-use and higher density developments around light rail stations and along commercial corridors
3. Distribution of affordable housing throughout the City
4. Protection of agricultural land and open space, and improving streetscape quality
5. Amount of affordable housing; improving air quality; and expanding the light rail system

A Planning Issues Report was also prepared that defined key issues brought forward in the first phases of the General Plan Update. The report was based on early input from Focus Group interviews, GPAC Interviews, the Town Hall Forums, the Technical Advisory Committee, Planning Staff, and the Technical Background Report (TBR). The Planning Issues Report and other General Plan documents are available at the General Plan website (www.sacgp.org). The Issues Report identifies 14 key issues to be addressed in the update. These issues include:

- Smart growth
- Sustainability
- Affordable housing
- Mixed-use, higher density development/infill
- Economic development
- Level of Service for roadways
- Service standards for public facilities
- Alternative transportation modes
- Public safety/ crime/ police service
- Air quality
- Open space/farmland protection
- Natural resource protection
- General Plan implementation
- Streamlined permit processing

Many of the top issues and values identified in the Town Hall Forums were also key ones identified in other sources. All of these issues and values are reflected in the Vision for Sacramento's future or as Guiding Principles.

The Vision and Guiding Principles also reflect recently adopted City policy. These include such policy statements as the City's Strategic Plan (2005), Infill Strategy (2002), Smart Growth Principles (2001), Civic Standards (2001), Economic Development Strategy Framework (2000),

and existing General Plan (including the Preservation Element, 2000, and the Housing Element Update 2003).

Thus, the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles have been informed by public input during the first phase of Town Hall Forums, by key information in the Planning Issues Report, and by existing City policy.

RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

November 22, 2005

RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE AMENDED PLANNING ISSUES REPORT AS A FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT FOR THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (M05-005)

BACKGROUND

A. On September 27, 2005, the Sacramento City Council accepted the Technical Background Report as a foundation for the General Plan Update.

B. Building on issues identified in the Technical Background Report, City staff and the General Plan consultant team conducted extensive outreach throughout Sacramento, including thirteen town hall forums as well as interviews and other publicly noticed meetings, in order to identify important issue categories for the Planning Issues Report.

C. The Planning Issues Report identifies major issue categories to be addressed during the preparation of the City's new General Plan, including the development of the land use alternatives and new goals and policies. These issue categories were identified based on substantial public input plus the work of the City's Technical Advisory Committee and General Plan Policy Team.

D. Based on the input from the General Plan Advisory Committee at its meeting on September 12, 2005, revisions have been incorporated into the amended Planning Issues Report. Both the Development Oversight Commission and the City Planning Commission also unanimously approved the Planning Issues Report.

E. Lastly, based on recommendations from the Mayor and City Council, staff has incorporated additional revisions to the Planning Issues Report to address particular issues of concern.

BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Planning Issues Report, as amended by Council, identifies key issue categories to be addressed in the General Plan Update.

Section 2. Furthermore, the Planning Issues Report, as amended by Council, is accepted as a basis for the development of both the General Plan land use alternatives and future policies.

RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

November 22, 2005

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE AMENDED VISION & GUIDING PRINICPLES AS THE GUIDING DOCUMENT FOR THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (M05-005)

BACKGROUND

A. On September 27, 2005, the Sacramento City Council accepted the Technical Background Report as a foundation for the General Plan Update.

B. From April until August 2005, City staff and the General Plan consultant team prepared a Planning Issues Report that identifies major issue categories to address in the General Plan Update and which informed the development of the Vision & Guiding Principles.

C. City staff conducted extensive outreach throughout Sacramento, including thirteen town hall forums and other publicly noticed meetings, in order to identify important community values and to solicit input for the Vision & Guiding Principles.

D. On September 12th and 19th, 2005, the General Plan Advisory Committee held two workshops on the Vision & Guiding Principles in order to solicit additional public input and to critically review the document. The Committee approved several changes to the document to ensure that it comprehensively addressed the values of Sacramento.

E. On October 6th, the City Planning Commission built upon the changes of the General Plan Advisory Committee and approved additional changes.

F. As a result of recommendations from the City's Design Review and Preservation Board on November 2nd, staff made modifications to the document related to community design and preservation issues.

G. Furthermore, the Vision & Guiding Principles, as amended, has the support of City Planning staff plus the inter-departmental Technical Advisory Committee and has been approved unanimously by the General Plan Advisory Committee, the Development Oversight Committee, and the City Planning Commission.

H. Lastly, on November 8th, staff made further modifications to the amended Vision & Guiding Principles based on Council's review and recommendations.

BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Vision & Guiding Principles, as amended by the City Council, the General Plan Advisory Committee, the City Planning Commission, and City Planning staff is formally adopted by City Council.

Section 2. The Vision & Guiding Principles, as amended, will serve as a guide and benchmark, not only for City staff, but also for the entire Sacramento community throughout the entire General Plan Update, including the development of land use alternatives and General Plan goals and policies.

Section 3. Furthermore, Council directs staff to use the Vision & Guiding Principles and return with a series of policy workshops on the following issues: 1) transportation level of service standards; 2) affordable housing; and 3) a downtown strategy.

Section 4. Finally, given that our existing General Plan was developed and adopted in the late 1980's, current General Plan land uses in some areas may not be compatible with the City's new vision. Therefore, Council directs staff to use the Vision & Guiding Principles to develop interim processing protocols to review proposed General Plan land use amendments during this period prior to the adoption of the new General Plan. Any changes to existing procedures will require approval by the City Council after review by the General Plan Advisory Committee, Development Oversight Commission, and the City Planning Commission.