Osage Warehouse Project
Responses to Comments Received on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Osage Warehouse Project (proposed project) was circulated for public comment from June 29, 2022, to July 29, 2022. Written comments were received as follows:

Date	Commenter
7/10/2022	Mari Del Angel & Salvador Jimenez, residents
7/11/2022	Jill Rogers, resident
7/12/2022	Cindy Clausen, resident
7/12/2022	Diane Hunter, resident
7/13/2022	Jill Rogers, resident
7/15/2022	Diane Hunter, resident
7/28/2022	Gary Gasperi, Sacramento County Department of Transportation
7/29/2022	Peter Minkel, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
7/29/2022	Paul Philley, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
7/29/2022	Sharon Rogers Lopez, resident
7/29/2022	Sharon Rogers Lopez, resident
8/4/2022	Mashim Shekotur, resident

All of the written comments are attached. Each of the comments addressed the project site and conditions as they relate to the particular areas of concern of the respective commenting agency, company, or organization. The comments are acknowledged by the City and have been considered as part of the project planning and its implementation.

Responses to the comment letters are provided below.

Response to Mari Angel and Salvador Jimenez, residents, 7/10/2022: Thank You for participating in the public review process of the IS/MND. With respect to the concerns cited by the commenter, the IS/MND assesses all potential project impacts associated with all environmental issue areas required for analysis under CEQA, in accordance with the City of Sacramento's environmental checklist. As part of such assessment, the IS/MND evaluates the project's consistency with applicable policies, regulations, and standards established at the federal, State, and local levels and incorporates analyses from the City's expert consultants. Where potential impacts are identified, the IS/MND sets forth mitigation measures to reduce the severity level of all identified potentially significant impacts to a less-than- significant level. As such, the analysis within the IS/MND is adequate and meets the requirements set forth by the CEQA Guidelines. Please see the applicable sections in Section III, Environmental Checklist and Discussion, of the IS/MND, which starts on page 14. For instance, with respect to potential noise level increases that could occur as part of the proposed project, please see Section 12, Transportation and Circulation, of the IS/MND, which evaluates such potential impacts.

Response to Jill Rogers, resident, 7/11/2022: Thank you for participating in the public review process of the IS/MND. The comment letter expresses a general opinion that the residents living along Osage Avenue disapprove of the proposed project and lists various concerns; however, the comment letter does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. As part of such assessment, the IS/MND evaluates the project's consistency with applicable policies, regulations, and standards established at the federal, State, and local levels and incorporates analyses from the City's expert consultants. Where potential impacts are identified, the IS/MND sets forth mitigation measures to reduce the severity level of all identified potentially significant impacts to a less-than- significant

level. As such, the analysis within the IS/MND is adequate and meets the requirements set forth by the CEQA Guidelines. Please see the applicable sections in Section III, Environmental Checklist and Discussion, of the IS/MND, which starts on page 14. For instance, with respect to potential noise level increases that could occur as part of the proposed project, please see Section 9, Noise, of the IS/MND, which evaluates such potential impacts.

With respect to the concerns cited by the commenter, the IS/MND assesses all potential project impacts associated with all environmental issue areas required for analysis under CEQA, in accordance with the City of Sacramento's environmental checklist. As part of such assessment, the IS/MND evaluates the project's consistency with applicable policies, regulations, and standards established at the federal, State, and local levels and incorporates analyses from the City's expert consultants. Where potential impacts are identified, the IS/MND sets forth mitigation measures to reduce the severity level of all identified potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. As such, the analysis within the IS/MND is adequate and meets the requirements set forth by the CEQA Guidelines. Please see the applicable sections in Section III, Environmental Checklist and Discussion, of the IS/MND, which starts on page 14. For instance, with respect to potential noise level increases that could occur as part of the proposed project, please see Section 9, Noise, of the IS/MND, which evaluates such potential impacts.

It should be noted that CEQA is an environmental protection statute that is concerned with foreseeable physical changes on the environment from the project. Significant effects on the environment are those that result in a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by implementation of the proposed project, including conditions related to land, air, water, mineral resources, flora, fauna, noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. The IS/MND evaluates only those potential project impactsthat are required for analysis under CEQA. Therefore, in instances where certain concerns are not required to be analyzed, such as the commenter's concern of "after hours illegal activities," such concerns are not addressed in the IS/MND. Furthermore, to presume that the proposed project would elicit illicit activities is speculative, and therefore, not required to be evaluated pursuant to CEQA.

In its role as the lead agency, the City of Sacramento will consider the information in the IS/MND along with other information that may be presented to the agency in deciding whether to approve the project. The comment letter has been noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Cindy Clausen, resident, 7/12/2022: Thank you for participating in the public review process of the IS/MND. The comment letter expresses a general opinion that the commenter does not support the proposed project based on existing social and quality of life conditions; however, the comment letter does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

CEQA is an environmental protection statute that is concerned with foreseeable physical changes on the environment from the project. Significant effects on the environment are those that result in a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by implementation of the proposed project, including conditions related to land, air, water, mineral resources, flora, fauna, noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. Although economic or social changes may have an indirect effect, they alone, without any associated environmental impacts, are not considered significant effects on the environment. The CEQA Guidelines provide that economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment (see also CEQA Guidelines Sections 15358[b], 15064[e], and 15382). As a result, evidence of social or economic impacts that do not contribute to, or are not caused by, physical impacts on the environment caused by the project, do not provide substantial evidence of a significant impact that requires analysis under CEQA.

In its role as the lead agency, the City of Sacramento will consider the information in the IS/MND along with other information that may be presented to the agency in deciding whether to approve

the project. The comment letter has been noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Diane Hunter, resident, 7/12/2022: Thank you for participating in the public review process of the IS/MND. The comment letter expresses a general opinion that the commenter does not support the proposed project based on existing social and quality of life conditions; however, the comment letter does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

the IS/MND assesses all potential project impacts associated with all environmental issue areas required for analysis under CEQA, in accordance with the City of Sacramento's environmental checklist. As part of such assessment, the IS/MND evaluates the project's consistency with applicable policies, regulations, and standards established at the federal, State, and local levels and incorporates analyses from the City's expert consultants. Where potential impacts are identified, the IS/MND sets forth mitigation measures to reduce the severity level of all identified potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. As such, the analysis within the IS/MND is adequate and meets the requirements set forth by the CEQA Guidelines. Please see the applicable sections in Section III, Environmental Checklist and Discussion, of the IS/MND, which starts on page 14. For instance, with respect to potential degradation of the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings, please see the analysis under Section 1, Aesthetics, of the IS/MND, which starts on page 17 and evaluates such potential impacts. With respect to potential transportation-related hazards, please see the analysis under Section 12, Transportation and Circulation, of the IS/MND, which starts on page 73 and evaluates such potential impacts.

In its role as the lead agency, the City of Sacramento will consider the information in the IS/MND along with other information that may be presented to the agency in deciding whether to approve the project. The comment letter has been noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision makers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Jill Rogers, resident, 7/13/2022: Thank you for participating in the public review process of the IS/MND. The comment letter is a duplicate of the letter sent by Jill Rogers on July 11, 2022. Please see Response to Jill Rogers, resident, 7/11/2022.

Response to Diane Hunter, resident, 7/12/2022: Thank you for participating in the public review process of the IS/MND. The comment letter is a hand-written duplicate of the letter sent by Diane Hunter on July 12, 2022. Please see Response to Diane Hunter, resident, 7/12/2022.

Response to Gary Gasperi, Sacramento County Department of Transportation, 7/28/2022: Thank you for participating in the public review process of the IS/MND. The project plans have been revised to address the commenter's concerns.

Response to Peter Minkel, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, 7/29/2022: Thank you for participating in the public review process of the IS/MND. The comment provides background information regarding applicable regulations and required permits. The comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND, has been noted for the record, and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Paul Philley, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, 7/29/2022: Thank you for participating in the public review process of the IS/MND. The analysis was prepared consistent with requirements/guidance at the time of preparation. Further changes are not necessary.

Response to Sharon Rogers Lopez, resident, 7/29/2022: Thank you for participating in the public review process of the IS/MND. The first portion of the comment letter expresses a general opinion that the residents living along Osage Avenue disapprove of the proposed project and cites and quotes an article pertaining to the effect of noise exposure on cognition. The IS/MND

addresses potential noise and vibration impacts under Section 9, Noise, of the IS/MND, which starts on page 56. The analysis includes an evaluation of potential impacts that could occur due to employee vehicles, truck circulation, and project operations. As detailed therein, the IS/MND concludes that potential impacts related to traffic noise at off-site sensitive receptors, operational noise at off-site receptors, construction noise, and vibration would be less than significant. In addition, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure 9-1, which is detailed on page 64, the project would construct an eight-foot-tall sound wall along the eastern project boundary to be consistent with the City's exterior noise standard. The sound wall would be required to be consistent with design standards set forth by the City, including those pertaining to landscaping and visual character.

With respect to the commenter's concerns related to wildlife and other biological resources, the IS/MND evaluates potential project impacts that could occur to biological resources under Section 3, Biological Resources, of the IS/MND, which starts on page 30. As detailed therein, potential impacts to Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, and other migratory birds and raptors would be reduced to a less-than-significant level, through incorporation of Mitigation Measure 3-1. All other potential potential biological resources impacts would be less than significant with development of the proposed project.

In regard to how the Focused Transportation Analysis described the existing community in proximity to the project site, the description is accurate. However, the commenter's elaboration is noted for the record. The IS/MND acknowledges that the existing condition of Osage Avenue is unsuitable for access to an industrial facility. However, as part of project approval, the proposed project would be conditioned to include the following improvements:

> Prior to grading, the following improvements shall be noted on Improvement Plans, subject to review and approval by the City:
>
> 1) Improve the intersection of Osage Avenue and South Watt Avenue as follows:
>
> - Install a traffic signal at the intersection, coordinated with the South Watt Avenue traffic system; and
> - Upgrade the intersection geometrics to City and County design guidelines, capable of accommodating heavy vehicles (typically WB-67 semi-trailer). This shall include, at a minimum:
> - Northbound approach – provide a left turn lane 200 feet long, and a through and right turn lane;
> - Southbound approach – provide a left turn lane 200 feet long, and a through and right turn lane;
> - Eastbound approach – restripe the existing pavement (40 feet wide) to accommodate a left turn lane 150 feet long and a through and right turn lane;
> - Westbound approach – provide a left turn lane 150 feet long, and a through and right turn lane; and
> - Accommodate pedestrian and bicycle movements at the intersection in accordance with City and County design guidelines.
>
> 2) Upgrade Osage Avenue along the site frontage. The improvements shall include an industrial local street cross-section north of the center line, and a reconstructed eastbound travel lane, shoulder, and a drainage south of the center line.

Through implementation of the above condition of approval, Osage Avenue would be improved to

such a condition to provide suitable access to the proposed warehouse.

With respect to potential flooding impacts, as detailed on page 54 of the IS/MND, consistent with Sacramento Municipal Code Chapter 13.16, the proposed stormwater control plan would be designed such that the post-development stormwater flows from the site would be equal to or less than predevelopment conditions. All stormwater from impervious surfaces at the site would be routed into the proposed bioretention area. The design of the proposed project provides for containment of runoff from the developed site through the use of bioretention areas. As a standard condition of approval for development projects in the City, the City's Department of Utilities requires preparation and submittal of project-specific drainage studies. With submittal of the required drainage study, the Department of Utilities would review the improvement plans for the proposed project prior to approval to ensure that adequate water quality control facilities are incorporated. As such, the IS/MND determined that the proposed project would not exacerbate on-site flood conditions.

In regard to the amount of volume that would be added to roads in the project vicinity as a result of the proposed project, as detailed on page 72 of the IS/MND, consistent with technical guidance published by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR), the IS/MND's evaluation of transportation impacts is based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT). VMT is a metric that accounts for the number of vehicle trips generated and the length or distance of those trips. VMT does not directly measure traffic operations; instead, VMT is a measure of transportation network use and efficiency, especially when expressed as a function of population (i.e., VMT per capita). As such, the IS/MND's assessment of transportation impacts does not consider how the project would result in impacts to the level of service (LOS) of project vicinity roads, which is associated with congestion and delays on roadways and is not required for analysis under CEQA. With respect to potentially hazardous roadway conditions that could occur as a result of the project, the IS/MND evaluates the project's potential to substantially increase hazards under question 'c' of Section 12, Transportation and Circulation, of the IS/MND, which starts on page 74. As detailed therein, the proposed project would not redesign, alter, or modify existing public roadways in the project vicinity. As such, the project would not substantially increase hazards.

Finally, with respect to the social character of the neighborhood, CEQA is an environmental protection statute that is concerned with foreseeable physical changes on the environment from the project. Significant effects on the environment are those that result in a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by implementation of the proposed project, including conditions related to land, air, water, mineral resources, flora, fauna, noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. Although economic or social changes may have an indirect effect, they alone, without any associated environmental impacts, are not considered significant effects on the environment. The CEQA Guidelines provide that economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment (see also CEQA Guidelines Sections 15358[b], 15064[e], and 15382). As a result, evidence of social or economic impacts that do not contribute to, or are not caused by, physical impacts on the environment caused by the project, do not provide substantial evidence of a significant impact that requires analysis under CEQA.

In its role as the lead agency, the City of Sacramento will consider the information in the IS/MND along with other information that may be presented to the agency in deciding whether to approve the project. The comment letter has been noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Sharon Rogers Lopez, resident, 7/29/2022: Thank you for participating in the public review process of the IS/MND. The noise standards used in the IS/MND to evaluate potential noise impacts associated with the proposed project are detailed in the discussions and analyses under Section 9, Noise, of the IS/MND and are in accordance with the adopted standards set forth by the City of Sacramento. The comment letter has been noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.

Response to Mashim Shekotur, resident, 8/4/2022: Thank you for participating in the public review process of the IS/MND. With respect to the proposed entrance to the project site, as discussed on page 10 of the IS/MND, access to the project site would be provided by two new driveways from Osage Avenue, located east of the proposed warehouse. The western driveway would provide access to the surface parking lot, while the eastern driveway would provide access to the loading docks in the rear of the building. The IS/MND acknowledges that the existing condition of Osage Avenue is unsuitable for access to an industrial facility. Therefore, as part of project approval, the proposed project would be conditioned to improve the intersection of Osage Avenue and South Watt Avenue through installation of a traffic signal at the intersection, coordinated with the South Watt Avenue traffic system, and upgrades to the intersection consistent with City and County design guidelines to accommodate heavy vehicles. In addition, the project would be conditioned to construct upgrades along Osage Avenue along the site frontage, including an industrial local street cross-section north of the center line and a reconstructed eastbound travel lane, shoulder, and a drainage south of the center line.

With respect to potential light pollution, please see the analysis under questions 'a' and 'b' of Section 1, Aesthetics, of the IS/MND. As detailed therein, while the proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare to the project site, the type and intensity of light and glare would be similar to that of existing industrial developments in the project vicinity, and the proposed project would comply with all applicable General Plan policies related to minimizing light and glare, which would be ensured during the Design Review process for the project. In addition, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure 9-1, which is detailed on page 64 of the IS/MND, the project would construct an eight-foot-tall sound wall along the eastern project boundary to be consistent with the City's exterior noise standard.

In regard to potential noise impacts to domestic animals, CEQA does not require that a project be evaluated for potential impacts to such types of animals. Protected animal species under CEQA are wildlife species that qualify for special status. Special-status species are species that have been listed as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (FESA), California Endangered Species Act (CESA), or are of special concern to federal resource agencies, the State, or private conservation organizations. Nonetheless, the comment has been noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.

With respect to potential impacts to neighborhood property values, CEQA is an environmental protection statute that is concerned with foreseeable physical changes on the environment from the project. Significant effects on the environment are those that result in a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by implementation of the proposed project, including conditions related to land, air, water, mineral resources, flora, fauna, noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. Although economic or social changes may have an indirect effect, they alone, without any associated environmental impacts, are not considered significant effects on the environment. The CEQA Guidelines provide that economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment (see also CEQA Guidelines Sections 15358[b], 15064[e], and 15382). As a result, evidence of social or economic impacts that do not contribute to, or are not caused by, physical impacts on the environment caused by the project, do not provide substantial evidence of a significant impact that requires analysis under CEQA. The comment has been noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.

Finally, to presume that the proposed project would elicit illegal activities is speculative, and therefore, not required to be evaluated pursuant to CEQA. The comment has been noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers as part of their consideration of the proposed project.

July 11, 2022

Ron Bess, Associate Planner
Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd.
Sacramento, CA 95811

Re: Osage Warehouse Project (DR21-163)

Dear Sir:

The residents of Osage Avenue strongly DISAPPROVE the above mentioned project. We have lived on this quiet street for 46 plus years. This project would highly impact this tiny, narrow road and neighborhood. Primary access on Osage Avenue is NOT SUITABLE. Our many areas of concern are as follows:

*increased traffic
*noise level, trucks entering and leaving
*all hours in and out
*after hours illegal activities
*children ride bikes
*families ride their horses
*we walk on this road
*safety issues for residents when exiting and returning to their homes
*street floods during winter months
*street is not maintained properly and added traffic will damage it more
*already have the 7 a.m. and 4 p,m. Commuter traffic speeding down our tiny road looking for a shortcut
*we do not want to go out our front door to warehouses and trucks almost in our face

DO NOT DESTROY OUR QUIET COUNTRY NEIGHBORHOOD.
THERE HAS TO BE OTHER AREAS IN THE COUNTY FOR THIS PROJECT AND NOT IN OUR YARD. Seriously, would you want this in your front yard?

PLEASE DO NOT LET THIS PROJECT HAPPEN.

All residents of Osage Avenue totally disapprove. We will wait for your reply.

T.·hankY °;!;J.

l;t\ O[Z)fl-e
//Jill Rogers, rt'obin Rogers
8970 Osage Avenue, Sacramento 95829
(CJ/6-SOS-252'1)

e-mailed: 7/13/22

July 12, 2022

Ron Bess,
Com, Dev. Dept.
300 Richards Blvd.
Sacramento, CA 95811

RE: Osage Avenue Project

Dear Sir:

I do not approve this project. We are a quiet rural street. The impact on our properties due to warehouses/loading docks being so close to our houses will cause a lot of hardship for us.

We already experience crime from the homeless. Locked mailboxes have been broken into, as well as my car. We cannot leave our cars in front of our houses. I'm not sure how much crime will come with this and the after hours illegal activities, almost in our front yards.

We are agricultural here. I moved here about 4 years ago to raise my horses and dogs. My grandchildren ride their horses up and down the street with no worries. We will not be able to live the same lifestyle if this project happens. We walk on our road daily. This will have to end also.

This all puts a personal impact on our lifestyle that we have not asked for.

Please reconsider to another location. Thank You.

Cindy Clausen

Cindy Clausen and Family
9038 Osage Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95829

I

July 15, 2022
8960 OSAge Ave
SAC, Ca 95829

Mr. Ron Bess, Associate Planner
Community Dev. Department,

My Name is Dione Hunter &
live at 8960 OSAge Ave Sacramto
Ca, 95829,
July 11, 2022 I received a
first ever letter, telling me
about the Project: OSAge Warehouse
Project (DR21-163) Location
9.5 acres project site, Watt
ave & OSAge, Sacramto, Ca
Living on this Corner of South
Watt & OSAge is already
very congested! On this
tiny street, The street floods
every winter, the road is
not wide enough to deal
with trucks, Cars have to
pull off the road now!
We didn't want to have a warehouse
in my front door! The 3
Homes that will be most effected
are 1. Dione Hunter 2. Sharon Rogers
3. Jill Rogers, They are very
upset! Requesting a High Masonry
Wall be put up on OSAge, with
Bushes to absorb some Noise

Note: An access on II
Isage axe, is not safe,
We dont Want Big Trucks entering
& Leaving here!

July 15, 2022

Mr. Ron Bess,

I hope you hear me & my commuity members and will get some consideration from the Community Del. Report, We have all been paying TAXes for many many years! My family Came here in 1972 and the Rogee's Family have been here since the 1950's! OR Before...

So, Thank you for any consideration as home owners Longtime & Property TAX payers!

Sincerely
Diane Hunter

Questions OR Answers 916-747-1630
email: dhunt46@att.Net

From: Jill Rogers
To: Ron Bess
Subject: Osage Warehouse Project (DR21-163)
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 1:09:42 PM

July 11, 2022

Ron Bess, Associate Planner
Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd.
Sacramento, CA 95811A

Re: Osage Warehouse Project (DR21-163)

Dear Sir:

The residents of Osage Avenue strongly DISAPPROVE the above mentioned project. We have lived on this quiet street for 46 plus years. This project would highly impact this tiny, narrow road and neighborhood. Primary access on Osage Avenue is NOT SUITABLE. Our many areas of concern are as follows:

*increased traffic
*noise level, trucks entering and leaving
*all hours in and out
*after hours illegal activities
*children ride bikes
*families ride their horses
*we walk on this road
*safety issues for residents when exiting and returning to their homes
*street floods during winter months
*street is not maintained properly and added traffic will damage it more
*already have the 7 a.m. and 4 p.m. Commuter traffic speeding down our tiny road looking for a shortcut
*we do not want to go out our front door to warehouses and trucks almost in our face

DO NOT DESTROY OUR QUIET COUNTRY NEIGHBORHOOD.
THERE HAS TO BE OTHER AREAS IN THE COUNTY FOR THIS PROJECT AND NOT IN OUR YARD. Seriously, would you want this in your front yard?

PLEASE DO NOT LET THIS PROJECT HAPPEN.

All residents of Osage Avenue totally disapprove. We will wait for your reply.
Thank You,

Jill Rogers, Robin Rogers
8970 Osage Avenue, Sacramento 95829

From: DIANE HUNTER
To: Ron Bess
Subject: OSAGE WAREHOUSE PROJECT: DR 21-163
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 9:06:00 PM

MY NAME IS DIANE HUNTER,I LIVE AT 8960 OSAGE AVE,SACRAMENTO,CA 95829 , JULY 11,2022 I RECIEVED A FIRST TIME LETTER FROM THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO,CA .TELLING ME ABOUT THE OSAGE WAREHOUSE PROJECT: LIVING ON THE CORNER OF SOUTH WATT AND OSAGE IS ALREADY VERY CONGESTED! ON THIS TINY STREET THE STREET FLOODS EVERY WINTER. THE ROAD IS NOT WIDE ENOUGH TO DEAL WITH TRUCKS ,CARS HAVE TO PULL OFF THE ROAD TO LET THEM PASS. I DIDNT WANT A WAREHOUSE IN MY FRONT DOOR! THE 3HOMES THAT WILL BE MOST EFFECTED ARE 1. DIANE HUNTER 2. JILL ROGERS 3. SHARON ROGERS LOPEZ.....THEY ARE VERY UPSET REQUESTING THAT A HIGH MASONRY WALL BE BUT UP ON OSAGE WITH PLANTS AND BUSHES TO OBSORB SOME OF THE NOISE ETC.. A ACCESS ON OSAGE AVE IS NOT SAFE, WE DONT WANT BIG TRUCKS ENTERING AND LEAVING HERE AT OUR ONLY ENTRANCE TO OUR PROPERTIES, IT WILL BLOCK ARE ENTRANCE WAY!

MR, RON BESS ,I HOPE YOU HEAR ME AND MY COMMUNITY MEMBERS, PLEASE CONSIDER OUR SITUATION. WE HAVE ALL BEEN PROPERTY OWNERS HERE FOR MANY YEARS,MY FAMILY CAME HERE IN 1972, THE ROGERS HAVE BEEN OWNING LAND HERE SINCE THE 1950 OR BEFORE... SO, THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME,AND YOUR CONCIDERATION DURING THESE HARD TIMES WERE LIVING IN. SINCERELY, DIANE HUNTER, ANY QUESTION OR ANSWERS,916 747 1630..

Department of Transportation
Ron E. Vicari, Director

Divisions
Administration
Maintenance & Operations
Engineering & Planning

County of Sacramento

July 28, 2022

Ron Bess, Associate Planner
Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd., 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY/INTENT TO ADOPT THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR OSAGE WAREHOUSE PROJECT (DR21-163)

Ron Bess,

The Sacramento County Department of Transportation (SacDOT) appreciates the opportunity to review the submittal documents for the subject project. SacDOT has previously coordinated with the City of Sacramento's staff regarding the intersection of South Watt Ave. at Osage Ave. and has the following comments on Appendix C – Focused TIA:

- **Page 5** – Transit System – Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) – is planned to run down Elk Grove Florin Rd / S Watt Ave / Watt Ave
    - Please See 2009 Regional Transit's (SacRT) Transit Action Plan and 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS)
- **Page 11** – City of Sacramento Facilities – 2nd to last bullet states S. Watt Ave from US-50 to Kiefer Blvd is all in the City of Sacramento. However, Watt Ave is half City jurisdiction from US-50 to Folsom Blvd. and S Watt is in the County from Folsom to Kiefer Blvd.
- **Page 24** – Mitigation Measure 1 – Bullet 1 reads:
    - "Install a traffic signal at the intersection, coordinated with the South Watt Avenue traffic signal system."

      ---Please change to---
    - "Install a traffic signal at the intersection, coordinated with the County of Sacramento regarding the South Watt Avenue traffic signal system."
- **Page 24** – Intersection Configuration description clarification. If the lanes are shared please change last four bullet's text from:
    - "and a through and right turn lane."

      ---Please change to---
    - "and a shared through/right turn lane."
- **Page 25** – Impact 2 and Mitigation Measure 2
    - Please note that SacRT's Transit Action Plan will have BRT on this segment and bus turnouts will be located on the departure side north and south leg of the S. Watt Ave. at Osage Ave. intersection.

- **Truck Turning Template** – According to the site plan, STAA truck templates were used at the driveway and for on-site circulation. Please also include an STAA truck turning template for intersection movements of S. Watt Ave. at Osage Ave.:

    - Southbound to Eastbound
    - Westbound to Northbound
    - Westbound to Southbound
    - Northbound to Eastbound

Also, in regards to the traffic signal, please provide a City Contact to coordinate with Heather Yee of SacDOT (yeeh@saccounty.gov) who is leading the County's South Watt Ave. Improvements Florin Rd. to SR-16 Project (S. Watt Ave Project). Coordination will be required for but not limited to:

- Bus turnouts to be located on the departure side of the north and south leg of the S. Watt Ave. at Osage Ave. intersection.
- Installation of a 5 foot wide class II bicycle lane in between the left turn lane and the shared through/right turn lane on the east leg of the intersection
- Power source and location of traffic control signal box, lane widths, and layout for Osage Ave.
- Amend City/County Maintenance Agreement

Included with this letter are SacDOT's markups for Appendix C – Focused TIA. Please feel free to contact me at (916) 876-4108 with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Gary Gasperi

Digitally signed by Gary Gasperi
Date: 2022.07.28 11:52:29-07'00'

Gary Gasperi, P.E.
Senior Civil Engineer
Department of Transportation

CC: Matthew Darrow, DOT
Lu Li, DOT
Heather Yee, DOT
Cameron Shew, DOT

GG

29 July 2022

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento,
Community Development Department
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811
srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, OSAGE WAREHOUSE (DR21-163) PROJECT, SCH#2022060670, SACRAMENTO COUNTY

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse's 29 June 2022 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the *Request for Review for the Mitigated Negative Declaration* for the Osage Warehouse (DR21-163) Project, located in Sacramento County.

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore, our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

I. Regulatory Setting

Basin Plan

The Central Valley Water Board is required to formulate and adopt Basin Plans for all areas within the Central Valley region under Section 13240 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Each Basin Plan must contain water quality objectives to ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses, as well as a program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives with the Basin Plans. Federal regulations require each state to adopt water quality standards to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act. In California, the beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and the Antidegradation Policy are the State's water quality standards. Water quality standards are also contained in the National Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.36, and the California Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.38.

The Basin Plan is subject to modification as necessary, considering applicable laws, policies, technologies, water quality conditions and priorities. The original Basin Plans were adopted in 1975, and have been updated and revised periodically as required, using Basin Plan amendments. Once the Central Valley Water Board has adopted a Basin Plan amendment in noticed public hearings, it must be approved by

the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and in some cases, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Basin Plan amendments only become effective after they have been approved by the OAL and in some cases, the USEPA. Every three (3) years, a review of the Basin Plan is completed that assesses the appropriateness of existing standards and evaluates and prioritizes Basin Planning issues. For more information on the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins*, please visit our website:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/

Antidegradation Considerations

All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Implementation Policy is available on page 74 at:
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_201805.pdf

In part it states:

Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.

This information must be presented as an analysis of the impacts and potential impacts of the discharge on water quality, as measured by background concentrations and applicable water quality objectives.

The antidegradation analysis is a mandatory element in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and land discharge Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) permitting processes. The environmental review document should evaluate potential impacts to both surface and groundwater quality.

II. Permitting Requirements

Construction Storm Water General Permit

Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml

Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits[1]

The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The MS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process.

For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_permits/

For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml

Industrial Storm Water General Permit

Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the Industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ. For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/industrial_general_permits/index.shtml

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit

If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements. If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACE at (916) 557-5250.

[1] Municipal Permits = The Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Water System (MS4) Permit covers medium sized Municipalities (serving between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large sized municipalities (serving over 250,000 people). The Phase II MS4 provides coverage for small municipalities, including non-traditional Small MS4s, which include military bases, public campuses, prisons and hospitals.

Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification

If an USACE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act or Section 9 from the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications. For more information on the Water Quality Certification, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/water_quality_certification/

Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Waters of the State

If USACE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., "non-federal" waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation. For more information on the Waste Discharges to Surface Water NPDES Program and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/waste_to_surface_water/

Projects involving excavation or fill activities impacting less than 0.2 acre or 400 linear feet of non-jurisdictional waters of the state and projects involving dredging activities impacting less than 50 cubic yards of non-jurisdictional waters of the state may be eligible for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0004-DWQ (General Order 2004-0004). For more information on the General Order 2004-0004, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf

Dewatering Permit

If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Threat General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board's Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Threat Waiver) R5-2018-0085. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.

For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2003/wqo/wqo2003-0003.pdf

For more information regarding the Low Threat Waiver and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/waivers/r5-2018-0085.pdf

Limited Threat General NPDES Permit

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete Notice of Intent must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under the Limited Threat General Order. For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2016-0076-01.pdf

NPDES Permit

If the proposed project discharges waste that could affect the quality of surface waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A complete Report of Waste Discharge must be submitted with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain a NPDES Permit. For more information regarding the NPDES Permit and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/permit/

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4684 or Peter.Minkel2@waterboards.ca.gov.

Peter Minkel

Peter Minkel
Engineering Geologist

cc: State Clearinghouse unit, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN
AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

July 29, 2022

Ron Bess
Associate Planner
Community Development Department
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Subject: Osage Warehouse Project (DR21-163) (State Clearinghouse #2022060670)

Dear Ron Bess:

Thank you for providing the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (Sac Metro Air District) with the opportunity to review the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Osage Warehouse Project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This project is a request to construct a single warehouse building of 115,468 square feet on approximately 9.8 acres in a manufacturing zone. Sac Metro Air District offers the following recommendations on air quality and climate considerations for project implementation and CEQA review, consistent with methods recommended in our Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County (CEQA Guide), available on our website:

- The first sentence of the section regarding project greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions states that "Emissions from operations of the proposed project were quantified and would equal approximately 960.47 metrics tons of CO_2 equivalent units per year, which is below the SMAQMD threshold of 1,100 metric tons of CO_2 equivalent units per year." Please note that projects below 1,100 metric tons are not less than significant unless they apply Sac Metro Air District Tier 1 Best Management Practices, which are as follows: (1) No natural gas: Projects shall be designed and constructed without natural gas infrastructure, and (2) Electric vehicle ready: Projects shall meet the current CalGreen Tier 2 standards, except all EV Capable spaces shall instead be EV Ready.
- The MND further contends that consistency with the City of Sacramento's Climate Action Plan as set forth in Appendix B of the general plan is sufficient for a determination of a less-than-significant impact. This determination is appropriate if the Climate Action Plan is qualified. If the plan is not qualified, please ensure the project is consistent with the Sac Metro Air District Greenhouse Gas Thresholds for Sacramento County.

- The MND uses Sac Metro Air District's non-zero thresholds of significance for particulate matter emissions, and under our thresholds of significance, use of the non-zero thresholds requires implementation of our Basic Construction Emission Control Practices (BCECP), available on our website. We recommend that the MND explicitly include Sac Metro Air District BCECP as a mitigation measure.

Sac Metro Air District commends the MND's special attention to daily heavy-duty truck trip estimation. CalEEMod uses a county-wide fleet mix ratio that may not accurately estimate heavy-duty truck trips for all warehouse uses, and it is important to estimate the heavy-duty truck trips accurately due to associated Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) emissions. As noted in our September 2021 letter on this project, TACs can cause long-term health effects such as cancer, congenital disabilities, neurological damage, or genetic damage; or short-term acute effects such as eye-watering, respiratory irritation (such as a cough), running nose, throat pain, and headaches. We maintain our design recommendations from that letter to reduce health risk from heavy-duty truck or equipment emissions.

Permitting Requirements
Please be aware that any future project manufacturing uses may require an Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate from the Sac Metro Air District. Please contact the Sac Metro Air District at 279-207-1122 or permitting@airquality.org with comments or questions on permit or registration requirements. For permit application forms and instructions, please visit the following page on the Sac Metro Air District website: http://www.airquality.org/Businesses/Permits-Registration-Programs.

Construction
As a reminder, all projects are subject to Sac Metro Air District rules and regulations in effect at the time of construction. Please visit our website to find a list of the most common rules that apply at the construction phase of projects.

Conclusion
Thank you for your attention to our comments. If you have questions about them, please contact Sac Metro Air District staff at mwright@airquality.org or 279-207-1157.

Sincerely,

Paul Philley

Paul Philley, AICP
Program Supervisor, CEQA & Land Use Section
Sac Metro Air District

From: S Lopez
To: Ron Bess
Subject: Proposed Osage Warehouse Project DR21-163
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 4:18:52 PM

Sharon Rogers Lopez
8980 Osage Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95829
sharon.r.lopez@gmail.com
916-397-7777

July 29. 2022

Dear Mr. Bess,

I, along with the residents on my street, Osage Avenue, oppose the Osage Warehouse Project (DR21-163). It would significantly disturb and harm our peaceful living and our health as well as that of the wildlife here.

In the article ***"The Effect of Noise Exposure on Cognitive Performance and Brain Activity Patterns"*** research found that *"Noise has different negative effects ranging from interference with cognitive processing to damaging mental and physical health. The non-auditory effects of noise exposure include perceived disturbance, annoyance, cognitive impairment, cardiovascular disorders and sleep disturbance."*

"Studies show that noise causes cognitive impairment and oxidative stress in the brain. According to Wang et al., with further urbanisation and industrialisation, noise pollution has become a risk factor for depression, cognitive impairment and neurodegenerative disorders. It has been observed that exposure to noise influences the central nervous system leading to emotional stress, anxiety, cognitive and memory defects."

"Studies have shown that the effect of fluctuating noise on cognitive function is higher than steady noise."

(https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6901841/)

Our relative quiet atmosphere here on Osage Avenue allows us to appreciate nature and all of the various birds and animals that dwell here. This is a wetland, and after fall and winter rains, the pond at 8970 Osage is brimming with water and wildlife abounds. We are a regular stop for many birds. We have Canadian wild geese and ducks who arrive in the spring to mate then hatch their eggs here. Federally protected white egrets hang out in our fields

looking for mates. A year or so ago, we even saw a pair of otters travel here and enter the pond. Turkeys that roam the area claim our neighborhood as well. When they are here, they walk down the road. Additional traffic would make it more hazardous for them and for the vehicles.

We are regularly visited by wildlife. Instinctually, wildlife do what they can to avoid excess noises. We live here, and they get used to us to a degree, but people and vehicles frighten them away. This is their land just as it is ours. They also need to be taken into consideration. The vehicles brought in by this project would terrorize them, and the level of decibels as well as the vibrations coming through on a daily basis would be harmful to all of us as well as significantly disrupting their lives and ours, destroying our harmony.

Our quiet agricultural community has already felt abandoned by those sworn to protect our interests. This project would be the final declaration that we in the community are deemed worthless by the elected officials of Sacramento City and Sacramento County.

The Focused Transportation Analysis Final Report (dated December 9, 2021) described the surrounding neighborhood as "Opposite the site along the south side of Osage Avenue are three residences." This simplistic description fails to recognize that many of us have been here for multiple generations, back when this was dairy, meat cattle, horse ranch, and farmland. We have raised horses, livestock, and chickens; we grow fruit, nuts, and vegetables; we go for walks, walk with strollers, go bike riding, and horseback riding in the neighborhood. We are all regularly visited by wildlife on our properties. Osage Avenue is a small country road in a small country neighborhood. Multiple families have been here since my childhood, when the county divided my father's land in two to build Elk Grove Florin Rd. This land is rich in history for my own and neighboring families; to us, we have much more than generic "residential lots".

In the "Environmental Setting" section, Osage Avenue east of South Watt is described as "poor to fair condition, exhibiting alligator cracking in several areas". I'm glad it's acknowledged that the government has neglected our road for years (despite the enthusiasm to collect taxes designated explicitly for road maintenance). Non-resident traffic uses Osage Avenue as a speedway to avoid traffic on South Watt, destroying the road much faster than expected. Holes have developed through the street, far worse than simply cracking. The last time the County came out to take care of potholes, they filled in the worst ones but not all of them. Our road has holes of various sizes.

“Existing Pedestrian System” says we have “no sidewalks or shoulders”. This is correct. We walk in the road when we walk to a neighbor’s house. If a vehicle comes down the road, we have to move off to the side of the road, into the dirt or weeds.

Our little road is not wide enough for two large vehicles, or often two cars, to comfortably pass. Often when two meet, one pulls off into the weeds on the side of the road and stops to let the other go by. A few days ago, I saw a pickup traveling one direction down Osage and a car traveling the other. They were going to pass right in front of my driveway. The car pulled onto my property to let the pickup go by, then pulled back out onto the road. I understand that needed to happen at that particular time because of how narrow our road is. Still, nobody on our street wants it happening regularly simply because a developer wants access points on Osage Avenue - bringing significantly increased and dangerous traffic. We residents would in no way benefit from a warehouse going in at 8981 Osage Avenue, yet our lives would undoubtedly be disrupted and impacted negatively.

Besides the noise and safety factor (which is a huge concern), Osage Avenue to the east cannot easily handle extra traffic. The sheer number of allotted parking spaces indicates SEVERAL additional vehicles daily will traverse and further damage our little street even worse than under current conditions. This is a county road, not city. City limits stop on the west side of South Watt – except for a patch on the north side of Osage Avenue (across from the first three properties) that includes 8981 Osage, and the county has not properly maintained our road in decades – as evidenced by the road itself. If the government cannot maintain our simple road in the best of times, how would one reasonably expect this pattern of neglect to change with a significant increase in traffic?

During the fall and winter there are heavy rains, and Osage Avenue floods at both ends. We pay extra on our utility bills for “drainage”, a great joke as there is no drainage. Drivers need to be extra careful and drive slowly through the pooled water – which sometimes takes a week or more to clear. Additional traffic on Osage would cause significant congestion of non-resident vehicles along our little road. We don’t want them in our front yards. We especially don’t want them there when impatient people decide to make a U-turn in the middle of the road and inevitably hit one of our fences, mailboxes, or another part of our property. When the ground around here is wet, it’s like quicksand… countless vehicles that have run off the road in these conditions have sunk into it and need to be towed out, including as recently as earlier this year. Besides it being extremely inconvenient for drivers, we don’t want anyone pulling onto the south side of Osage and ripping up our ground, making big ruts if they get

in the mud. Given the government's inability (or lack of concern) to maintain our road, I'm confident neither of your agencies will be here to repair our driveways or property from the inevitable damage.

With mitigation measures, there would at least be a traffic light at the intersection of Osage and South Watt (which should have happened years ago anyway because
of all the accidents that have occurred there). Lines of vehicles exiting and then backed up are another thing that nobody whose property does not face a main street would want in their front yards. If the increased traffic headed out on Hedge Avenue, it would only be a matter of time before there would be an increase in vehicular accidents there as well.

We already have some experience with extra vehicles on our little street and we are not happy about it. There is a landscaping business here on our street illegally. A
complaint was lodged, yet somehow they remain. Not only do their trucks rip up the road, but they have disturbed our sleep in the early morning. The only thing I want to hear in the early morning is the occasional crow of a neighborhood rooster, other neighborhood animals, or the beautiful sound of birds… not the sounds of landscaping companies or the sounds of a warehouse across the street.

We started out as a rural agricultural community. As a baby, I was riding horses with my mother as she herded cattle. Then, the government decided to put Elk Grove- Florin Rd./South Watt through our pastures, splitting family land. Now, you're talking about approving a warehouse in our front yards. It seems it has been one encroachment after another during my lifetime.

I have lived at this address for 40 years. When I purchased my land from my parents, the county map was marked AR – Agricultural Residential. The original Osage Avenue, east of South Watt, has always been a small country road. Now, we see vehicles zipping down our little street, using it as a shortcut for traffic between
South Watt and other points. It has been beat up by big rigs, bottom dumps, transfer trucks, and other vehicles it already can't handle, including daily traffic from landscaping trucks that travel to and fro from a company that moved in illegally. In addition to the wear and tear on the road, which is not well-maintained, we all hear when the employees for the landscaping company go to work; it breaks the quiet of the early morning. Then we are disturbed again when their trucks head out… again breaking the quiet of the morning.

We relish relative quiet and enjoy hearing the talking and singing of the various birds and fowl that come to visit or make their homes here. Some of them also don't like being disturbed and will leave the area if they are. Forty years ago, South Watt (then named Elk Grove-Florin Rd.) was fairly quiet with occasional vehicles. South Watt itself has brought traffic that disturbs our peace with noise and vibrations. The warehouses to the west of South Watt brought increased noise and vibrations just with their daily operations. That's bad enough, but we also have to deal with the afterhours activities in their streets and parking lots. For years, we have heard vehicles on occasion speeding through the warehouse areas to the west in the evenings and late at night into the early mornings. Currently, there are near-nightly disturbances from fireworks and/or some kind of explosives that are set off at odd times throughout the night. Explosives go off at all different times and for different lengths of time. This is what would be happening directly across the street from us if this project is approved. We do not want the afterhours activities in our front yards. We do not want any of this in front of our homes.

On top of all that, our area has been zoned a "Green Zone". (Some of us did not receive notice of that change in time so were unable to protest it.) As long as there are still residents here, there should be no project in the space across from us. Being in a Green Zone is already dangerous enough for those of us who live in this isolated area, something that perhaps was not considered when the zoning was approved.

If a building is put in, there is no predicting what might go into it, and what initially goes in isn't necessarily what will be there in a few years. Maybe it is planned as something to do with the marijuana business, or perhaps after some years it ends up dealing with the marijuana business – either way would put that business and its associated activities and security hazards on our doorstep making life here even more dangerous for us.

Since we are semi-rural, we are isolated. For several years, it has taken an unacceptably long time to get a response from law enforcement. I would hope the safety and security of citizens would be a top priority, especially since such a project regrettably coming to fruition would increase the need for responsive law enforcement due to an inevitable increase in crime and safety concerns.

The way I understand it, under CEQA Guidelines, this proposed project would cross thresholds, making a significant impact. If the warehouse project is approved, increased traffic south of the site and east of the site would create significantly more hazardous conditions – conditions for increased conflict between bicyclists, pedestrians, and motor vehicles. *They would all be*

pushed off the road more often, and the increase in traffic would accelerate the degrading of the road which is already substandard. (It was not constructed for the amount and type of traffic whose load it already bears.). Also, the way I understand it, infrastructure improvements are to be made on the city side only, leaving pedestrians and bicyclists still in the road with motor vehicles on the south side of Osage in front of the project site and, of course, east of the project site with the increased traffic. The more traffic there is, the greater the likelihood of bicycle / pedestrian, bicycle / motor vehicle, or pedestrian / motor vehicle conflicts… and possibly deaths.

Under Sacramento County's Safety category, the project as proposed glares as an incompatible use on Osage Avenue at this time. *Considering the current conditions of the narrow road and current conditions of the agricultural residential neighborhood and our local wildlife, the increased traffic would create significantly more hazardous conditions for all concerned on Osage Avenue. It would create unnecessary safety hazards and an untenable situation for the neighborhood.*

Our precious little ones on Osage and in our greater Tokay community would run higher odds of a conflict with a motor vehicle with increased traffic. Through the years, we've seen children play in the street and at times unexpectedly run into the street. Children in the community have used our small street for their toys that required more of a flat area. If your children lived on this street or in this community, would you want to risk their safety with an increase in traffic?

If the multiple safety hazards that would be created, as well as the neighborhood residents' wishes, are completely disregarded in favor of the developer's lobbying efforts, then we urge that:

- Entrances/exits be placed along the main road of South Watt and not the narrow and oft-neglected road of Osage Avenue.
- The south side (Osage Avenue) be provided a sound wall that would block sound and light from disturbing existing residents.
- The sound wall should be aesthetically pleasing to the residents.
- Effective road drainage be installed on Osage Avenue (east of South Watt)
- The Osage Avenue road itself should be re-built to properly accommodate the unexpected vehicular load it has had to deal with and the additional load that would be expected. (Some of the additional vehicles that would be brought in by the project can be expected to travel east on Osage to avoid traffic that backs

up at Elder Creek Rd., just as other vehicles do now.)
- Speed bumps should be installed in at least two locations on Osage Avenue to discourage speeding down this little neighborhood road. (Non-residents who shortcut through our neighborhood often seem more concerned with getting to the other end of our street than they are with watching their speed.)

Make no mistake, this project is met with complete opposition by residents of this neighborhood. Our neighborhood is our home, our sanctuary, and we do not want it disturbed.

Sincerely,
Sharon Rogers Lopez

PS: I noticed the name Parkway Plaza Neighborhood in the top left of the Focused Transportation Analysis. Who came up with that? I hadn't heard of that name until seeing it in this report. Other developers have tried to come in before and make up neighborhood associations which didn't exist and regional names that also didn't exist. This area is called Tokay. The Japanese farmers prior to WWII raised strawberries and Tokay grapes. Tokay grapes were still in the area when I was a kid. There is a history to Tokay. There is nothing here that has anything to do with a parkway plaza, and we don't want anything to do with a parkway plaza. We are not city. Except for the warehouses to the west, this is mostly an agricultural area. We belong to the community of Tokay.

QUESTIONS:

1. There a plan for Osage Avenue to be widencd.
    a. Who loses property for it to be widened?
    b. Sidewalks?
    c. Bicycle lanes?
2. When Osage is widened, what is the plan… Only directly in front of the warehouse project? The entirety of the avenue? We do not want to lose any of our property to help a developer profit. If we lose property, our remaining property loses value.
3. If improvements are only on the city side, will new asphalt be only on the city side?
4. Where are the **three entrances/exits located** in relation to our **THREE HOUSES**?

5. What hours of the day are vehicles estimated to travel in and out? Could this possibly end up being 24 hours a day? What kind of vehicles do they estimate and how many?
6. When warehouses have gone in, there have been certain types of people who have been attracted to those areas who are not there to do day-time business with them. Speedsters and/or people setting off firecrackers/explosives create problems nearly nightly in the warehouse areas to the west and south - waking us at all hours. What is the plan for keeping them out of this area?
7. There are homeless who wander around the western warehouse area afterhours. We know this because they set off someone's loud recording that tells them to get off the property.
There is a homeless "village" of trailers, etc. on South Watt directly west of 8981 Osage Avenue. What is the plan for **keeping** the homeless out of this warehouse area?
8. What is the plan for keeping the homeless from loitering just outside?
9. I have trouble understanding some items in the report… Did the proposal add stop signs on Osage Avenue or is that on the developer's property at access points?
10. In Sacramento County, what is the maximum daily amount of traffic that the Planning Commission would add to a small residential neighborhood with a substandard narrow road? It seems absurd if it plans for up to 6000 vehicles as indicated in the report. It also seems absurd if the Planning Commission would purposely add any additional vehicles knowing the residents must walk in the narrow street and also knowing it is difficult for two vehicles to safely pass each other without at least one driving off the road.

Attachments:
Pictures
1. Tractor and bottom dumps on Osage Avenue (regular occurrence)
2. Osage Avenue road condition East side 1
3. Osage Avenue road condition 2

From: S Lopez
To: Ron Bess
Subject: Re: Proposed Osage Warehouse Project DR21-163
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 5:00:09 PM

Addendum to my letter of 7/29/22

Dear Mr. Bess,

In the Environmental Noise Assessment, decibels were compared. According to Noise Sources and Effects, a chart from Purdue University, 50 dB would be the sounds of a quiet suburb and a quiet **rural** area would be at 30 dB. We enjoy the rustling of leaves which is at 20 dB. Please take that into consideration.

ref
(https://www.chem.purdue.edu/chemsafety/Training/PPETrain/dblevels.htm)

On Fri, Jul 29, 2022 at 4:17 PM S Lopez <sharon.r.lopez@gmail.com> wrote:

> Sharon Rogers Lopez
> 8980 Osage Avenue
> Sacramento, CA 95829
> sharon.r.lopez@gmail.com
> 916-397-7777
>
> July 29. 2022
>
> Dear Mr. Bess,
>
> I, along with the residents on my street, Osage Avenue, oppose the Osage Warehouse Project (DR21-163). It would significantly disturb and harm our peaceful living and our health as well as that of the wildlife here.
>
> In the article ***"The Effect of Noise Exposure on Cognitive Performance and Brain Activity Patterns"*** research found that *"Noise has different negative effects ranging from interference with cognitive processing to damaging mental and physical health. The non-auditory effects of noise exposure include perceived disturbance, annoyance, cognitive impairment, cardiovascular disorders and sleep disturbance."*
>
> *"Studies show that noise causes cognitive impairment and oxidative stress in the brain. According to Wang et al., with further urbanisation and industrialisation, noise pollution has become a risk factor for depression, cognitive impairment and neurodegenerative disorders. It has been observed*

that exposure to noise influences the central nervous system leading to emotional stress, anxiety, cognitive and memory defects."

"Studies have shown that the effect of fluctuating noise on cognitive function is higher than steady noise."

(https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6901841/)

Our relative quiet atmosphere here on Osage Avenue allows us to appreciate nature and all of the various birds and animals that dwell here. This is a wetland, and after fall and winter rains, the pond at 8970 Osage is brimming with water and wildlife abounds. We are a regular stop for many birds. We have Canadian wild geese and ducks who arrive in the spring to mate then hatch their eggs here. Federally protected white egrets hang out in our fields looking for mates. A year or so ago, we even saw a pair of otters travel here and enter the pond. Turkeys that roam the area claim our neighborhood as well. When they are here, they walk down the road. Additional traffic would make it more hazardous for them and for the vehicles.

We are regularly visited by wildlife. Instinctually, wildlife do what they can to avoid excess noises. We live here, and they get used to us to a degree, but people and vehicles frighten them away. This is their land just as it is ours. They also need to be taken into consideration. The vehicles brought in by this project would terrorize them, and the level of decibels as well as the vibrations coming through on a daily basis would be harmful to all of us as well as significantly disrupting their lives and ours, destroying our harmony.

Our quiet agricultural community has already felt abandoned by those sworn to protect our interests. This project would be the final declaration that we in the community are deemed worthless by the elected officials of Sacramento City and Sacramento County.

The Focused Transportation Analysis Final Report (dated December 9, 2021) described the surrounding neighborhood as "Opposite the site along the south side of Osage Avenue are three residences." This simplistic description fails to recognize that many of us have been here for multiple generations, back when this was dairy, meat cattle, horse ranch, and farmland. We have raised horses, livestock, and chickens; we grow fruit, nuts, and vegetables; we go for walks, walk with strollers, go bike riding, and horseback riding in the neighborhood. We are all regularly visited by wildlife on our properties. Osage Avenue is a small country road in a small country neighborhood. Multiple families have been here since my childhood, when the county

divided my father's land in two to build Elk Grove Florin Rd. This land is rich in history for my own and neighboring families; to us, we have much more than generic "residential lots".

In the "Environmental Setting" section, Osage Avenue east of South Watt is described as "poor to fair condition, exhibiting alligator cracking in several areas". I'm glad it's acknowledged that the government has neglected our road for years (despite the enthusiasm to collect taxes designated explicitly for road maintenance). Non-resident traffic uses Osage Avenue as a speedway to avoid traffic on South Watt, destroying the road much faster than expected. Holes have developed through the street, far worse than simply cracking. The last time the County came out to take care of potholes, they filled in the worst ones but not all of them. Our road has holes of various sizes.

"Existing Pedestrian System" says we have "no sidewalks or shoulders". This is correct. We walk in the road when we walk to a neighbor's house. If a vehicle comes down the road, we have to move off to the side of the road, into the dirt or weeds.

Our little road is not wide enough for two large vehicles, or often two cars, to comfortably pass. Often when two meet, one pulls off into the weeds on the side of the road and stops to let the other go by. A few days ago, I saw a pickup traveling one direction down Osage and a car traveling the other. They were going to pass right in front of my driveway. The car pulled onto my property to let the pickup go by, then pulled back out onto the road. I understand that needed to happen at that particular time because of how narrow our road is. Still, nobody on our street wants it happening regularly simply because a developer wants access points on Osage Avenue - bringing significantly increased and dangerous traffic. We residents would in no way benefit from a warehouse going in at 8981 Osage Avenue, yet our lives would undoubtedly be disrupted and impacted negatively.

Besides the noise and safety factor (which is a huge concern), Osage Avenue to the east cannot easily handle extra traffic. The sheer number of allotted parking spaces indicates SEVERAL additional vehicles daily will traverse and further damage our little street even worse than under current conditions. This is a county road, not city. City limits stop on the west side of South Watt – except for a patch on the north side of Osage Avenue (across from the first three properties) that includes 8981 Osage, and the county has not properly maintained our road in decades – as evidenced by the road itself. If the government cannot maintain our simple road in the best of times, how would one reasonably expect this pattern of neglect to change with a significant increase in traffic?

During the fall and winter there are heavy rains, and Osage Avenue floods at both ends. We pay extra on our utility bills for “drainage”, a great joke as there is no drainage. Drivers need to be extra careful and drive slowly through the pooled water – which sometimes takes a week or more to clear. Additional traffic on Osage would cause significant congestion of non-resident vehicles along our little road. We don’t want them in our front yards. We especially don’t want them there when impatient people decide to make a U-turn in the middle of the road and inevitably hit one of our fences, mailboxes, or another part of our property. When the ground around here is wet, it’s like quicksand… countless vehicles that have run off the road in these conditions have sunk into it and need to be towed out, including as recently as earlier this year. Besides it being extremely inconvenient for drivers, we don’t want anyone pulling onto the south side of Osage and ripping up our ground, making big ruts if they get in the mud. Given the government’s inability (or lack of concern) to maintain our road, I’m confident neither of your agencies will be here to repair our driveways or property from the inevitable damage.

With mitigation measures, there would at least be a traffic light at the intersection of Osage and South Watt (which should have happened years ago anyway because
of all the accidents that have occurred there). Lines of vehicles exiting and then backed up are another thing that nobody whose property does not face a main street would want in their front yards. If the increased traffic headed out on Hedge Avenue, it would only be a matter of time before there would be an increase in vehicular accidents there as well.

We already have some experience with extra vehicles on our little street and we are not happy about it. There is a landscaping business here on our street illegally. A
complaint was lodged, yet somehow they remain. Not only do their trucks rip up the road, but they have disturbed our sleep in the early morning. The only thing I want to hear in the early morning is the occasional crow of a neighborhood rooster, other neighborhood animals, or the beautiful sound of birds… not the sounds of landscaping companies or the sounds of a warehouse across the street.

We started out as a rural agricultural community. As a baby, I was riding horses with my mother as she herded cattle. Then, the government decided to put Elk Grove- Florin Rd./South Watt through our pastures, splitting family land. Now, you’re talking about approving a warehouse in our front yards. It seems it has been one encroachment after another during my lifetime.

I have lived at this address for 40 years. When I purchased my land from my parents, the county map was marked AR – Agricultural Residential. The original Osage Avenue, east of South Watt, has always been a small country road. Now, we see vehicles zipping down our little street, using it as a shortcut for traffic between
South Watt and other points. It has been beat up by big rigs, bottom dumps, transfer trucks, and other vehicles it already can't handle, including daily traffic from landscaping trucks that travel to and fro from a company that moved in illegally. In addition to the wear and tear on the road, which is not well-maintained, we all hear when the employees for the landscaping company go to work; it breaks the quiet of the early morning. Then we are disturbed again when their trucks head out… again breaking the quiet of the morning.

We relish relative quiet and enjoy hearing the talking and singing of the various birds and fowl that come to visit or make their homes here. Some of them also don't like being disturbed and will leave the area if they are. Forty years ago, South Watt (then named Elk Grove-Florin Rd.) was fairly quiet with occasional vehicles. South Watt itself has brought traffic that disturbs our peace with noise and vibrations. The warehouses to the west of South Watt brought increased noise and vibrations just with their daily operations. That's bad enough, but we also have to deal with the afterhours activities in their streets and parking lots. For years, we have heard vehicles on occasion speeding through the warehouse areas to the west in the evenings and late at night into the early mornings. Currently, there are near-nightly disturbances from fireworks and/or some kind of explosives that are set off at odd times throughout the night. Explosives go off at all different times and for different lengths of time. This is what would be happening directly across the
street from us if this project is approved. We do not want the afterhours activities in our front yards. We do not want any of this in front of our homes.

On top of all that, our area has been zoned a "Green Zone". (Some of us did not receive notice of that change in time so were unable to protest it.) As long as there are still residents here, there should be no project in the space across from us. Being in a Green Zone is already dangerous enough for those of us who live in this isolated area, something that perhaps was not considered when the zoning was approved.

If a building is put in, there is no predicting what might go into it, and what initially goes in isn't necessarily what will be there in a few years. Maybe it is planned as something to do with the marijuana business, or

perhaps after some years it ends up dealing with the marijuana business – either way would put that business and its associated activities and security hazards on our doorstep making life here even more dangerous for us.

Since we are semi-rural, we are isolated. For several years, it has taken an unacceptably long time to get a response from law enforcement. I would hope the safety and security of citizens would be a top priority, especially since such a project regrettably coming to fruition would increase the need for responsive law enforcement due to an inevitable increase in crime and safety concerns.

The way I understand it, under CEQA Guidelines, this proposed project would cross thresholds, making a significant impact. If the warehouse project is approved, increased traffic south of the site and east of the site would create significantly more hazardous conditions – conditions for increased conflict between bicyclists, pedestrians, and motor vehicles. *They would all be pushed off the road more often, and the increase in traffic would accelerate the degrading of the road which is already substandard. (It was not constructed for the amount and type of traffic whose load it already bears.). Also, the way I understand it, infrastructure improvements are to be made on the city side only, leaving pedestrians and bicyclists still in the road with motor vehicles on the south side of Osage in front of the project site and, of course, east of the project site with the increased traffic. The more traffic there is, the greater the likelihood of bicycle / pedestrian, bicycle / motor vehicle, or pedestrian / motor vehicle conflicts… and possibly deaths.*

Under Sacramento County's Safety category, the project as proposed glares as an incompatible use on Osage Avenue at this time. *Considering the current conditions of the narrow road and current conditions of the agricultural residential neighborhood and our local wildlife, the increased traffic would create significantly more hazardous conditions for all concerned on Osage Avenue. It would create unnecessary safety hazards and an untenable situation for the neighborhood.*

Our precious little ones on Osage and in our greater Tokay community would run higher odds of a conflict with a motor vehicle with increased traffic. Through the years, we've seen children play in the street and at times unexpectedly run into the street. Children in the community have used our small street for their toys that required more of a flat area. If your children lived on this street or in this community, would you want to risk their safety

with an increase in traffic?

If the multiple safety hazards that would be created, as well as the neighborhood residents' wishes, are completely disregarded in favor of the developer's lobbying efforts, then we urge that:

- Entrances/exits be placed along the main road of South Watt and not the narrow and oft-neglected road of Osage Avenue.
- The south side (Osage Avenue) be provided a sound wall that would block sound and light from disturbing existing residents.
- The sound wall should be aesthetically pleasing to the residents.
- Effective road drainage be installed on Osage Avenue (east of South Watt)
- The Osage Avenue road itself should be re-built to properly accommodate the unexpected vehicular load it has had to deal with and the additional load that would be expected. (Some of the additional vehicles that would be brought in by the project can be expected to travel east on Osage to avoid traffic that backs up at Elder Creek Rd., just as other vehicles do now.)
- Speed bumps should be installed in at least two locations on Osage Avenue to discourage speeding down this little neighborhood road. (Non-residents who shortcut through our neighborhood often seem more concerned with getting to the other end of our street than they are with watching their speed.)

Make no mistake, this project is met with complete opposition by residents of this neighborhood. Our neighborhood is our home, our sanctuary, and we do not want it disturbed.

Sincerely,
Sharon Rogers Lopez

PS: I noticed the name Parkway Plaza Neighborhood in the top left of the Focused Transportation Analysis. Who came up with that? I hadn't heard of that name until seeing it in this report. Other developers have tried to come in before and make up neighborhood associations which didn't exist and regional names that also didn't exist. This area is called Tokay. The Japanese farmers prior to WWII raised strawberries and Tokay grapes. Tokay grapes were still in the area when I was a kid. There is a history to Tokay. There is nothing here that has anything to do with a parkway plaza, and we don't want anything to do with a parkway plaza. We are not city. Except for the warehouses to the west, this is mostly an agricultural area. We belong to the community of Tokay.

QUESTIONS:

1. There a plan for Osage Avenue to be widencd.
    a. Who loses property for it to be widened?
    b. Sidewalks?
    c. Bicycle lanes?
2. When Osage is widened, what is the plan… Only directly in front of the warehouse project? The entirety of the avenue? We do not want to lose any of our property to help a developer profit. If we lose property, our remaining property loses value.
3. If improvements are only on the city side, will new asphalt be only on the city side?
4. Where are the **three entrances/exits located** in relation to our **THREE HOUSES**?
5. What hours of the day are vehicles estimated to travel in and out? Could this possibly end up being 24 hours a day? What kind of vehicles do they estimate and how many?
6. When warehouses have gone in, there have been certain types of people who have been attracted to those areas who are not there to do day-time business with them. Speedsters and/or people setting off firecrackers/explosives create problems nearly nightly in the warehouse areas to the west and south - waking us at all hours. What is the plan for keeping them out of this area?
7. There are homeless who wander around the western warehouse area afterhours. We know this because they set off someone's loud recording that tells them to get off the property.
There is a homeless "village" of trailers, etc. on South Watt directly west of 8981 Osage Avenue. What is the plan for **keeping** the homeless out of this warehouse area?
8. What is the plan for keeping the homeless from loitering just outside?
9. I have trouble understanding some items in the report… Did the proposal add stop signs on Osage Avenue or is that on the developer's property at access points?
10. In Sacramento County, what is the maximum daily amount of traffic that the Planning Commission would add to a small residential

neighborhood with a substandard narrow road? It seems absurd if it plans for up to 6000 vehicles as indicated in the report. It also seems absurd if the Planning Commission would purposely add any additional vehicles knowing the residents must walk in the narrow street and also knowing it is difficult for two vehicles to safely pass each other without at least one driving off the road.

Attachments:
Pictures
1. Tractor and bottom dumps on Osage Avenue (regular occurrence)
2. Osage Avenue road condition East side 1
3. Osage Avenue road condition 2

From: Mashim Shekotur
To: Ron Bess
Subject: Warehouse Project on Osage Ave and Watt Ave
Date: Thursday, August 4, 2022 2:07:47 PM

As a family of three, we live at 9010 Osage Avenue. We have a few concerns that we would like to address with the building of the warehouse you want to construct.

- The first issue that we are having is the traffic that it will bring onto our already small street. Our neighbors and we have agreed that it would be best if the entrance strictly from Watt Avenue. Our road is never taken care of with many potholes, along with people who consistently speed constantly and do not abide by speed limits. We have personally had multiple animals killed due to people speeding on our streets and none of those people were our neighbors. We respect each other and know each other by their first name and have been friends with all of our surrounding neighbors. Putting the entrance off of Osage Ave can and most likely will endanger us and our families. If you do decide to build the warehouse all we ask is that the entrance is on watt avenue with no entrances being on Osage ave.
- The second issue is the light pollution that you will bring into the area. We ask kindly that the entrance is from watt avenue and the side of Osage gets a wall so that the neighbors and us included do not get light into our homes from all the light poles that will be put up to light up your parking lot.
- The third issue is that we live on an agricultural property and the property has animals on it. The sound of the loud trucks and loud cars will harm and traumatize our animals.
- The fourth issue with building a depot will lower the value of the home. This will no longer be a place of peace with farm animals but instead, be a truck stop and speeding zone for all that come through Osage Ave. If a warehouse is to be built there this will create issues when we decide to sell our beloved family home. Buyers will not want to buy a property that is loud along with lights that are on at night. This will exacerbate the financial burden on our family.
- The fifth issue is the illegal activity that it will bring into an area. There are currently warehouses across Osage on the other side of Watt Avenue and if you come here at night almost every night you can hear cars drifting and being loud. By building this warehouse it is a guarantee that there will be cars looking for a place that is suitable for donuts and drifting in their car which will raise the noise level. Drifting is also illegal on private or public roads and properties. There is a track for that kind of stuff.

We would love to be contacted and have a phone call to further address this issue. We kindly ask you to listen to our concerns and act appropriately when considering how to go about this project.

Kindest regards from the residents of 9010 Osage Ave, Sacramento CA, 95829

Anatoliy Shchekoturov
Lyudmila Schchekoturov (916) 583-0821
Maxim Shchekoturov (916) 477-6422