

Jackson Highway Visioning
Public Workshop #2
Workbook Feedback Summary
April 28, 2008



The following report provides a summary of participant feedback, representing a broad range of opinions and ideas about concepts in land use planning. The findings are strictly advisory, meaning they are not representative of the broader population. However, they do provide important insight into the opinions and perceptions of 81 workshop participants; additionally, not every participant chose to complete a feedback form.

Introduction

The County of Sacramento Planning and Community Development Department recently hosted a public workshop to gather feedback on its Jackson Highway Visioning project where 81 participants attended.

The workshop was held from 6–8 p.m. on Monday, April 28, 2008, at the Rosemont High gym. Workshop advertisements were posted on the County Web site, through stakeholder and property owner mailers and personal emails. The workshop included a short PowerPoint presentation of project concept maps, followed by four stations highlighting concept elements for participants to view at their leisure. The four stations included County staff and consultant team members and focused on: road/transit, agriculture/habitat/recreation, land use balance/design overview and a question and answer station.

Feedback forms were developed to collect participant feedback on the overall concept map comments and the following development principles:

- Create distinctive and sustainable community nodes that contain a “complete” mix of land uses.
- Design communities so that employment nodes, parks, schools, shopping and other daily needs are within a close distance to housing.
- Provide a range of housing choices that could include:
 - Semi-rural
 - Traditional single family homes
 - Condominiums
 - Townhomes
 - Apartments
 - Mixed-use development
- Provide a variety of transportation options that could include:
 - Roadways
 - Bike trails
 - Walking paths
 - Public transportation
- Protect and preserve existing natural resources, including agricultural, rangelands, critical habitats and open space.

The development principles were derived in part from participant feedback obtained during the first workshop.

Participant Feedback Forms

Map #1	Map #2
Create distinctive and sustainable community nodes that contain a “complete” mix of land uses.	
<p>This statement is well represented on Map #1. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p>	<p>This statement is well represented on Map #2. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"> AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION 18 6 4 </p>	<p style="text-align: center;"> AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION 20 5 2 </p>
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many community nodes in each area. Eagles Nest development is in some areas already protected. • Agree, with the exception of the main node which should be moved west and allow for a contiguous preserve from Mather south to the Cosumnes. • Too much many community nodes. Development is mapped in areas that are already protected along Eagles Nest Road and north of Jackson. • County DWR is planning to construct regional WTP at northeast corner of Florin/Vineyard extension – smack in the middle of envisioned town center. Congesting traffic on existing Hwy 16 is creating future problems – Hwy 16 needs to bypass future town centers. • Design = urban sprawl around minimally separated work centers. • Lots of single family, maybe too much. • Residential densities need to be very high (40-80 du/acres would be very good). • Central node is too big. Should spread the size of nodes more evenly. • Provides for a well balance development process. While at the same time providing access to services. • No. • Looks like mix is reasonable. Alternative is much better, however, in preserve connections. • Although the rerouting of Jackson Hwy will impede the flow of traffic for non-area residents. • I like the road alignment portion of alternative #1. (not the traditional grid like version in alternative #2). 	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many community nodes in each area. Eagles Nest development is in some areas already protected. • Agree, with the exception of the main node which should be moved west and allow for a contiguous preserve from Mather south to the Cosumnes. • Too much many community nodes. Development is mapped in areas that are already protected along Eagles Nest Road and north of Jackson. • County DWR is planning to construct regional WTP at northeast corner of Florin/Vineyard extension – smack in the middle of envisioned town center. Congesting traffic on existing Hwy 16 is creating future problems – Hwy 16 needs to bypass future town centers. • Design = urban sprawl around minimally separated work centers. • My property is right in the projected downtown area – not pleased. • Lots of single family, maybe too much. • Residential densities need to be very high (40-80 du/acres would be very good). • Disagree - central node is too big. Should spread the size of nodes more evenly. • Equally the same. • No. • Missing ag res product that reflects existing communities south of Grant Line. Alternative has better preserve connections. • The addition of a cultural center (ag-tourism center) brings a unique component to the area. • I like the agricultural reserve portion of alternative 2 (east of Grant Line).

- The node concept is best depicted as the alternative #1, map #1 node near Jackson and Excelsior. The urban, higher density node there seems well conceived except for the mini-node on Jackson that is east of this main node. The value of an identity gateway is much lower than the value of a under habitat corridor connector, which it currently narrows excessively. Remove the 3 western most residential areas would be a big improvement.

- I just hate concept 2 east Excelsior. The town center location and gateway create a huge impact to vernal pools in the USFWS critical habitat area. The other development nodes (east of Excelsior) are way too big and close together at Florin and on Grant Line.

Map #1	Map #2
Design communities so that employment nodes, parks, schools, shopping and other daily needs are within a close distance to housing.	
<p>This statement is well represented on Map #1. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p>	<p>This statement is well represented on Map #2. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"> AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION 21 2 3 </p>	<p style="text-align: center;"> AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION 22 1 3 </p>
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage people to live near where they work and play. • No • That answer truly depends on the infrastructure design as to whether it can sustain that proximity of heavy travel. • This will never happen! • I prefer the downtown version from alternative #1 (Excelsior and Jackson) with the alignment of Jackson being pushed north. • It is unclear whether the concepts will achieve the critical mass necessary in each node to support services. Also, please consider “daily needs” as not just retail needs, but service needs (e.g. doctors, child care). If there isn’t enough to support a variety of amenities in each node, it is probably better to centralize all amenities in one location. • For the most part. • Balance development. Provides access to services. • Nodes need to be more balanced in size. Downtown node is too big. • This is workable if densities/employment opportunities are intense. • All development is confined to infill of existing urban areas. • I think – info overload. • The map is not sufficient to decipher whether shopping for daily needs would occur near residential, as “commercial” can wind up being big box stores that are not for “daily needs.” Likewise, schools are not shown, so we’re not sure where they would be placed. Generally the town center approach works but not around Grant Line. 	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No • This will never happen! • It is unclear whether the concepts will achieve the critical mass necessary in each node to support services. Also, please consider “daily needs” as not just retail needs, but service needs (e.g. doctors, child care). If there isn’t enough to support a variety of amenities in each node, it is probably better to centralize all amenities in one location. • Ag-res missing, otherwise okay. • Balance development – provides access to transportation. • Nodes need to be more balanced in size. Downtown node is too big. • Whichever concept gets more pop is best. • All development is confined to infill of existing urban areas. • I think! – info overload. • The map is not sufficient to decipher whether shopping for daily needs would occur near residential, as “commercial” can wind up being big box stores that are not for “daily needs.” Likewise, schools are not shown, so we’re not sure where they would be placed. Generally the town center approach works but not around Grant Line. The big node on Grant Line is misplaced because it will be an attractant for traffic on a road that should stay relatively developed to provide a beltway – bypass to alternate congestion. Why would we put lots of commercial development on a bypass other than due to pressure from the fiscalization of land use.

Map #1	Map #2
<p align="center">Provide a range of housing choices that could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-rural • Traditional single family homes • Condominiums • Townhomes • Apartments • Mixed-use development 	
<p>This statement is well represented on Map #1. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p> <p align="center"> AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION 16 4 5 </p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I little hard to comprehend in this venue. If I sat down with maps and had numbers. • Reviewed this statement and it does provide for the above. • Much better for ag res. • The “feathering” of density as the USB is approached is appropriate. • What about agriculture? Farmers! • What is “traditional single family homes” 7,200 sq. ft.? 2,000 sq. ft.? or 5-8,000 sq. ft. mc mansions. • Condos/apartments always seem to be degenerative to a vibrant community. • No • Too hard to comprehend in this venue. • Requires more feathering using low densities to ag-res to rural. • Townhomes – high density is best. • For alternative #1 of map #1, I’d like to see more med-density development on the north side of the node at Jackson/Excelsior/Keifer. Shows way too much ag res east of Grant Line. Cluster development (map #2) makes more sense. 	<p>This statement is well represented on Map #2. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p> <p align="center"> AGREE DISAGREE NO OPINION 17 5 4 </p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I little hard to comprehend in this venue. If I sat down with maps and had numbers. • Reviewed this statement and it does provide for the above. • True to lack of ag res. • What about agriculture? Farmers! • What is “traditional single family homes” 7,200 sq. ft.? 2,000 sq. ft.? or 5-8,000 sq. ft. mc mansions. • No • Seems less flexible and varied than 1. • Too hard to comprehend in this venue. • With all the open space that will be preserved to protect species, ag-land should not be preserved on side USB as part of long-term vision. • Requires more feathering using low densities to ag-res to rural. • Townhomes – high density is best. • I like the cluster development concept east of Grant Line. Much better than ag res there.

Map #1	Map #2												
Provide a variety of transportation options that could include:													
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roadways • Walking paths • Bike trails • Public transportation 													
<p>This statement is well represented on Map #1. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p>	<p>This statement is well represented on Map #2. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p>												
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>AGREE</td> <td>DISAGREE</td> <td>NO OPINION</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </table>	AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION	18	4	4	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>AGREE</td> <td>DISAGREE</td> <td>NO OPINION</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17</td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </table>	AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION	17	1	5
AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION											
18	4	4											
AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION											
17	1	5											
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More public transit – it is more efficient and can help reduce GHG. • Neither option adequately considers regional transportation characters of Jackson Highway. • I am sorry I did not catch this. • No • Key being: don't just make a variety of options available, make them attractive and desirable. • Like couplet design to node. Probably more acceptable to grid pattern of #2 in this area. • Central node is located as far as possible from north-south roads to Hwy 50. Need good cross access. Move nodes farther east and west. • Very diverse development. • I didn't see a clear depiction of this. • Too many curvy roads – not good design. • The plan seems to help integrate transportation alternatives. Alternative #1 shows only small nodes on Grant Line which is better than concept 2. 	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More public transit – it is more efficient and can help reduce GHG. • Grid is preferred. • Neither option adequately considers regional transportation characters of Jackson Highway. • Public transportation easier in 2 than 1. • I am sorry I did not catch this. • No • Grid pattern is good. Don't know how acceptable to existing community. • Central node is located as far as possible from north-south roads to Hwy 50. Need good cross access. Move nodes farther east and west. • Very diverse development. • I didn't see a clear depiction of this. • Better than #1 – very important for walking and biking is a grid pattern. It shortens distances and helps keep people from getting lost. 												

Map #1	Map #2												
Protect and preserve existing natural resources, including agricultural, rangelands, critical habitats and open space.													
<p>This statement is well represented on Map #1. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p>	<p>This statement is well represented on Map #2. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement.</p>												
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; width: 33%;">AGREE</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 33%;">DISAGREE</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 33%;">NO OPINION</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> </table>	AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION	13	10	1	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; width: 33%;">AGREE</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 33%;">DISAGREE</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 33%;">NO OPINION</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">18</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> </table>	AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION	18	5	1
AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION											
13	10	1											
AGREE	DISAGREE	NO OPINION											
18	5	1											
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern corridor is pinched. Development is occurring in protected areas. Eagles Nest and Jackson. Less development along Grant Line. • Provides for the above, while at the same time providing proximity to the above. • Alt. plan is much better for open space. Better connections of open space. • Does acceptable job. Alternative is better connectivity. • The amount of preservation will likely not meet ideal expectations, but both concepts appear to preserve a fair amount of space. • Not enough habitat protected. • The main node disrupts the potential contiguous preserves that would range from Mather to Cosumnes even the alternative, do not provide enough of a corridor. • Based on concepts, ag areas will be condensed areas by design yet you speak of “protecting existing” – ironic isn’t it? • Not enough habitat protected. • Northern corridor across Jackson is pinched. Development is occurring in protected areas. • More than enough. • Neither of the concepts do justice to the workshop 1 results. Neither concept provides a sufficient habitat corridor. • Preservation of ag lands and large open space should not happen inside the USB, unless associated at the same time with protection of endangered species. • Is the linkage for habitat big enough? • Leave open areas as amenities for higher densities. • Very good! • There appears to be less development on map 	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern corridor is pinched. Development is occurring in protected areas. Eagles Nest and Jackson. Less development along Grant Line. • Provides for the above, while at the same time providing proximity to the above. • Alt. plan is much better. • Does acceptable job. Alternative is better connectivity. • The amount of preservation will likely not meet ideal expectations, but both concepts appear to preserve a fair amount of space. • I like the idea of an agricultural-tourism center. • Better represented on map 2. • Should protect as much habitat and farmland as possible. • Not enough habitat protected. • The main node disrupts the potential contiguous preserves that would range from Mather to Cosumnes even the alternative, do not provide enough of a corridor. • Not enough habitat protected. • Northern corridor across Jackson is pinched. Development is occurring in protected areas. • More than enough. • Preservation of ag lands and large open space should not happen inside the USB, unless associated at the same time with protection of endangered species. • Is the linkage for habitat big enough? • Leave open areas as amenities for higher densities. • Very good! • Map #2 leaves open ag land east of Grant Line – much better! Reduce the development along Grant Line. • The commercial and development nodes along 												

#1 along Grant Line, but map #1 seems to but ag/res development all the way to the USB.

- The corridor east of the “big node” at Jackson and Excelsior is unnecessarily narrow. The development (single family) shows west of Sunrise (south of Jackson) encroaches into good habitat and should go away. No development should appear south of Jackson and west of Sunrise except around meaning pit (Triangle Rock).

Grant Line are way too big and intrusive into good habitat on the west side of Grant Line.

Do you have any additional comments?

Please provide your overall comments about the two conceptual alternatives.

Comments:

- Keep in mind floodplain areas – some of the development areas are shown within areas that will not allow development because of flooding potential.
- Appreciate the long time planning.
- Neither concept gives credit to the workshop 1 result which clearly favored “habitat conservation” and rural res. over all other land uses! The corridors connecting Mather resources to the UP prairie preserve are too small. The carbon center located on Jackson Highway should be moved west of Excelsior Road.
- Open space and habitat preserve connections are better in both alternative plans. #1 takes much better job of acknowledging and respecting existing ag-res community south of Grant Line.
- Since habitat protection was voted #1 in all areas, why is there not more habitat protected in either alternative. There needs to be much more habitat protection and space for cattle grazing – especially east of Excelsior.
- Do not expand the UPA. This “visioning” is premature – infill first! The core values voiced in all communities was habitat conservation. Yet you still want to develop. Conserve habitat – that is the prime directive. Ag is vital. Locally grown food is becoming more important daily. We as a community cannot afford to pave over sustainable ag that currently exists. These lands are vital to both humans and wildlife!
- I don’t believe it is appropriate to use “agriculture” as a buffer against the USB line. This limits the ability for farmers and ranchers to achieve the highest value for the land. If the County or its citizens want to limit this value, it should compensate it.
- As a local business owner, my primary concern is that the “concepts” set forth seem to be changing existing land use designations and current zonings!
- Let us know in the future if there will be any changes – 5817 Excelsior Road, Sacramento, CA 95827
- Sacramento County needs to talk to SACOG – especially regarding connector – no growth concept.
- Maps look nothing like the results of the first visioning. Insufficient habitat corridors and insufficient habitat conservation. Even the alternatives aren’t any better.
- The most significant concern is to maintain or improve the existing water table. Additional source(s) of water must be identified before this area can develop. Concept 2’s treatment of the area near the USB is best – need to protect open space – Cosumnes River.
- The ultimate form of whatever is developed in this area will be greatly influenced by the ultimate density. It might be valuable to credit scenario’s demonstrating other alternatives such as all/mostly agriculture, all mostly habitat/park land, as well as various levels of suburban to urban development.
- Uninspired land use concepts – the Blue Print did better job.
- Extremely disappointed you do not allow questions from landowners and Sacramento County taxpayers. We want to hear our neighbors.
- Should have as little development as possible in this area and preserve as much open space and farmland as possible. Also should not put 6 lane thoroughfares in this area – should be no more than 2 or 4 lanes.
- The use of Grant Line as a development axis is problematic. Measure A propaganda from SACOG and the County promised that the Grant Line connector route (it is certain to come that way) would serve as a development boundary, maintaining agriculture and open space between Grant Line and the river, with development only to it on the Western side. Actually, proposed vision is out of step with the new MTP (which foresees 4 lanes in much of this section) and the connector discussions now in progress.
- Remove all urban uses/development on Eagles Nest Road between Florin Road and Grant Line. The urban uses on the west side of Eagles Nest are in areas that are either preserved or targeted/purchased for habitat preservation/mitigation.

- Too much development along Grant Line and Eagles Nest. Large development at Grant Line and Eagles Nest is not needed – should be open space. It was hard to group/analyze all that is captured in these maps. Habitat corridor going north should be wider. Move main Jackson node – to the west – widen corridor.
- Move the “downtown district,” i.e. main hub, south of Mather west to the Jackson/Excelsior intersection and create a contiguous preserve from Mather down to Cosumnes as opposed to a token 1,000 foot corridor between the two preserve spaces.
- Generally, it’s a good start. Too much development along Grant Line & Eagles Nest. At the corner of Jackson & Grant Line there is development on the SW corner which seems sort of unnecessary. Large development at Grant Line & Eagles Nest is a bad idea. I like the flow of traffic around the town center in Alt. 1 (Jackson). The location of the town center seems wrong. Habitat corridor going north should be wider.
- If you must plan development anywhere in this area (which is foolish when we are faced with global warming, a mandate to reduce energy usage (AB32), and lots of vacant land within existing development boundaries that could be rezoned to much higher density) – then design the development to be carbon neutral (see attached info on a sustainable community planned for Rohnert Park). (Attachment #1)

Additional Comments

A separate comment card provided space for participants to express any additional comments pertaining to the workshop, concept maps or general project comments.

For pre-prepared comments, please visit the project Web site at http://www.planning.saccounty.net/gpupdate/Jackson_Visioning_Project.html and click on 'additional comments received.'

- Concept 2 "downtown main street" or concept 1 "downtown district" as it is currently shown there is a ~1,000 ft. corridor between the north and south open space. I see no reason that this downtown district be moved west ~ mile which centers the district on the Jackson & Excelsior interchange and provides for a contiguous open space "preserve" between Mather and the Cosumnes River.
- Presents plan 1 and plan 2 as only approaches as to where things should be. Doesn't ask public for alternatives. Presentation did poor job of orienting where things are. Concepts need overlay of existing smaller streets in project area. Guy named John sloughed-off questions.
- It's a good start.
- Should preserve as much open space/habitat/farmland as possible in this area. There should not be 6 lane thoroughfares - should be no more than 2 or 4 lanes in this area.
- Difficult to locate particular streets (home location) on map. What about other options that public might want to see - other than just these 2 presented maps.
- Remove the Urban Development on Eagles Nest between Florin and Grantline. The Urban uses on the west side of Eagles Nest are in areas that are either preserved or targeted for habitat preservation.
- Outside the USB should remain in Ag while inside has been marked for development. Putting an agriculture designation on lands inside the USB economically impacts those lands and the assumptions people may be making for their long term viability of their agricultural business.
- Concerned about the workshop format - taking tabular votes without attributing where those voters come from doesn't necessarily give the BOS complete information to make a decision. For example, there could be 10 individuals adamantly opposed to a concept that directly live in the affected area, but 50 that favor it and live elsewhere. This gives a skewed result and there the votes should not be homogenized.
- I support the feathering concept but prefer 2-3 units/Ac.
- Don't like either alternative. The concept of moving traffic around the Core area along Jackson. Concerned that the corridor between Mather and SVC VP Prairie Preserve would not be functional. Increase the density around the core Jackson area and provide a much wider corridor.
- Prefer the grid street layout for the majority of the plan area, but also like the Jackson oval shaped version. Placing commercial along Grant Line road defeats the purpose of the connector. Commercial with all the traffic signals slows things down too much. Fear it might become a Sunrise type of road.
- Want to see a corridor between Mather and the SVC VP Prairie Preserve that maintains the hydrologic connectivity. Move the Jackson urban core to the south west. For every district that was surveyed, people ranked habitat and open space preservation as number one priority, which was not represented in the maps. Preserves in the Jackson area will become a tadpole shrimp strategy.
- Don't understand the benefits of Concept 1, with curvilinear streets.
- The habitat corridor crossing Jackson seems too skinny to be very effective.
- What will the Grant Line connector look like? How do these options affect development along Grant Line?
- Disappointed to see the Folsom South Canal and Sloughhouse Road not identified on the plan, and to see ag uses all over those areas.