

**COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO
CALIFORNIA**

For the Agenda of:
October 31, 2006
Timed: 3:15 pm

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Department of Planning and Community Development

Subject: **WORKSHOP #17 ON THE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN UPDATE:
REPORT ON THE EXPANDED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PUBLIC
OUTREACH RESULTS**

Contact: Surinder Singh (916) 874-5462
David Defanti (916) 874-6155
Lori Parrington (916) 874-8371

Overview

The General Plan Update (GPU) public outreach process has spanned over two years, from August 2004 to present. The GPU public outreach consisted primarily of 16 Board of Supervisors Workshops, accompanying public focus group sessions and Community Planning Advisory Council presentations, held between August 2004 and May 2006. However, due to Planning Staff's growth management strategies to accommodate the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint projections, your Board directed staff to expand the public outreach for the GPU. The expanded GPU public outreach process began in June 2006 and consisted of extensive media outreach and ten interactive community outreach workshops held in September and October 2006. In response to the media outreach, approximately 500 residents attended the community outreach workshops. This report includes a brief description of this public outreach program, process and key findings. The complete details and results of the outreach effort are included in Attachments "B" and "C" of this report.

Recommendations

1. Receive and file information on the results and feedback received from the expanded General Plan Update public outreach conducted from June through October, 2006; and accept testimony from the public on the General Plan Update project.
2. Consider the results of the public outreach program during the review of the Draft General Plan Update, commencing on November 8, 2006.

Measures/Evaluation

The attached *General Plan Update Public Outreach Process – Summary Report* outlines the methods and results of the expanded GPU public outreach process.

Fiscal Impact

None.

DISCUSSION:

On December 6, 2005, the Board of Supervisors directed the Planning Department to develop an enhanced public outreach program for the County General Plan Update (GPU). This program built on the public outreach carried out by the County over the last 2 years, which included presentations to the Community Planning Advisory Councils (CPACs), design of a GPU website, distribution of newsletters advertising upcoming events, 16 GPU workshops before the Board of Supervisors and a series of 12 evening focus group meetings. The outreach up to that point had been designed to correspond with the minor update initially planned for the General Plan. However, in late 2005 the scope of the GPU changed significantly and was expanded to address changing growth expectations within the unincorporated County as a result of SACOG's Blueprint project. With this change in anticipated growth, the Board recognized the need to more proactively engage citizens in the development and refinement of growth management strategies which will guide the County over the 25-year planning horizon. In addition, key outcomes from the GPU Workshops held with the Board since August 2004 needed to be addressed in the outreach program.

In the expanded outreach process, the County specifically sought to describe, illustrate and discuss the growth management strategies that staff had presented to the Board of Supervisors. Objectives of these strategies aim to: (1) preserve open space & agricultural lands; (2) reign in regional sprawl; and (3) revitalize neighborhoods and create a unique sense of place within each community. The growth management strategies are: Buildout of Vacant and Underutilized Parcels, Build-Out of Planned Communities, Commercial Corridor Planning and Expansion of the Urban Policy Area (UPA).

KEY FINDINGS FROM THE OUTREACH PROCESS

The summary report (Attachment "B") and the Appendix (Attachment "C") includes detailed results from all of the workshops as well as the online game. The report also includes overall key findings and themes compiled from all of the workshops relating to the proposed growth management strategies and other key components of the GPU. The key findings regarding the growth management strategies, countywide mapping and community mapping exercise are described below. Detailed findings from all three workshop exercises and online game responses are included in Sections Three, Four and Five in the Summary Report (Attachment "B"):

General Comments on the Growth Management Strategies

➤ *UPA/USB Expansion – Overall Strategy:*

- Participants had mixed comments on whether or not the UPA or USB should be expanded. In general, participants indicated that expansion should be considered in areas immediately adjacent to existing developed areas. A vocal minority recommended considering UPA or USB changes on a case-by-case basis.

➤ *UPA/USB Expansion – New Growth Areas:*

- Most participants expressed a preference to see the County pursue commercial corridor

reinvestment and infill development before allowing development to occur in proposed new growth areas. However, a minority of residents indicated that building new housing in these new growth areas could help to alleviate pressure on existing neighborhoods to accommodate new residents.

▪ *Easton and West of Watt:*

- Most participants indicated that they would support the development of Easton and West of Watt if necessary.
- Easton: Several participants indicated that this area should be considered for development if transit connections were added.
- West of Watt: At several workshops, participants commented that this area was better suited to new growth than the other three proposed areas, although there were some concerns about airport noise.

▪ *Jackson Areas 1 & 2:*

- Participants expressed a number of concerns regarding these two areas given the proximity to Mather airfield, vernal pools and existing light industrial uses.
- If this area does develop, many residents indicated that improvements to Jackson Highway will be critical and that development of Area 1 (to Excelsior) is preferable to development of Area 2 (to Sunrise).

➤ ***Commercial Corridor Strategy:***

- Residents across the county generally supported the commercial corridor strategy; however, many expressed that corridor planning efforts should involve the local community and respect existing community plans.
- Many residents also expressed the importance of addressing traffic related impacts during the planning of the commercial corridors and that additional traffic should not adversely affect local neighborhoods.

➤ ***Infill Development:***

- In general, residents supported infill development as a strategy to accommodate new housing, although many participants stressed that infill should be consistent with existing zoning and community plans;
- A number of participants commented that they would prefer the County to pursue infill development prior to allowing for development to occur within the new growth areas.

➤ ***Buildout of Planned Communities:***

- Residents generally supported the buildout of planned communities consistent with the approved plans for the areas.

Results of the Countywide Mapping Exercise

During the workshops, community residents were asked to review and define the potential character of several commercial corridors that are located within the unincorporated area. The following table summarizes the results of this exercise. Detailed results are presented in pages 30-34 of the *General Plan Update Public Outreach Process - Summary Report* (Attachment “B”).

Table 1
Results of Countywide Corridor Mapping Exercise
Corridor Characterizations

Corridor Type	Definition of characterizations	Recommended Corridors
Transit Supportive Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greatly enhanced transit service (e.g., bus rapid transit or light rail) serving the corridor • Most intense commercial/residential development of four corridor options • Mixed use development focused around transit stops • Building heights: one to five stories • Distinctive nodes or districts that feature homes, stores, job centers, entertainment, and transit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watt Avenue North • Florin Road • Folsom Blvd
Community Mixed Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater level of mixed use development, with more homes on top of stores • Stores and job centers that serve both the immediate neighborhood and the surrounding community • Some enhanced bus transit service • Traditional design focus: walkability, buildings oriented to street, parking in rear • Building heights: one to four stories 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Auburn Blvd East • Franklin Blvd • Stockton Blvd South • Fair Oaks Blvd West • Stockton Blvd Central
Neighborhood Mixed Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some homes above stores (i.e., “mixed use”) • Some traditional shopping centers • Single and multi-family homes • Stores that serve the immediate neighborhoods • Traditional design focus: walkability, buildings oriented to street, parking in rear • Building heights: one to three stories 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair Oaks Blvd Central • Greenback Lane • Auburn Blvd West • Fulton Avenue • Watt Avenue Central
Suburban Retail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on commercial and retail uses that have plentiful parking • Large shopping centers at major intersections; smaller commercial uses along street • Existing levels of transit and bus service • Wide streets to move more cars at faster speeds • Few homes or offices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair Oaks Blvd East

General Comments on the Community Related Mapping Exercise

➤ ***Carmichael and Arden Arcade:***

- Residents of both Carmichael and Arden Arcade valued their large lot, semi-rural lifestyle and the American River Parkway. Community residents requested for more amenities, including shops, restaurants, as well as streetscape improvements. Concerns were expressed at both workshops regarding traffic problems and the quality/design of development.

➤ ***North Highlands, Antelope, Rio Linda and Natomas:***

- Transportation improvement was identified as the top priority for the North Highlands and Antelope area. Residents requested that existing parks and open space be preserved and recommended for several mobility improvements including improved roads, transit, and bike and pedestrian facilities. North Highlands and Antelope residents requested for new retail and entertainment opportunities, including a downtown district and movie theater. North Highlands and Antelope residents further expressed support for new development along Watt Avenue North. Many residents favored the County's strategy for reinvesting in commercial corridors and identified several corridors for future planning: Elkhorn Blvd., Roseville Road, Don Juan Drive, Antelope Road, M Street (Rio Linda).

➤ ***Orangevale and Fair Oaks:***

- During both workshops, a majority of the residents stressed the need to preserve the community's rural and semi-rural character. Many residents supported enhanced transit service and sidewalk improvements in select areas. Orangevale residents expressed a need for new shopping and entertainment options while Fair Oaks residents requested for additional parks and a new community center.

➤ ***Vineyard and Cordova:***

- Many residents liked the mix of rural and urban life. Many residents expressed a need for roadway improvements, increased transit and better shopping amenities.

➤ ***Delta, Southeast and Cosumnes:***

- During both workshops, many residents requested for the preservation of their existing quiet and rural lifestyle, including the protection of agricultural areas and natural resources/wildlife areas. Delta residents also discussed the need for better flood protection and economic activities (agro-tourism and enviro-tourism). Residents in the Southeast and Cosumnes communities expressed concerns regarding the volume and speed of vehicles, road maintenance and truck travel.

➤ ***South Sacramento:***

- Residents recommended the preservation of several historic areas, including Old Town Florin. Residents recommended the following community improvements: new pedestrian and bicycle path, increased transit, new community facilities including community centers, streetscape plans and lighting. The following two corridors were recommended for future planning: Power Inn Road and 47th Avenue.

CONCLUSION:

As the scope of the General Plan Update expanded with the proposed growth management strategies developed to handle the anticipated changes to occur in the County through the year 2030, the Board recognized the need to more proactively engage citizens and hear from them about what the County should look like in the future. Based on this direction, the County undertook a five-month expanded public outreach process to inform people about the GPU and encourage their participation and feedback. Through media outreach, an interactive online game

and a series of community workshops, more than 600 interested citizens participated in this process. County staff has acquired very useful and important feedback from these community members and stakeholders. This information is being presented to your Board to assist in making future decisions and providing additional direction regarding the GPU process.

Planning staff would like to thank the many people who helped make this outreach process possible, including County staff from the Planning and Community Development Department, Department of Transportation, Department of Neighborhood Services, and Department of Water Resources as well as staff from the City of Sacramento Planning Department, Sacramento Area Council of Governments and Community Services Planning Council who helped facilitate group exercises at the workshops and served as experts to answer questions specific to their disciplines. Thank you to the Board of Supervisors and their Chiefs-of-Staffs for providing opening remarks at the workshops and helping to advertise the public outreach. In addition, Planning staff would like to thank the MIG/Koegel and Associates team for their outstanding work on the outreach process. Lastly, the County would sincerely like to thank all those who participated in the workshops and provided feedback on the growth management strategies and other issues addressed in the General Plan.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Background on the consultant selection process and outreach strategies
- B. General Plan Update Public Outreach Process – Summary Report, October 2006
- C. Appendix to the General Plan Update Public Outreach Process – Summary Report