Appendix B
NOP Scoping Comment Letters

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 3
703 B STREET
MARYSVILLE, CA 95901
PHONE (530) 634-7616
FAX (530) 741-4245
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov/dist3

Making Conservation a California Way of Life.

April 2, 2019

GTS# 03-SAC-2019-00401
SCH: 2019039011

Scott Johnson
Senior Planner
City of Sacramento
Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd., Third Floor
Sacramento, CA, 95811

Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project – Notice of Preparation (NOP)

Dear Mr. Johnson

Thank you for including California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the application review for the project referenced above. Caltrans' new mission, vision, and goals signal a modernization of our approach to California's transportation system. We review this local development for impacts to the State Highway System (SHS) in keeping with our mission, vision and goals for sustainability/livability/economy, and safety/heath. We provide these comments consistent with the state's mobility goals that support a vibrant economy and build communities.

The Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development (NAR PUD) area will include a circulation network intended to utilize or repurpose existing PUD area roadways to serve future development, improve connectivity with the existing road system, and support multi-modal transportation. The proposed NAR PUD will change the land use designation of the project site from Urban Center High to Urban Center Low and will change the zoning designation from Sports Complex/Planned Unit Development (SPX-PUD) to General Commercial/Planned Unit Development (C-2-PUD). The NAR PUD site is a 183.8-acre site located within the City of Sacramento's North Natomas community in the northwestern portion of the city and includes the Sleep Train Arena building, the former Sacramento Kings practice facility. Based on the information provided, Caltrans provides the following comments:

Traffic Operations/Forecasting:

The proposed project is anticipated to contribute significant traffic congestion to nearby Interstate 5 (I-5) and Interstate 80 (I-80). Because of this, a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) is required. The TIS should be based on the Caltrans "Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies", and must cover the following:

- Trips generated and distributed from the project site;
- Existing traffic condition without the project;

- Existing traffic condition with the project;
- Future Cumulative traffic condition without the project and with the project;
- Future cumulative traffic impacts with the project that includes proposed projects around the project site, some of which includes:
    - Natomas Crossing-Quadrant B Office: located east of I-5 and north and south of Arena Boulevard.
    - North Natomas Community Center & Aquatic Center: located north of Del Paso Road and east of I-5.
    - Hyatt House & Place-North Natomas: located west of I-5 and on the south edge of Del Paso Road.
    - Sleep Train Apartments: located east of I-5, north of Arena Boulevard, and south of Del Paso Road.
    - Paso Verde School: located east of I-5 and north of Del Paso Road
    - Natomas Town Center East: located at 2631 Del Paso Road.
- Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) analysis which includes VMT per capita, and the average VMT per capita for the surrounding area;
- Evaluation of elements of multi-modal transportation system analysis; and,
- Queue length analysis at the on and off ramps at Arena Boulevard, Del Paso Road, and Truxel Road. The scope of the analysis should include nearby I-5, I-80 mainline, ramps, and ramp intersections.

Please provide our office with copies of any further actions regarding this project. We would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on any changes related to this development.

If you have any questions regarding these comments or require additional information, please contact Uzma Rehman, Intergovernmental Review Coordinator for the City of Sacramento, by phone (530) 741-5173 or via email to uzma.rehman@dot.ca.gov

Sincerely,

Alex Fong, Branch Chief
Office of Transportation Planning
Regional Planning Branch – South

CC: State Clearinghouse

From:	Wood, Dylan@Wildlife
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	Wildlife R2 CEQA
Subject:	Comments on the NOP for the Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development (SCH: 2019039011)
Date:	Friday, March 22, 2019 2:54:06 PM

Mr. Johnson,

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has received and reviewed the **Notice of Preparation** for the **Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development** (Project) in Sacramento County. CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist the Lead Agency in adequately identifying and, where appropriate, mitigating the project's significant or potentially significant, direct and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife resources.

The proposed Project footprint falls within the boundaries of the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP). CDFW recommends the City of Sacramento discuss the Project's place within the NBHCP.

A search of CNDDB and CDFW's BIOS reveal three special-status species occurrences within the Project footprint or within 150 meters of the Project site. These species include: giant gartersnake (*Thamnophis gigas*), Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), and burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*). CDFW recommends the draft EIR specifically analyze potential impacts to these species.

Since known burrowing owl habitat is present on and adjacent to the Project site, CDFW recommends a qualified biologist complete surveys for burrowing owl in accordance with the *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012). The staff report guidelines state that "the survey methods used and results including the information described in the Summary Report and to include the reports within the CEQA documentation." As such, CDFW recommends following survey methodology below to determine burrowing owl use of the Project area prior to circulation of the final EIR. The survey includes: 1) at least one site visit between 15 February and 15 April, and 2) a minimum of three survey visits, at least three weeks apart, between 15 April and 15 July, with at least one visit after 15 June. Surveys will be conducted on the Project site and within 150 meters of areas that will be directly or indirectly impacted by the Project, where feasible. Surveys shall not be conducted during inclement weather, when burrowing owls are typically less active and visible. If burrowing owls or evidence of burrowing owls (e.g. whitewash or pellets) are not observed during any surveys, no additional mitigation is necessary. If the birds are present, take could occur. If any new burrowing owl colonizes the Project site after the CEQA document has been adopted, it may constitute changed circumstances that should be addressed in a re-circulated CEQA document (CDFG 2012) if those potential impacts have not been disclosed.

Migratory nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 U.S.C., §§ 703-712). CDFW implemented the MBTA by adopting the Fish and Game Code section 3513. Fish and Game Code sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3800 provide additional protection to nongame birds, birds of prey, their nests and eggs. Potential habitat for nesting birds and birds of prey is present within the Project footprint. The initial study should disclose all potential activities that may incur a direct or indirect take to nongame nesting

birds within the project footprint and its close vicinity. Appropriate avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures to avoid take should also be included. Measures to avoid the impacts can include species specific work windows, bird surveys, biological monitoring, installation of noise attenuation barriers, etc. As a part of the draft EIR, CDFW recommends identifying any trees slated for removal and said trees be properly analyzed for potential impacts to nesting birds. Likewise, any plans for the plantings of new trees should also be included with the number and species to be planted (CDFW recommends using native California species when feasible).

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the project that may affect California fish and wildlife. I am available for further consultation if the City has questions regarding these comments or fish and wildlife issues that arise when drafting the EIR.

Sincerely,

Dylan Wood
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Environmental Scientist
(916) 358-2384

CALIFORNIA
Water Boards

GAVIN NEWSOM
GOVERNOR

JARED BLUMENFELD
SECRETARY FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

25 March 2019

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Boulevard, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

CERTIFIED MAIL
7018 3090 0000 5203 5410

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION FOR THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, NATOMAS ARENA REUSE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, SCH#2019039011, SACRAMENTO COUNTY

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse's 1 March 2019 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the *Request for Review for the Notice of Preparation for the Draft Environmental Impact Report* for the Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development 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 Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-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

[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.

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.

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/

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 Risk General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board's Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Risk Waiver) R5-2013-0145. 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 Risk 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 Risk Waiver and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/waivers/r5-2013-0145_res.pdf

Regulatory Compliance for Commercially Irrigated Agriculture

If the property will be used for commercial irrigated agricultural, the discharger will be required to obtain regulatory coverage under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. There are two options to comply:

1. **Obtain Coverage Under a Coalition Group.** Join the local Coalition Group that supports land owners with the implementation of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. The Coalition Group conducts water quality monitoring and reporting to the Central Valley Water Board on behalf of its growers. The Coalition Groups charge an annual membership fee, which varies by Coalition Group. To find the Coalition Group in your area, visit the Central Valley Water Board's website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/regulatory_information/for_growers/coalition_groups/ or contact water board staff at (916) 464-4611 or via email at IrrLands@waterboards.ca.gov.

2. **Obtain Coverage Under the General Waste Discharge Requirements for Individual Growers, General Order R5-2013-0100**. Dischargers not participating in a third-party group (Coalition) are regulated individually. Depending on the specific site conditions, growers may be required to monitor runoff from their property, install monitoring wells, and submit a notice of intent, farm plan, and other action plans regarding their actions to comply with their General Order. Yearly costs would include State administrative fees (for example, annual fees for farm sizes from 11-100 acres are currently $1,277 + $8.53/Acre); the cost to prepare annual monitoring reports; and water quality monitoring costs. To enroll as an Individual Discharger under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, call the Central Valley Water Board phone line at (916) 464-4611 or e-mail board staff at IrrLands@waterboards.ca.gov.

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) 464-4812 or Jordan.Hensley@waterboards.ca.gov.

Jordan Hensley
Environmental Scientist

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

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION
Cultural and Environmental Department
1550 Harbor Blvd., Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95691 Phone (916) 373-3710
Email: nahc@nahc.ca.gov
Website: http://www.nahc.ca.gov
Twitter: @CA_NAHC

April 2, 2019

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd., Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

RE: SCH# 2019039011 Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project, Sacramento County

Dear Mr. Johnson:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has received the Notice of Preparation (NOP), Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) or Early Consultation for the project referenced above. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code §21000 et seq.), specifically Public Resources Code §21084.1, states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit.14, §15064.5 (b) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (b)). If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) shall be prepared. (Pub. Resources Code §21080 (d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 5064 subd.(a)(1) (CEQA Guidelines §15064 (a)(1)). In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources within the area of potential effect (APE).

CEQA was amended significantly in 2014. Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) (AB 52) amended CEQA to create a separate category of cultural resources, "tribal cultural resources" (Pub. Resources Code §21074) and provides that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code §21084.2). Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code §21084.3 (a)). **AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation, a notice of negative declaration, or a mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015.** If your project involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation or proposed designation of open space, on or after March 1, 2005, it may also be subject to Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) (SB 18). **Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements**. If your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (154 U.S.C. 300101, 36 C.F.R. §800 et seq.) may also apply.

The NAHC recommends consultation with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources. Below is a brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC's recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments.

Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.

AB 52

AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements:

1. Fourteen Day Period to Provide Notice of Completion of an Application/Decision to Undertake a Project: Within fourteen (14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, a lead agency shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, to be accomplished by at least one written notice that includes:
   a. A brief description of the project.
   b. The lead agency contact information.
   c. Notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d)).
   d. A "California Native American tribe" is defined as a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of Statutes of 2004 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21073).

2. Begin Consultation Within 30 Days of Receiving a Tribe's Request for Consultation and Before Releasing a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report: A lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1, subds. (d) and (e)) and prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or Environmental Impact Report. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1(b)).
   a. For purposes of AB 52, "consultation shall have the same meaning as provided in Gov. Code §65352.4 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (b)).

3. Mandatory Topics of Consultation If Requested by a Tribe: The following topics of consultation, if a tribe requests to discuss them, are mandatory topics of consultation:
   a. Alternatives to the project.
   b. Recommended mitigation measures.
   c. Significant effects. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).

4. Discretionary Topics of Consultation: The following topics are discretionary topics of consultation:
   a. Type of environmental review necessary.
   b. Significance of the tribal cultural resources.
   c. Significance of the project's impacts on tribal cultural resources.
   d. If necessary, project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation that the tribe may recommend to the lead agency. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).

5. Confidentiality of Information Submitted by a Tribe During the Environmental Review Process: With some exceptions, any information, including but not limited to, the location, description, and use of tribal cultural resources submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public, consistent with Government Code §6254 (r) and §6254.10. Any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (c)(1)).

6. Discussion of Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources in the Environmental Document: If a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency's environmental document shall discuss both of the following:
   a. Whether the proposed project has a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource.
   b. Whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, including those measures that may be agreed to pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (a), avoid or substantially lessen the impact on the identified tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (b)).

7. Conclusion of Consultation: Consultation with a tribe shall be considered concluded when either of the following occurs:
    a. The parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or
    b. A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (b)).

8. Recommending Mitigation Measures Agreed Upon in Consultation in the Environmental Document: Any mitigation measures agreed upon in the consultation conducted pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2 shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and in an adopted mitigation monitoring and reporting program, if determined to avoid or lessen the impact pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (b), paragraph 2, and shall be fully enforceable. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (a)).

9. Required Consideration of Feasible Mitigation: If mitigation measures recommended by the staff of the lead agency as a result of the consultation process are not included in the environmental document or if there are no agreed upon mitigation measures at the conclusion of consultation, or if consultation does not occur, and if substantial evidence demonstrates that a project will cause a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency shall consider feasible mitigation pursuant to Public Resources Code §21084.3 (b). (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (e)).

10. Examples of Mitigation Measures That, If Feasible, May Be Considered to Avoid or Minimize Significant Adverse Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources:
    a. Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to:
        i. Planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.
        ii. Planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
    b. Treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
        i. Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
        ii. Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
        iii. Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.
    c. Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.
    d. Protecting the resource. (Pub. Resource Code §21084.3 (b)).
    e. Please note that a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a non-federally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC to protect a California prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, or ceremonial place may acquire and hold conservation easements if the conservation easement is voluntarily conveyed. (Civ. Code §815.3 (c)).
    f. Please note that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated. (Pub. Resources Code §5097.991).

11. Prerequisites for Certifying an Environmental Impact Report or Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration with a Significant Impact on an Identified Tribal Cultural Resource: An Environmental Impact Report may not be certified, nor may a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration be adopted unless one of the following occurs:
    a. The consultation process between the tribes and the lead agency has occurred as provided in Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 and §21080.3.2 and concluded pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2.
    b. The tribe that requested consultation failed to provide comments to the lead agency or otherwise failed to engage in the consultation process.
    c. The lead agency provided notice of the project to the tribe in compliance with Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d) and the tribe failed to request consultation within 30 days. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (d)).

The NAHC's PowerPoint presentation titled, "Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices" may be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPAPDF.pdf

SB 18

SB 18 applies to local governments and requires local governments to contact, provide notice to, refer plans to, and consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation of open space. (Gov. Code §65352.3). Local governments should consult the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's "Tribal Consultation Guidelines," which can be found online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf

Some of SB 18's provisions include:

1. Tribal Consultation: If a local government considers a proposal to adopt or amend a general plan or a specific plan, or to designate open space it is required to contact the appropriate tribes identified by the NAHC by requesting a "Tribal Consultation List." If a tribe, once contacted, requests consultation the local government must consult with the tribe on the plan proposal. **A tribe has 90 days from the date of receipt of notification to request consultation unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe.** (Gov. Code §65352.3 (a)(2)).
2. No Statutory Time Limit on SB 18 Tribal Consultation. There is no statutory time limit on SB 18 tribal consultation.
3. Confidentiality: Consistent with the guidelines developed and adopted by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to Gov. Code §65040.2, the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of the information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of places, features and objects described in Public Resources Code §5097.9 and §5097.993 that are within the city's or county's jurisdiction. (Gov. Code §65352.3 (b)).
4. Conclusion of SB 18 Tribal Consultation: Consultation should be concluded at the point in which:
    a. The parties to the consultation come to a mutual agreement concerning the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation; or
    b. Either the local government or the tribe, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached concerning the appropriate measures of preservation or mitigation. (Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (2005) at p. 18).

Agencies should be aware that neither AB 52 nor SB 18 precludes agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52 and SB 18. For that reason, we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Contact Lists and "Sacred Lands File" searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/

NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments

To adequately assess the existence and significance of tribal cultural resources and plan for avoidance, preservation in place, or barring both, mitigation of project-related impacts to tribal cultural resources, the NAHC recommends the following actions:

1. Contact the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) Center (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068) for an archaeological records search. The records search will determine:
    a. If part or all of the APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
    b. If any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
    c. If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
    d. If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

2. If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
    a. The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure.
    b. The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional CHRIS center.

3. Contact the NAHC for:
    a. A Sacred Lands File search. Remember that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the Sacred Lands File, nor are they required to do so. A Sacred Lands File search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project's APE.
    b. A Native American Tribal Consultation List of appropriate tribes for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in planning for avoidance, preservation in place, or, failing both, mitigation measures.

4. Remember that the lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources (including tribal cultural resources) does not preclude their subsurface existence.
    a. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15064.5(f) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(f)). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
    b. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the disposition of recovered cultural items that are not burial associated in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
    c. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the treatment and disposition of inadvertently discovered Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15064.5, subdivisions (d) and (e) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, subds. (d) and (e)) address the processes to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery of any Native American human remains and associated grave goods in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address: Katy.Sanchez@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

for

Katy Sanchez
Associate Environmental Planner

cc: State Clearinghouse

Natomas Unified School District
Connecting students to their future

March 29, 2019

Scott Johnson, Senior Planner
City of Sacramento Community Development Department
Environmental Planning Services
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811-0218
srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

Dear Mr. Johnson:

The Natomas Unified School District (the District) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project. As you know, the District operates schools within the vicinity of this proposed PUD area. We understand that the PUD proposes to change the land use designation of the site from Urban Center High to Urban Center Low and change the zoning district designation from Sports Complex/Planned Unit Development to General Commercial/Planned Use Development to allow greater flexibility. We understand that, in particular, the applicant is interested in allowing single-family residential, multi-family residential, commercial, institutional, industrial, and agricultural uses.

The change from Urban Center High to Urban Center Low would reduce height limits, reduce minimum and maximum densities, and reduce minimum and maximum non-residential development intensities. This change can also affect the student generation rates within the District's service area. For example, with the decrease in minimum density, it will be more likely that compact single-family development could be developed. The student generation rate for single-family residential development (0.65) is more than twice as high as multi-family development (0.29). The rate for attached single-family development (0.29) is the same as multi-family development. The housing types that ultimately are developed within the project site will be important for understanding the implications for the District in facilities planning. The NOP does not spell out the housing types that would be developed – other PUDs in the City have provided details as a part of the entitlement process. The District is interested to know whether this PUD review process will provide additional detail on housing types so that the District can understand how this project would affect facilities planning.

The District is interested in coordinating with the City to determine the feasibility of a school site within this PUD area. If the site is planned for residential development, a school site will be needed. The size and type of school would depend on the amount and type of residential development. For example, assuming 30 percent of the 183.8-acre site is occupied with rights-of-way and other undevelopable areas, 30 percent of the site is for non-residential development, and the balance is residential development, this would yield between 1,470 and 11,028 dwelling units using minimum and maximum residential densities from the City's Urban Center Low designation.

The City's PUD requirements are intended to provide "greater flexibility in the design of integrated developments than otherwise possible through strict application of zoning regulations. It is the intent of this chapter to encourage the design of well-planned facilities that offer a variety of housing or other land uses through creative and imaginative planning, among them the following types of developments" (Planning and Development Code Section 17.452.010). Therefore, we assume the PUD review process will produce detail on how this applicant intends to use this flexibility in creative and thoughtful planning and design. These details will be important for the District in consideration of school facilities needs in the PUD area. It will also be important to review design details in order to ensure safe and convenient walking and bicycling through the area along routes that accommodate existing and future school trips.

Finally, the District is curious to learn the relationship between this project and the City's General Plan update. In the NOP, it appears the project is focused on changes to allowable land use and density, with some relatively minor changes to circulation. It would be interesting to understand whether this PUD will be considered within the context of the overall General Plan update. As noted in our previous response to the NOP for the General Plan update MEIR, the District would like to meet with City staff at the appropriate time to discuss policies and programs that mitigate impacts to school services and facilities which could be a part of an updated General Plan.

The District looks forward to coordinating with City staff on this PUD review process.

Sincerely,

Lalanya Rothenberger

Lalanya Rothenberger
Executive Director
Facilities and Strategic Planning

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Plan Review Team
Land Management

PGEPlanReview@pge.com

6111 Bollinger Canyon Road 3370A
San Ramon, CA 94583

March 5, 2019

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
300 Richard Blvd., 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Ref: Gas and Electric Transmission and Distribution

Dear Mr. Johnson,

Thank you for submitting NAR PUD Project plans for our review. PG&E will review the submitted plans in relationship to any existing Gas and Electric facilities within the project area. If the proposed project is adjacent/or within PG&E owned property and/or easements, we will be working with you to ensure compatible uses and activities near our facilities.

Attached you will find information and requirements as it relates to Gas facilities (Attachment 1) and Electric facilities (Attachment 2). Please review these in detail, as it is critical to ensure your safety and to protect PG&E's facilities and its existing rights.

Below is additional information for your review:

1. This plan review process does not replace the application process for PG&E gas or electric service your project may require. For these requests, please continue to work with PG&E Service Planning: https://www.pge.com/en_US/business/services/building-and-renovation/overview/overview.page.

2. If the project being submitted is part of a larger project, please include the entire scope of your project, and not just a portion of it. PG&E's facilities are to be incorporated within any CEQA document. PG&E needs to verify that the CEQA document will identify any required future PG&E services.

3. An engineering deposit may be required to review plans for a project depending on the size, scope, and location of the project and as it relates to any rearrangement or new installation of PG&E facilities.

Any proposed uses within the PG&E fee strip and/or easement, may include a California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) Section 851 filing. This requires the CPUC to render approval for a conveyance of rights for specific uses on PG&E's fee strip or easement. PG&E will advise if the necessity to incorporate a CPUC Section 851filing is required.

This letter does not constitute PG&E's consent to use any portion of its easement for any purpose not previously conveyed. PG&E will provide a project specific response as required.

Sincerely,

Plan Review Team
Land Management

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Attachment 1 – Gas Facilities

There could be gas transmission pipelines in this area which would be considered critical facilities for PG&E and a high priority subsurface installation under California law. Care must be taken to ensure safety and accessibility. So, please ensure that if PG&E approves work near gas transmission pipelines it is done in adherence with the below stipulations. Additionally, the following link provides additional information regarding legal requirements under California excavation laws: http://usanorth811.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/CA-LAW-English.pdf

1. Standby Inspection: A PG&E Gas Transmission Standby Inspector must be present during any demolition or construction activity that comes within 10 feet of the gas pipeline. This includes all grading, trenching, substructure depth verifications (potholes), asphalt or concrete demolition/removal, removal of trees, signs, light poles, etc. This inspection can be coordinated through the Underground Service Alert (USA) service at 811. A minimum notice of 48 hours is required. Ensure the USA markings and notifications are maintained throughout the duration of your work.

2. Access: At any time, PG&E may need to access, excavate, and perform work on the gas pipeline. Any construction equipment, materials, or spoils may need to be removed upon notice. Any temporary construction fencing installed within PG&E's easement would also need to be capable of being removed at any time upon notice. Any plans to cut temporary slopes exceeding a 1:4 grade within 10 feet of a gas transmission pipeline need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.

3. Wheel Loads: To prevent damage to the buried gas pipeline, there are weight limits that must be enforced whenever any equipment gets within 10 feet of traversing the pipe.

Ensure a list of the axle weights of all equipment being used is available for PG&E's Standby Inspector. To confirm the depth of cover, the pipeline may need to be potholed by hand in a few areas.

Due to the complex variability of tracked equipment, vibratory compaction equipment, and cranes, PG&E must evaluate those items on a case-by-case basis prior to use over the gas pipeline (provide a list of any proposed equipment of this type noting model numbers and specific attachments).

No equipment may be set up over the gas pipeline while operating. Ensure crane outriggers are at least 10 feet from the centerline of the gas pipeline. Transport trucks must not be parked over the gas pipeline while being loaded or unloaded.

4. Grading: PG&E requires a minimum of 36 inches of cover over gas pipelines (or existing grade if less) and a maximum of 7 feet of cover at all locations. The graded surface cannot exceed a cross slope of 1:4.

5. Excavating: Any digging within 2 feet of a gas pipeline must be dug by hand. Note that while the minimum clearance is only 12 inches, any excavation work within 24 inches of the edge of a pipeline must be done with hand tools. So to avoid having to dig a trench entirely with hand tools, the edge of the trench must be over 24 inches away. (Doing the math for a 24 inch wide trench being dug along a 36 inch pipeline, the centerline of the trench would need to be at least 54 inches [24/2 + 24 + 36/2 = 54] away, or be entirely dug by hand.)

Water jetting to assist vacuum excavating must be limited to 1000 psig and directed at a 40° angle to the pipe. All pile driving must be kept a minimum of 3 feet away.

Any plans to expose and support a PG&E gas transmission pipeline across an open excavation need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.

6. Boring/Trenchless Installations: PG&E Pipeline Services must review and approve all plans to bore across or parallel to (within 10 feet) a gas transmission pipeline. There are stringent criteria to pothole the gas transmission facility at regular intervals for all parallel bore installations.

For bore paths that cross gas transmission pipelines perpendicularly, the pipeline must be potholed a minimum of 2 feet in the horizontal direction of the bore path and a minimum of 12 inches in the vertical direction from the bottom of the pipe with minimum clearances measured from the edge of the pipe in both directions. Standby personnel must watch the locator trace (and every ream pass) the path of the bore as it approaches the pipeline and visually monitor the pothole (with the exposed transmission pipe) as the bore traverses the pipeline to ensure adequate clearance with the pipeline. The pothole width must account for the inaccuracy of the locating equipment.

7. Substructures: All utility crossings of a gas pipeline should be made as close to perpendicular as feasible (90° +/- 15°). All utility lines crossing the gas pipeline must have a minimum of 12 inches of separation from the gas pipeline. Parallel utilities, pole bases, water line 'kicker blocks', storm drain inlets, water meters, valves, back pressure devices or other utility substructures are not allowed in the PG&E gas pipeline easement.

If previously retired PG&E facilities are in conflict with proposed substructures, PG&E must verify they are safe prior to removal. This includes verification testing of the contents of the facilities, as well as environmental testing of the coating and internal surfaces. Timelines for PG&E completion of this verification will vary depending on the type and location of facilities in conflict.

8. Structures: No structures are to be built within the PG&E gas pipeline easement. This includes buildings, retaining walls, fences, decks, patios, carports, septic tanks, storage sheds, tanks, loading ramps, or any structure that could limit PG&E's ability to access its facilities.

9. Fencing: Permanent fencing is not allowed within PG&E easements except for perpendicular crossings which must include a 16 foot wide gate for vehicular access. Gates will be secured with PG&E corporation locks.

10. Landscaping: Landscaping must be designed to allow PG&E to access the pipeline for maintenance and not interfere with pipeline coatings or other cathodic protection systems. No trees, shrubs, brush, vines, and other vegetation may be planted within the easement area. Only those plants, ground covers, grasses, flowers, and low-growing plants that grow unsupported to a maximum of four feet (4') in height at maturity may be planted within the easement area.

11. Cathodic Protection: PG&E pipelines are protected from corrosion with an "Impressed Current" cathodic protection system. Any proposed facilities, such as metal conduit, pipes,

service lines, ground rods, anodes, wires, etc. that might affect the pipeline cathodic protection system must be reviewed and approved by PG&E Corrosion Engineering.

12. Pipeline Marker Signs: PG&E needs to maintain pipeline marker signs for gas transmission pipelines in order to ensure public awareness of the presence of the pipelines. With prior written approval from PG&E Pipeline Services, an existing PG&E pipeline marker sign that is in direct conflict with proposed developments may be temporarily relocated to accommodate construction work. The pipeline marker must be moved back once construction is complete.

13. PG&E is also the provider of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E's facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs which may endanger the safe operation of its facilities.

Attachment 2 – Electric Facilities

It is PG&E's policy to permit certain uses on a case by case basis within its electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) provided such uses and manner in which they are exercised, will not interfere with PG&E's rights or endanger its facilities. Some examples/restrictions are as follows:

1. Buildings and Other Structures: No buildings or other structures including the foot print and eave of any buildings, swimming pools, wells or similar structures will be permitted within fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) areas. PG&E's transmission easement shall be designated on subdivision/parcel maps as "**RESTRICTED USE AREA – NO BUILDING."**

2. Grading: Cuts, trenches or excavations may not be made within 25 feet of our towers. Developers must submit grading plans and site development plans (including geotechnical reports if applicable), signed and dated, for PG&E's review. PG&E engineers must review grade changes in the vicinity of our towers. No fills will be allowed which would impair ground-to-conductor clearances. Towers shall not be left on mounds without adequate road access to base of tower or structure.

3. Fences: Walls, fences, and other structures must be installed at locations that do not affect the safe operation of PG&'s facilities. Heavy equipment access to our facilities must be maintained at all times. Metal fences are to be grounded to PG&E specifications. No wall, fence or other like structure is to be installed within 10 feet of tower footings and unrestricted access must be maintained from a tower structure to the nearest street. Walls, fences and other structures proposed along or within the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) will require PG&E review; submit plans to PG&E Centralized Review Team for review and comment.

4. Landscaping: Vegetation may be allowed; subject to review of plans. On overhead electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s), trees and shrubs are limited to those varieties that do not exceed 15 feet in height at maturity. PG&E must have access to its facilities at all times, including access by heavy equipment. No planting is to occur within the footprint of the tower legs. Greenbelts are encouraged.

5. Reservoirs, Sumps, Drainage Basins, and Ponds: Prohibited within PG&E's fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) for electric transmission lines.

6. Automobile Parking: Short term parking of movable passenger vehicles and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) is allowed. The lighting within these parking areas will need to be reviewed by PG&E; approval will be on a case by case basis. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications. Blocked-up vehicles are not allowed. Carports, canopies, or awnings are not allowed.

7. Storage of Flammable, Explosive or Corrosive Materials: There shall be no storage of fuel or combustibles and no fueling of vehicles within PG&E's easement. No trash bins or incinerators are allowed.

8. Streets and Roads: Access to facilities must be maintained at all times. Street lights may be allowed in the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) but in all cases must be reviewed by PG&E for

proper clearance. Roads and utilities should cross the transmission easement as nearly at right angles as possible. Road intersections will not be allowed within the transmission easement.

9. Pipelines: Pipelines may be allowed provided crossings are held to a minimum and to be as nearly perpendicular as possible. Pipelines within 25 feet of PG&E structures require review by PG&E. Sprinklers systems may be allowed; subject to review. Leach fields and septic tanks are not allowed. Construction plans must be submitted to PG&E for review and approval prior to the commencement of any construction.

10. Signs: Signs are not allowed except in rare cases subject to individual review by PG&E.

11. Recreation Areas: Playgrounds, parks, tennis courts, basketball courts, barbecue and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) may be allowed; subject to review of plans. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications.

12. Construction Activity: Since construction activity will take place near PG&E's overhead electric lines, please be advised it is the contractor's responsibility to be aware of, and observe the minimum clearances for both workers and equipment operating near high voltage electric lines set out in the High-Voltage Electrical Safety Orders of the California Division of Industrial Safety (https://www.dir.ca.gov/Title8/sb5g2.html), as well as any other safety regulations. Contractors shall comply with California Public Utilities Commission General Order 95 (http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/gos/GO95/go_95_startup_page.html) and all other safety rules. No construction may occur within 25 feet of PG&E's towers. All excavation activities may only commence after 811 protocols has been followed.

Contractor shall ensure the protection of PG&E's towers and poles from vehicular damage by (installing protective barriers) Plans for protection barriers must be approved by PG&E prior to construction.

13. PG&E is also the owner of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E's facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs that may endanger the safe and reliable operation of its facilities.

REGIONALSAN
TAKING THE WASTE OUT OF WATER
Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District

Main Office
10060 Goethe Road
Sacramento, CA 95827-3553
Tel: 916.876.6000
Fax: 916.876.6160

Treatment Plant
8521 Laguna Station Road
Elk Grove, CA 95758-9550
Tel: 916.875.9000
Fax: 916.875.9068

March 4, 2019

Mr. Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento – Community Development Department
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Sacramento CA 95811

Subject: Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project (P18-077)

Dear Mr. Johnson,

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (Regional San) has reviewed the provided documents and has the following comments.

The proposed Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development (PUD) would change land use designations for the 183.3-acre former arena site from Urban Center High to Urban Center Low and would change the zoning designation from Sports Complex PUD to General Commercial PUD. The proposed project is located at 1 Sports Parkway within the North Natomas Community of the City of Sacramento.

Local sanitary sewer service for the proposed project site will be provided by the Sacramento Area Sewer District's (SASD) local sewer collection system. Ultimate conveyance of wastewater from the SASD collection system to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP) for treatment and disposal will be provided by the Regional San Interceptor system.

Customers receiving service from Regional San and SASD are responsible for rates and fees outlined within the latest Regional San and SASD ordinances. Fees for connecting to the sewer system are set up to recover the capital investment of sewer treatment facilities that provides service to new customers. The SASD ordinance is located on the SASD website at https://www.sacsewer.com/sewer-ordinance, and the Regional San ordinance is located on the Regional San website at: https://www.regionalsan.com/ordinance.

Regional San and SASD are not land-use authorities. Projects identified within Regional San and SASD planning documents are based on growth projections provided by land-use authorities. Onsite and offsite impacts associated with constructing sanitary sewer facilities to provide service must be included in subsequent environmental impact reports.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please feel free to contact me at (916) 876-6104 or by email: armstrongro@sacsewer.com.

Sincerely,

Robb Armstrong

Robb Armstrong
Regional San Development Services & Plan Check

Department of Transportation
Ron E. Vicari, Director

Divisions
Administration
Engineering & Planning
Maintenance & Operations

County of Sacramento

March 1, 2019

Mr. Scott Johnson
Senior Planner
City of Sacramento, Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR THE NATOMAS ARENA REUSE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (P18-077)

Dear Mr. Johnson:

The Sacramento County Department of Transportation (SACDOT) has had a chance to review the NOP for this project. Thank you for the opportunity to review. We have the following comment:

- Please include analysis of impacted Sacramento County Roadway facilities in the traffic analysis that will be prepared for the EIR. Traffic from this development will use portions of Del Paso Road, North Market Boulevard, Northgate Boulevard, and even El Centro Road. Please identify any impacts and mitigation measures as appropriate for these facilities.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (916) 874-7052.

Sincerely,

Matthew G. Darrow, PE, TE, PTOE
Senior Transportation Engineer
Department of Transportation.

MGD

c: Dan Shoeman - DOT
Rick Carter – DOT

SACRAMENTO AREA SEWER DISTRICT
SERVING YOU 24/7

10060 Goethe Road
Sacramento, CA 95827-3553
Tel 916.876.6000
Fax 916.876.6160
www.sacsewer.com

April 8, 2019

Mr. Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento, Community Development Department
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Subject: Notice of Preparation (NOP) for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for The Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project

The Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD) has reviewed the subject document and have the following comments:

The area identified within the Natomas Arena Reuse project will receive sewer service from SASD. The most current SASD planning document, the 2010 System Capacity Plan Update (SCP) was approved by the SASD Board of Directors in January 2012. The SCP can be found on the SASD website at https://www.sacsewer.com/standards-specifications. Sewer studies, including points of connection and phasing information will need to be completed to fully assess the impacts of any project that has the potential to increase existing or future flow demands.

SASD is not land-use authorities. Projects identified SASD's planning documents are based on growth projections identified by land-use authorities. Onsite and offsite impacts associated with constructing sanitary sewers facilities to provide service must be included in subsequent environmental impact reports.

SASD and expects that if the project is subject to currently established policies, ordinances, fees, and to conditions of approval, then mitigation measures within the EIR will adequately address the sewage aspects of the project. SASD anticipates a less than significant impact to the sewage facilities due to mitigation

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please call me at 916-876-6336.

Sincerely,

Yadira Lewis

Yadira Lewis
SASD Development Services

SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN
AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

April 2, 2019

Submitted Via Email

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

Subject: **Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Natomas Arena Reuse area Planned Unit Development Project (NAR PUD).**

Mr. Johnson,

The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (Sac Metro Air District) thanks the City of Sacramento for the opportunity to comment on the proposed NOP. The EIR will analyze the environmental impacts of implementing the NAR PUD on the 183± acre former arena site in North Natomas, and will include analysis of:

- The change of the land use designation of the project site from Urban Center High to Urban Center Low,
- The change of the zoning designation of the project site from Sports Complex/Planned Unit Development (SPX-PUD) to General Commercial/Planned Unit Development (C-2-PUD)
- The development of a circulation network intended to utilize or repurpose existing PUD area roadways to serve future development, improve connectivity with the existing road system, and support multi-modal transportation.

The Sac Metro Air District is required by law to "represent the citizens of the Sacramento district in influencing the decisions of other public and private agencies whose actions may have an adverse impact on air quality within the Sacramento district[1]. We offer our comments in that spirit.

Potential Impacts: The Sac Metro Air District anticipates that is project will be significant for short-term, (construction) and long-term (operational) emissions; the EIR should include an analysis & mitigation plan consistent with the Sac Metro Air District's CEQA Guide[2]. The EIR should include analysis of the consistency of the NAR PUD the with the City's Climate Action Plan.

The reduction in residential density resulting from the proposed change of the land use designation of the project site from *Urban Center High* to *Urban Center Low* could imperil the viability of the planned Sacramento Regional Transit light-rail Green line running adjacent to and

[1] California Health and Safety Code §40961
[2] SMAQMD CEQA guide to Air Quality Assessment: http://www.airquality.org/ceqa/ceqaguideupdate.shtml

through the project site. The transportation section should include analysis of the impacts of the downzoning on City and regional transportation plans. The alternatives analysis should consider a scenario in which the project site retains a land use designation of *Urban Center High.*

The transportation section should also include analysis of the projects potential impacts on the viability of the planned but unbuilt crossings of Interstate 5 described in the North Natomas Community Plan and subsequent planning documents. The EIR should consider the construction or funding of the Snowy Egret Way overcrossing of Interstate 5 as mitigation for projects potential impacts.

General Comments: All projects are subject to Sac Metro Air District rules in effect at the time of construction. A complete listing of current rules is available at www.airquality.org or by calling (916) 874-4800.

The District thanks the City of Sacramento for the opportunity to comment on this project. If you have additional questions or require further assistance, please contact me at jhurley@airquality.org or (916) 874-2694.

Sincerely,

-JJ Hurley

Joseph James Hurley
Planner/Analyst
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
916.874.2694

Attachments: SMAQMD Rules & Regulations Statement

ATTACHMENT

Sac Metro Air District Rules & Regulations Statement (revised 6/2018)

*The following statement is recommended as standard condition of approval or construction document language for **all** development projects within the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (Sac Metro Air District):*

All projects are subject to Sac Metro Air District rules in effect at the time of construction. A complete listing of current rules is available at www.airquality.org or by calling 916-874-4800. Specific rules that may relate to construction activities or building design may include, but are not limited to:

Rule 201: General Permit Requirements. Any project that includes the use of equipment capable of releasing emissions to the atmosphere may require permit(s) from Sac Metro Air District prior to equipment operation. The applicant, developer, or operator of a project that includes an emergency generator, boiler, or heater should contact the Sac Metro Air District early to determine if a permit is required, and to begin the permit application process. Other general types of uses that require a permit include, but are not limited to, dry cleaners, gasoline stations, spray booths, and operations that generate airborne particulate emissions.

Portable construction equipment (e.g. generators, compressors, pile drivers, lighting equipment, etc.) with an internal combustion engine over 50 horsepower is required to have a Sac Metro Air District permit or a California Air Resources Board portable equipment registration (PERP) (see Other Regulations below).

Rule 402: Nuisance. The developer or contractor is required to prevent dust or any emissions from onsite activities from causing injury, nuisance, or annoyance to the public.

Rule 403: Fugitive Dust. The developer or contractor is required to control dust emissions from earth moving activities, storage or any other construction activity to prevent airborne dust from leaving the project site.

Rule 414: Water Heaters, Boilers and Process Heaters Rated Less Than 1,000,000 BTU PER Hour. The developer or contractor is required to install water heaters (including residence water heaters), boilers or process heaters that comply with the emission limits specified in the rule.

Rule 417: Wood Burning Appliances. This rule prohibits the installation of any new, permanently installed, indoor or outdoor, uncontrolled fireplaces in new or existing developments.

Rule 442: Architectural Coatings. The developer or contractor is required to use coatings that comply with the volatile organic compound content limits specified in the rule.

Rule 453: Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials. This rule prohibits the use of certain types of cut back or emulsified asphalt for paving, road construction or road maintenance activities.

Rule 460: Adhesives and Sealants. The developer or contractor is required to use adhesives and sealants that comply with the volatile organic compound content limits specified in the rule.

Rule 902: Asbestos. The developer or contractor is required to notify the Sac Metro Air District of any regulated renovation or demolition activity. Rule 902 contains specific requirements for surveying, notification, removal, and disposal of asbestos containing material.

Other Regulations (California Code of Regulations (CCR))

17 CCR, Division 3, Chapter 1, Subchapter 7.5, §93105 Naturally Occurring Asbestos: The developer or contractor is required to notify the Sac Metro Air District of earth moving projects, greater than 1 acre in size in areas "Moderately Likely to Contain Asbestos" within eastern Sacramento County. The developer or contractor is required to comply with specific requirements for surveying, notification, and handling soil that contains naturally occurring asbestos.

13 CCR, Division 3, Chapter 9, Article 5, Portable Equipment Registration Program: The developer or contractor is required to comply with all registration and operational requirements of the portable equipment registration program such as recordkeeping and notification.

13 CCR, Division 3, Chapter 9, Article 4.8, §2449(d)(2) and 13 CCR, Division 3, Chapter 10, Article 1, §2485 regarding Anti-Idling: Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to 5 minutes. These apply to diesel powered off-road equipment and on-road vehicles, respectively.

SMUD®

Sent Via E-Mail

April 1, 2019

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
300 Richards Blvd., 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811
srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development / NOP / P18-077

Dear Scott Johnson;

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project (Project, P18-077). SMUD is the primary energy provider for Sacramento County and the proposed Project area. SMUD's vision is to empower our customers with solutions and options that increase energy efficiency, protect the environment, reduce global warming, and lower the cost to serve our region. As a Responsible Agency, SMUD aims to ensure that the proposed Project limits the potential for significant environmental effects on SMUD facilities, employees, and customers.

It is our desire that the Project NOP will acknowledge any Project impacts related to the following:

- Overhead and or underground transmission and distribution line easements. Please view the following links on smud.org for more information regarding transmission encroachment:
  - https://www.smud.org/en/Business-Solutions-and-Rebates/Design-and-Construction-Services
  - https://www.smud.org/en/Corporate/Do-Business-with-SMUD/Land-Use/Transmission-Right-of-Way
- Utility line routing
- Electrical load needs/requirements
- Energy Efficiency
- Climate Change
- Cumulative impacts related to the need for increased electrical delivery

More specifically, SMUD would like to have the following details related to the electrical infrastructure incorporated into the project description:

- Structural setbacks of less than 14 feet may create clearance issues. The developer shall meet with all utilities to ensure adequate setbacks are maintained.
- To maintain adequate trench integrity, building foundations must have a minimum horizontal clearance of 5 feet from any SMUD trench. Developer to verify with other utilities (Gas, Telephone, etc.) for their specific clearance requirements.
- Proposed SMUD facilities located on the customer's property outside of the existing or proposed PUE(s) may require a dedicated SMUD easement.
- To ensure adequate access to SMUD equipment, all paved surfaces shall be accessible to a 26,000 pound SMUD service vehicle in all weather. The placement of SMUD equipment shall be no further than 15 feet from said drivable surface that has a minimum width of 20 feet.
- There are existing underground/overhead SMUD 12/69kV facilities along Sports Parkway, West Entrance Rd, Main Entrance Rd, Innovation Dr, Five Star Way and Terracina Dr. If proper clearances from the building cannot be maintained, the developer will need to work with SMUD to relocate or underground the facilities. This work would be billable to the customer.
- SMUD requires a minimum 12.5-foot PUE adjacent to all public roads for 12kV facilities
- The developer shall dedicate any private drive, ingress and egress easement, or Irrevocable Offer of Dedication (and 10 feet adjacent thereto) as a public utility easement for overhead and underground facilities and appurtenances.
- The project shall identify and analyze impacts to existing overhead and underground SMUD electrical infrastructure.
    - Any necessary mitigation and or relocation cost shall be the responsibility of the ownership/developer.
    - The NAR PUD shall identify and analyze necessary easements and Public Utility Easements necessary to serve the project.

SMUD would like to be involved with discussing the above areas of interest as well as discussing any other potential issues. We aim to be partners in the efficient and sustainable delivery of the proposed Project. Please ensure that the information included in this response is conveyed to the Project planners and the appropriate Project proponents.

Environmental leadership is a core value of SMUD and we look forward to collaborating with you on this Project. Again, we appreciate the opportunity to provide input on this NOP. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact SMUD's Environmental Management Specialist, Rob Ferrera, at rob.ferrera@smud.org or 916.732.6676.

Sincerely,

Nicole Goi
Regional & Local Government Affairs
Sacramento Municipal Utility District
6301 S Street, Mail Stop A313
Sacramento, CA 95817
nicole.goi@smud.org

Cc: Rob Ferrera

North Natomas jibe
Walk. Bike. Bus.

April 2, 2019

Scott Johnson, Senior Planner
City of Sacramento Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd., Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811

RE: NOP of EIR for the Natomas Reuse Planned Unit Development Project

To the City of Sacramento Environmental Project Manager:

This letter is in response to the Notice of Preparation for the Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Development Project and is intended to provide input on the scope of the EIR. I am writing on behalf of North Natomas Jibe, North Natomas' advocate for development that supports walking, biking and transit.

As a general comment on the project, the plan as proposed is very vague and could include a number of styles of development, all with different roadway infrastructure needs. The project will need much more detail to be evaluated in a thoughtful manner. That said, in reviewing the zoning designation changes and proposed circulation network, we have come up with the following suggestions and concerns:

1. **Include project in the CFD.**
   A development of this considerable size will generate increased trips, traffic and result in air quality and congestion impacts that will impact the surrounding areas. All North Natomas property owners, the area defined by Elkhorn Blvd. to the north, I-80 on the south, the West Drainage Canal on the West and Power Lines to the east, contribute to the Community Facilities District No. 99-01 providing successful mitigation measures to off-set these issues. Set in the heart of North Natomas and within this CFD area, this project has a responsibility to contribute to and maintain the funding mechanism that allows education, programs, services, advocacy and infrastructure to reduce air quality impacts and congestion.

2. **Designate West Entrance, AKA "Snowy Egret", as a bicycle and pedestrian priority east/west connection.**
   The future connection between west Natomas, over the freeway and connecting to and through West Entrance, as outlined in the Community Plan, should be built out to provide a direct, pedestrian and cyclist east/west throughway. The West Entrance road is better suited to be aligned to the Arco Arena East Entry Dr. for this purpose. This connection could serve as a lower volume east/west connection that neither Del Paso Rd. nor Arena Blvd. can because of high volume and speed.

North Natomas jibe
Walk. Bike. Bus.

3. **Circulation system must prioritize travel by walk, bike and transit.**
   In order to reduce the amount of global climate change and greenhouse gas emissions generated by this development, a comprehensive traffic study should be commissioned to right-size the surrounding street network, originally built out to accommodate arena traffic. Currently the outer roadways are either arterials or major collectors. In certain sections, especially where future light rail alignment is earmarked, there may be an opportunity to reduce the amount of travel lanes, allowing for the inclusion of protected bikeways and/or reconditioning to include upgraded walk/bike facilities.

4. **Prioritize connectivity to and within project.**
   Include an uninterrupted complete street network *through*, and within the interior roads. The proposed street sections show the most direct and highly traveled routes through the project (1 and 2) combine pedestrian and bicycle facility to a 12 foot shared walkway. This type of facility disincentivizes faster moving non-vehicular trips by making it more challenging to move through at a faster speed and creates conflict of use for both pedestrians and cyclists. Facility design that inherently creates conflict between users discourages use. The EIR should promote facility design that aligns with the City's facilities selection criteria outlined in the Bicycle Master Plan and with national best practices in NACTO's Urban Street Design Guide.

5. **Include future plans within the City's Bikeway Master Plan.**
   All plans should be included in the BMP so they can be better tracked, and funding can be sought, if need be.

6. **Project must include robust bike amenities through the project such as bike paths, racks, bike corrals, fix-it stations.**

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the project. Please contact Mellissa Meng at Mellissa@jibe.org or me at Becky@jibe.org to answer any questions.

Sincerely,

Becky Heieck
Executive Director
North Natomas Jibe

April 1, 2019

To: Scott Johnson

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposal submitted by SBH Natomas LLC for the North Natomas Infill Redevelopment PUD. I am writing on behalf of the Natomas Chamber of Commerce, representing over 100 member businesses.

When the downtown arena site was chosen and approved by the City and the Kings, there was a promise made to replace the arena with a project of similar economic value to the Natomas community, and even something that might “make a difference in the world”. The recent proposal submitted by the Kings does not appear to fulfill either of those promises. Where will the ongoing economic benefit from 2000 high density residential units come from? How will the 1 million plus square feet of undefined commercial space produce high paying jobs that contribute to the local economy?

Natomas is already building residential housing, but Natomas is not a permanent destination for most of the residents. Only 36% of the current high schools seniors attended kindergarten in the Natomas Unified School District, so there is a high level of turnover. Commercial spaces that house high paying jobs will attract and keep people in the area. Affordable housing is extremely important, but providing jobs will drive the demand for housing.

This current proposal has no definition for the commercial space. Natomas has vacant retail space, and some large sites have been vacant for years. The retail and food service sector typically provides low paying, high turnover jobs. Warehouse space typically has very low labor requirements. We would like to see commercial projects that attract higher paying, long term employment opportunities.

The Natomas community deserves something that will bring people to the area for employment or entertainment. We want something that attracts people to the area. We want something that will be a destination for the people of Northern California. The arena brought people from all over Northern California to Natomas for sporting events, concerts, the circus, and various other forms of entertainment, and these visitors made a large contribution to the local economy by eating in the restaurants and shopping at the retail stores.

We are asking for a development that will provide an economic engine for the Natomas community. There is an opportunity to build that economic engine at the arena location, and we have one chance to get it right.

Sincerely,
Jeff Beckman
President, Natomas Chamber of Commerce

SACRAMENTO AREA
BICYCLE ADVOCATES

909 12th St, Ste. 116
Sacramento, CA 95814

sacbike.org
saba@sacbike.org
916 444-6600

Apr. 2, 2019

Scott Johnson, Senior Planner
City of Sacramento Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd., Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Subject: Notice of Preparation for an Environmental Impact Report for the Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I'm writing on behalf of Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates to offer our recommendations for the proposed environmental impact report for the Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project.

SABA seeks to improve the region's quality of life by advocating for policies and plans that enable people to choose to ride a bike instead of drive for short trips. We pursue this mission in part by ensuring that projects like this one safeguard and enable trips by bike by as many people as possible.

Most trips by bike are short trips of fewer than three miles. The project site is at the center of Natomas, within a mile of schools, community destinations, jobs, shopping and services. A three-mile radius around the site encompasses virtually all of North and South Natomas.

Bicycle transportation in Sacramento is guided by plans and policies whose goals should be reflected in the EIR. The City of Sacramento's Climate Action Plan and Bicycle Master Plan share a goal of increasing the share of trips made by bike to 7%; Sacramento's current citywide bicycle mode share is just under 2%. All future development in Natomas must support increased bicycle ridership.

The Bicycle Master Plan also sets the goal of creating a connected network of continuous, low-traffic-stress bikeways to enable people of all ages and abilities to travel by bike comfortably and safely. To create a connected bikeway network that supports increased ridership, the plan includes Bikeway Facility Selection Guidelines that match bikeway types to roadway characteristics such as posted travel speed and average daily traffic.

This goal is also informed by the City's Vision Zero Action Plan, which sets the goal of eliminating all serious injury and fatal traffic collisions of all kinds by 2027 and lays out countermeasures for addressing roadway hazards to people traveling by bike, on foot and by public transit. Del Paso Road directly north of the project site is part of the High Injury Network identified in the plan, one of the corridors in the city with the highest concentration of severe injury and fatal traffic collisions of all kinds.

Finally, Sacramento is a member of the National Association of City Transportation Officials, which promulgates national best practices for bicycling, walking and public transit.

With these plans and policies in mind, here are the issues we propose to be addressed in the Natomas Arena Reuse PUD Project EIR:

- The impact of revised land uses on services, transportation and mobility, including the type, volume and patterns of traffic generated by uses on the site. How will those impacts affect conditions for people who currently travel by bike around the project site and for those who can expect to be able to travel by bike to, from and within the project site, across the project site in all directions and at the six entrance roads indicated on Exhibit 6?

- Based on the expectation that a proposed bridge aligning with a future Snowy Egret Drive will be built someday over I-5, the impacts of the project on expected trips by bike to and from the bridge. Bike trips across I-5 currently require traveling on Arena Blvd. and Del Paso Road, both of them high-traffic-stress routes that present significant hazards for bicycling and discourage many people from traveling by bike.

- With the potential for residential land uses resulting from proposed rezoning, whether the project site will accommodate a school site or whether children residing in the project site would be expected to travel to nearby existing schools. How will the project affect the ability of kids living within the project site to safely reach neighboring schools, especially kids who will cross Arena Blvd. to reach Natomas Charter School and cross Del Paso Road to reach Sacramento Valley Technical High School?

- To the extent that changing zoning leads to the development that generates new jobs, the project's impact on the ability of workers to travel conveniently and safely by all transportation modes.

We look forward to reviewing the draft EIR for the project. Thank you for this opportunity to contribute our ideas. Please feel welcome to contact me directly at policy@sacbike.org or by phone with questions or additional information.

With respect,

Jim Brown
SABA Policy Consultant

CC Paul Philley, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

4/2/2019 VIA EMAIL

Scott Johnson, Senior Planner
City of Sacramento Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd., 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

RE: Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project (SCH# 2019039011)

Dear Mr. Johnson:

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development (PUD) Project (SCH Number 2019039011).

The existing road system surrounding the project site was sized to handle peak traffic loads generated by the events at the sports arena. The project site's proximity to two freeways enabled much of the event traffic to leave the area without excessive interaction with local traffic. The project proposes changes to zoning and the land use designation that will generate a much different pattern of traffic and more trips that will stay within the area and include walking and biking.

The travel patterns and modes will not necessarily be well served by the existing road system. Sacramento's Vision Zero study found that two-thirds of fatal crashes occur on streets with posted speeds of 40+ mph. The Natomas Arena Reuse PUD site is surrounded by streets that are wide and have speed limits that are 45 mph. The project will allow for land uses that will create walking and biking trips for people of all ages along and across these high speed roads.

We request that the EIR evaluate the safety impacts of the existing roads on the future users. We also request that the EIR evaluate the potential negative impact to walking and biking mode share the existing roads may incur.

WALKSacramento is working to support increased physical activity such as walking and bicycling in local neighborhoods as well as helping to create community environments that support walking and bicycling. The benefits include improved physical fitness, less motor vehicle traffic congestion, better air quality, and a stronger sense of cohesion and safety in local neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Chris Holm
Project Manager

909 12th Street, Suite 203, Sacramento, CA 95814
916-446-9255 • www.walksacramento.org

From: AVON ALFARO
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Comments on Arena Site
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 7:36:38 PM

I have been a resident of the Natomas area for 10 years. I don't feel the area needs anymore housing or shopping areas. There are properties near this site that already fit that description that have been empty a long time and have yet to be filled.

I agree with many other residents that our area needs something else: a hospital, another school, another fire station, more family activities/entertainment.... but not more apartments/housing developments and definitely not another shopping center.

Thank you,
Avon Alfaro
Resident of North Natomas

Sent from my iPhone

From: Amy Gidding-Mora
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Space in Natomas
Date: Sunday, March 24, 2019 8:14:44 AM

I am in support of the Zoo expanding to the former King's Sleep Train Arena, or any other development that would offer new jobs and visitors to the Natomas area.

I am NOT in support of another large housing development going into that space. Natomas is heavy in housing and retail, and the traffic into downtown from this area is already extremely heavy, as evidenced by I5 daily back-up. Meanwhile, there is a need for large scale economic boosts to the economy and/or influx of tourism or event dollars.

How about Sacramento City sticking to the promise to put something significant in Natomas in place of the Kings' arena? More housing is not going to fulfill that commitment.

Thank you.

Amy Gidding-Mora
3388 Paumanok Way
Sacramento, CA 95835

From: Amber Hustead
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Kings Proposed Plan
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 2:36:38 PM

Good afternoon,

As a resident of Natomas for 10 years and an active member of the community, I am writing to give feedback on the proposed development in the old Arena location.

When the Kings moved downtown, Natomas residents were promised by both Sacramento leaders and the Kings Organization, the site would not become another housing or retail development. We were promised an addition that would create high paying jobs and make a positive difference in our community. With the current proposal, it feels like the Kings organization is looking to make some quick money and leave us to deal with the mess left behind.

Our community cannot currently handle thousands of more houses especially after another development was recently approved. We do not have adequate schools, police, fire or transportation for this project to be approved. There are very few details provided regarding this development and it seems it was haphazardly thrown together.

Natomas needs and deserves an alternative to this proposal. A zoo is a great option which many community members support. Give people a reason to come back to Natomas and support the businesses that are here.

Thank you,
Amber Hustead
2475 Autumn Meadow Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95835
916-281-4766

From: Dyls Daddio
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena site reuse plans
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2019 9:20:58 AM

To whom it may concern,

Thank you for soliciting public opinion with regards to the Sleep Train Arena site. I know there are many ideas out there, and probably more than one can be accommodated. It is my understanding that since there are new medical facilities going in the railyard downtown, that is off the table. I have been a resident of North Natomas for 7 years now, and have many opinions to offer since my experience as a civil servant lends itself in this direction.

With the building moratorium lifted in North Natomas, there are tons of lots that were sitting vacant before and, especially north of Del Paso Rd, are now bustling with construction of high density housing. I know I speak for many when I say that we don't want to see 2000 or more new housing units placed there.

Relocating the Sacramento Zoo here is my first choice since they are not in an appropriate space currently. Sacramento is rapidly becoming a "destination city" with world class attractions (Golden 1 Center), dining/hospitality (Sheraton and Hilton plus myriad high end dining choices) and other services (UC Davis Med) & industries (Intel). We should have a world class zoo!

I would also think there's room for more retail (Trader Joe's please!!!), or a sizable business park.

Just please, no more apartments, condominiums, townhouses or cookie cutter tracts with tiny, packed in lots, all of which will lower our existing property values in the area.

I would also like to suggest, since I have experience in this department, coordinating the traffic signals in the area, particularly Truxel Rd, which is a nightmare to drive down. There are arena entrances (Northeast entrance at Terracina most notably, as well as the Southeast entrance) that will turn red to all other directions so that non-existent traffic coming from the arena can leave (which they're not). There are also left turn pockets from northbound Truxel to that Northeast entrance that turn green with no one there, holding up traffic. It's a mess. Unless I have an extra 10 minutes (which is never) I find alternate routes and avoid Truxel because the signals seem almost programmed to turn red as you get to them. It's extremely frustrating. The problem extends across Del Paso to Natomas Blvd as well. I work for Caltrans

and was a field signal tech for years… I don't think there's a worse area to drive in Sacramento than Truxel Rd in North Natomas.

Also hoping to see the light rail extended out towards the airport sometime in the near future.

Thank you for listening.

Arik Jenkins

From: anitjune@yahoo.com
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: We support a zoo in Natomas Arena
Date: Saturday, March 23, 2019 4:22:48 PM

Dear Mr. Scott Johnson, Senior Planner Community Development Department,

I am a resident in North Natomas and I am writing to express my support for an animal sanctuary in NATOMAS ARENA. Natomas does not have an attraction for family of all ages. We need it. It will benefit not only the rescued animals but our kids, the young generation as well as the old.

Natomas does not need any more condensed housing or apartment complex. There is not enough school and classrooms are already packed. Teachers are underpaid and even being asked to voluntarily docking their paychecks to support lower classroom size. Traffic is awful and parking on the streets at high density residential areas is a nightmare, plus an invitation for night prowlers. With the exception of some seniors or young couples, a family with kids stays longer in a house with a reasonable sized backyard to have some trees or see some green.

It is time to focus on the existing families already committed to work and live here in Natomas. Any new funding should be devoted to teach youths to appreciate nature, stay in school (with a small classroom size) and respect other people's property.

Sincerely yours,

Anit June

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: We support a zoo in Natomas Arena
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:27:46 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:08 AM
To: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: We support a zoo in Natomas Arena

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** "anitjune@yahoo.com" <anitjune@yahoo.com>
> **Date:** March 23, 2019 at 4:23:33 PM PDT
> **To:** "AASHBY@CITYOFSACRAMENTO.ORG" <AASHBY@CITYOFSACRAMENTO.ORG>
> **Subject: We support a zoo in Natomas Arena**
> **Reply-To:** "anitjune@yahoo.com" <anitjune@yahoo.com>
>
> Dear Councilmember Angelique Ashby,
>
> I am a resident in North Natomas and I am writing to express my support for an animal sanctuary in NATOMAS ARENA. Natomas does not have an attraction for family of all ages. We need it. It will benefit not only the rescued animals but our kids, the young generation as well as the old.
>
> Natomas does not need any more condensed housing or apartment complex. There is not enough school and classrooms are already packed. Teachers are underpaid and even being asked to voluntarily docking their paychecks to support lower classroom size. Traffic is awful and parking on the streets at high density residential areas is a nightmare, plus an invitation for night prowlers. With the exception of some seniors or young couples, a family with kids stays longer in a house with a reasonable sized backyard to have some trees or see some green.
>
> It is time to focus on the existing families already committed to work and live here in Natomas. Any new funding should be devoted to teach youths to appreciate nature, stay in school (with a small classroom size) and respect other people's property.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Anit June

From:	Erica Castillo
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	FW: Sacramento Zoo"s relocation
Date:	Tuesday, April 2, 2019 9:49:22 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Sunday, March 31, 2019 10:33 PM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Sacramento Zoo's relocation

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Adrienne Kaufmann <adyalice8@gmail.com>
> **Date:** March 30, 2019 at 3:42:09 PM PDT
> **To:** aashby@cityofsacramento.org
> **Subject: Sacramento Zoo's relocation**
>
> Hello Ms. Ashby,
>
> I am writing to ask for your help in assuring that the Sacramento Zoo is allowed to relocate to the former Sleep Train Arena. My name is Adrienne Kaufmann and I live at 383 Olivadi Way, Sacramento, CA 95834. I was born in Sacramento, and after a 24 year absence, I recently moved back here with my husband.
>
> Sacramento cannot lose its zoo. It has been a well-loved and well-attended family institution for decades. I grew up in Sacramento and raised my children here and in nearby communities. We loved visiting the zoo and were frequent visitors, even when we lived in another county.
>
> We have moved back to Sacramento and currently live in North Natomas. The former Sleep Train Arena site is an ideal location for the Sacamento Zoo. When the Kings moved downtown, the residents of Natomas were promised that whatever moved to that site would be of value to the community. Natomas does not need more apartments nor more commercial space. There are thousands of apartments in and planned for the community. There is enough commercial business, including several empty commercial spaces - both large and small.
>
> The Sacramento Zoo is not only a family friendly venue; they are also a vital partner in the conservation of wildlife. They must be allowed to continue their important work.

The Sacramento Zoo also has a 45 year partnership with the UC Davis Veterinary School. UC Davis would not be able to attract as many students to their veterinary school if this long-standing partnership is dissolved.

Please do everything in your power to ensure that the Sacramento Zoo stays in the Sacramento area, ideally at the former Sleep Train Arena site.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Adrienne Kaufmann
383 Olivadi Way
Sacramento, CA 95834

From: Adrienne Kaufmann
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sacramento Zoo"s relocation
Date: Saturday, March 30, 2019 4:56:41 PM

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I am writing to ask for your help in assuring that the Sacramento Zoo is allowed to relocate to the former Sleep Train Arena. My name is Adrienne Kaufmann and I live at 383 Olivadi Way, Sacramento, CA 95834. I was born in Sacramento, and after a 24 year absence, I recently moved back here with my husband.

Sacramento cannot lose its zoo. It has been a well-loved and well-attended family institution for decades. I grew up in Sacramento and raised my children here and in nearby communities. We loved visiting the zoo and were frequent visitors, even when we lived in another county.

We have moved back to Sacramento and currently live in North Natomas. The former Sleep Train Arena site is an ideal location for the Sacamento Zoo. When the Kings moved downtown, the residents of Natomas were promised that whatever moved to that site would be of value to the community. Natomas does not need more apartments nor more commercial space. There are thousands of apartments in and planned for the community. There is enough commercial business, including several empty commercial spaces - both large and small.

The Sacramento Zoo is not only a family friendly venue; they are also a vital partner in the conservation of wildlife. They must be allowed to continue their important work. The Sacramento Zoo also has a 45 year partnership with the UC Davis Veterinary School. UC Davis would not be able to attract as many students to their veterinary school if this long-standing partnership is dissolved.

Please do everything in your power to ensure that the Sacramento Zoo stays in the Sacramento area, ideally at the former Sleep Train Arena site.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Adrienne Kaufmann
383 Olivadi Way
Sacramento, CA 95834

From: Angela Kesti
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 9:48:15 PM

Hi,
Please consider the plan for moving the Sacramento zoo to the property where ARCO arena is. It's best for the animals that are already delicate & stressed being in captivity. Allow the necessary zoo leaders develop &provide an environment for the animals in the best interest of the animals & also best for Sacramento.
Thank you for doing the right thing!

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From: Andrea Lynch
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sacramento Zoo Relocation
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 8:49:55 AM

Hello,

This email is in response to a preliminary proposal to turn Sleep Train Arena into a mixed/commercial use space which Natomas already has plenty of. This email is in support of a proposal to relocate the Sacramento zoo to Natomas.

Kind Regards,

Sent from my iPhone. I apologize for brevity or mistakes.

From: Abby Maurer
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse area Planned Unit Development Project
Date: Thursday, March 21, 2019 9:17:11 AM

Hello,

I would like to submit a comment on the proposed Arena plan. Natomas is already the epitome of urban sprawl and the last thing it needs is more housing and commercial outlets. The City of Sacramento has the opportunity to do something truly wonderful and have our zoo move onto the site of the former arena and become a truly world class institution that draws visitors to Sacramento and can be enjoyed by everybody that lives here. Even if moving the zoo to that location isn't feasible, almost anything would be better than another huge area of generic housing and commercial outlets.

Thank you for your consideration.
Abigail Maurer

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: A Letter Regarding the Relocation of the Sacramento Zoo
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:26:39 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:03 AM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: A Letter Regarding the Relocation of the Sacramento Zoo

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Amber <amby05@hotmail.com>
Date: March 25, 2019 at 7:49:15 PM PDT
To: "aashby@cityofsacramento.org" <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: A Letter Regarding the Relocation of the Sacramento Zoo

March 25th, 2019

Dear Councilmember Ashby:

The zoo is a very fun place that is enjoyable for so many families! Since there has been a campaign on how it should or shouldn't move to Natomas, I would like to state my opinion on it. I believe it should move to Natomas. It would be amazing if the zoo moved! I saw their plans and it would be the best zoo yet to some people. It would also be fun for the community.

It is also hard for people in other towns that have to drive all the way over to Land Park or Downtown Sacramento. People sometimes have trouble parking there. It would be easier for everyone if it moved to a more convenient location that's bigger. Think about how many more people would visit the zoo! Also, Natomas is a growing community with lots of young families. When kids come from all over Natomas, they will probably want to come again. There would be lots of repeat business.

With a new location and a lot of space, it could have many new animals. That's important because if we have more animals it will be even more interesting and we could save animals from extinction! The zoo is also currently working on conservation projects. If they move they could work on more conservation projects and save more animals.

I believe the zoo should relocate to Natomas. I have some good ideas for the new zoo (if the zoo moves) and I hope you can see how important it is for the zoo to move to Natomas.

Your fellow citizen,

Ashley, age 8 (We Want A Zoo Ambassador)

From: Amber
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse PUD Project (P18-077)
Date: Monday, April 1, 2019 1:07:02 PM

Dear Mr. Johnson:

I am writing to express my concerns about the Natomas Arena Reuse PUD Project (P18-077), specifically in regard to land use and planning, population and housing, and transportation. Natomas lost a major economic draw when the Kings moved downtown. Many of us were happy to see the Kings stay in Sacramento and have enjoyed Golden One Center personally, but have been anxiously awaiting for something of relatively equivalent value to make a home here in Natomas. Re-zoning the land for more residential and commercial use rather an an entertainment attraction is not what Natomas residents need or want.

As you very well know, since the moratorium on building was lifted four years ago, Natomas has seen more and more residences being built. With this has come increased traffic and increased pressure on our school systems. Many of the charter schools have wait lists of well over one hundred students *per grade level*. That's hundreds, if not thousands of local students not being able to attend their school of choice and not being offered better education options locally. When our daughter started school we were on at least three waitlists for local schools despite being district residents and having mulitple other preference points, and our intradistrict transfer was declined due to overcrowding.

Traffic to and from school is already a major issue. Natomas Pacific Pathways Prep Elementary, which is located at 4400 East Commerce Drive, currently neighbors the arena land. While the school is less than 3 miles from our home, it takes over 15 minutes, sometimes up to 30+ minutes to arrive there due to morning traffic. Out of the three major routes I have available to me to take our daughters to school, the one that is the longest distance (taking the 99 freeway South to I-5 South) is actually the fastest. Our city streets like East Commerce and Del Paso Road are not equipped for any additional housing and traffic, and there is already more coming as many new communities are being built to the north, west, and south of Del Paso and East Commerce Way. I encourage you to grab a coffee and sit on East Commerce Way heading South from North Park to Del Paso any weekday morning between 7:30 and 8 am while school is in session. You will watch a slow crawl of cars sit on that single lane stretch for a ridiculously inappropriate amount of time. This is what residents have to deal with to drop their children off at any number of local schools only to then fight rush hour traffic to get to work.

Please take into consideration these concerns as you make your decision to rezone the arena land. Can we please put something of use in this spot first, and then let the people and businesses follow? A zoo or a large outdoor sports complex would be reasonable possibilities. My suggestion would be to support the zoo's relocation and expansion efforts here. Not only would it be great for the local economy (bringing business to local hotels and restaurants, many who are currently struggling) but it would be an asset to our schools and our community as a whole. We do not need more housing, more people, and more cars crowding our streets and our schools.

Thank you,

Amber Roumiguiere
Natomas Resident
(916) 572-8675

From:	Erica Castillo
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	FW: Support for a new Zoo - "We want a Zoo"
Date:	Friday, March 29, 2019 10:25:58 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 9:49 AM
To: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Support for a new Zoo - "We want a Zoo"

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** akshaj mehta <mehtaakshaj@gmail.com>
> **Date:** March 28, 2019 at 6:44:04 PM PDT
> **To:** aashby@cityofsacramento.org
> **Cc:** mayorsteinbergschedule@cityofsacramento.org
> **Subject: Support for a new Zoo - "We want a Zoo"**
>
> Good Evening Council-member Ashby and Mayor Steinberg!
> My name is Akshaj Mehta and I am a Natomas resident. I am an 8th grader, a published author and the creator of writetolead.com. I am writing this email for you to please consider the move of the Zoo to Natomas.
>
> The zoo's play an important role in **Education**. All elementary schools in and around Natomas (Twin Rivers and Robla district) will be close to an amazing Field Trip. Studies show that the students learn and grasp quickly by seeing things in person. So having a Zoo in Natomas will be a great field trip, where they will learn and have a better understanding by Seeing Live animals in their natural habitat which they would normally not be able to see. Not just elementary but Zoo's also provide an Educational resource to students K-12 in various different ways.
>
> Another reason is "**Tourist Attraction**". I am sure moving the zoo to Natomas Arena will become a big Family Travel Attraction for not just for Natomas families but to many families in and around Sacramento area much like the San Diego Zoo.I would love to see people from all across United States come here to see our zoo. This will surely put Natomas on the map.
>
> The land park zoo will benefit from the move, as it has limited space for the animals right now. More space and area will make the **animals happier** and in turn they will behave better for a great experience for the visitors. Bigger zoos also mean more animals. More animals mean more animal lives saved from malicious animal hunters.

Having a zoo in Natomas will also increase **volunteer opportunities for Youth** not just for 1 but for 3 different school district students. This will also create more avenues for teenagers / Students for them to be engaged in community projects.

I want to end this email with a quote from **Betty White**, an American actress, "**People forget the good that zoos do. If it weren't for zoos, we would have many species that would be extinct today.**"

Thanks!
Akshaj Mehta
www.writetolead.com
currently reading : Currently Reading : The Giver by Lois Lowry

From: Allison Melott
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena site
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 3:59:57 PM

While I am not philosophically opposed to more housing and retain in Natomas, we also need things that provide personal enrichment. Completing the regional park would be a good start. I'd like to see something complementary at the arena site. Surely we can find something that will do that AND bring in tax dollars.

Allison Melott

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

From: Alison Orozco
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development comments
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 4:18:10 PM

I want to encourage the city to refuse the current plans for the redevelopment of the former Sleep Train Arena and surrounding land currently controlled by the Sacramento Kings organization. When the Kings relocated to the Golden 1 Center, we in Natomas were promised that the redevelopment would bring bring high-wage jobs and be done with a long-term vision for the Natomas community and Sacramento in general. They promised they would "get it right." The submitted plan does none of that. It is simply more of the same. More medium and high-density housing. More commercial buildings. Natomas currently has multiple new home developments in process and thousands THOUSANDS more in the planning process. We do not need more houses and apartment buildings. We have MANY vacant commercial buildings that have no tenants interested. Many of these buildings have been vacant for YEARS. We have no need for more unoccupied commercial space. What Natomas does need is entertainment and recreation options that would be a boon to the community and the whole of Sacramento. The Sacramento Zoo has expressed a strong interest in moving to the Natomas arena site. The Zoo would bring jobs, volunteer opportunities, educational opportunities, and entertainment to the area. It would also attract businesses to fill the currently empty commercial buildings. I urge you to deny the Kings' submitted plans for redevelopment and encourage placement of the Sacramento Zoo on the arena land. Please do for Natomas what was promised.

Alison Orozco
310 Eastbrook Way
Sacramento, CA 95835

March 30th, 2019

Dear Mr. Johnson:

I am writing to express my concerns about the Natomas Arena Reuse PUD Project (P18-077) specifically in regards to land use and planning, population and housing, and transportation.

Natomas lost a major economic draw when the Kings moved downtown. Many of us were happy to see the Kings stay in Sacramento and have enjoyed Golden One Center personally, but have been anxiously awaiting for something of relatively equivalent value to make a home here in Natomas. Re-zoning the land for more residential and commercial use rather an an entertainment attraction is not what Natomas residents need or want.

As you very well know, since the moratorium on building was lifted four years ago, Natomas has seen more and more residences being built. With this has come increased traffic and increased pressure on our school systems. Many of the charter schools have wait lists of well over one hundred students *per grade level*. That's hundreds, if not thousands of local students not being able to attend their school of choice and not being offered better education options locally. When our daughter started school we were on at least three waitlists for local schools despite being district residents and having mulitple other preference points, and our intradistrict transfer was declined due to overcrowding.

Traffic to and from school is already a major issue. Natomas Pacific Pathways Prep Elementary, which is located at 4400 East Commerce Drive, currently neighbors the arena land. While the school is less than 3 miles from our home, it takes over 15 minutes, sometimes up to 30+ minutes to arrive there due to morning traffic. Out of the three major routes I have available to me to take our daughters to school, the one that is the longest distance (taking the 99 freeway South to I-5 South) is actually the fastest. Our city streets like East Commerce and Del Paso Road are not equipped for any additional housing and traffic, and there is already more coming as many new communities are being built to the north, west, and south of Del Paso and East Commerce Way. I encourage you to grab a coffee and sit on East Commerce Way heading South from North Park to Del Paso any weekday morning between 7:30 and 8 am while school is in session. You will watch a slow crawl of cars sit on that single lane stretch for a ridiculously inappropriate amount of time. This is what residents have to deal with to drop their children off at any number of local schools only to then fight rush hour traffic to get to work.

Please take into consideration these concerns as you make your decision to rezone the arena land. Can we please put something of use in this spot first, and then let the people and businesses follow? A zoo or a large outdoor sports complex would be reasonable possibilities. My suggestion would be to support the zoo's relocation and expansion efforts here. Not only would it be great for the local economy (bringing business to local hotels and restaurants, many who are currently struggling) but it would be an asset to our schools and our community as a whole. We do not need more housing, more people, and more cars crowding our streets and our schools.

Thank you,

Amber Roumiguiere

Amber Roumiguiere

From:	Amber Rousseau
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Kings" arena proposal
Date:	Tuesday, April 2, 2019 12:45:22 PM

Hello,

I am a North Natomas resident. I'm concerned about the proposal for what appears to be more shopping centers and single family homes on the old Kings' arena site.

In my opinion, North Natomas would benefit from more recreational activities like a zoo, science center, or small amusement park that would attract customers to our area. And, while we have smaller doctors' offices, we lack a hospital or large medical center. Any of those options would be much more beneficial to Sacramento residents than more shopping and houses.

Natomas resident and voter,
Amber Rousseau

Councilmember Angelique Ashby
City Hall
915 I street, 5th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

March 24, 2019

Dear Councilmember Ashby,

My name is Janelle Arsich, I have lived in Natomas for 9 years and I am a mother of 3 young children. We have watched Natomas grow over those 9 years and also decline. Crime has been on the rise locally at the neighborhood level, stores and restaurants have come and gone. We have also seen hundreds of new homes being built, many of them that are unoccupied. I realize much of this had to do with the building moratorium, which was lifted and that was great news when it was. However, the idea of putting in more housing and businesses into the old Arco Arena location will not serve our community. We do not have the infrastructure to support hundreds of new families moving in. We don't have enough freeway space, schools and gas stations. Our small community is already feeling the squeeze of overcrowded schools and too much traffic.

What we need is a zoo! The zoo will bring not only a much-needed expansion to the already well loved zoo, but will bring more enrichment to the Natomas area. It will increase our economy of bringing in visitors, where they will then shop & eat in the area as well, but also give people of both Natomas and Sacramento areas another place to take our children. I have been taking my kids to the Sacramento Zoo since my oldest daughter was born 13 years. While we love the Land Park area and the zoo, it is small. My family would love to spend all day with the animals, but in reality we can spend about 1-2 hours to see everything we want to see. The Zoo itself deserves the expansion as well and the old arena site can provide them with that.

Please support the move of the Sacramento Zoo to the old Arena site and not new housing and that Natomas doesn't need, want and cannot support.

Thank you for your time and support.

Sincerely,

The Arsich Family

Janelle Arsich

Madison Arsich

Taylor Arsich

Hunter

From: Ashley Van De Pol
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena: Scope of Analysis-EIR
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 2:37:30 PM

Good afternoon Mr. Johnson,

I believe it is in the best interest of our community and the animals of the Sacramento Zoo, to have the zoo relocate to where the Sleep Train Arena resides. Rezoning this space for commercial-housing development will only compound the traffic and infrastructure problems in our area. When the Kings moved arenas, an obvious entertainment hole was left in Natomas. The Sacramento Zoo deserves this space. Last month I visited the zoo and was sadden to see how little space the animals have for enrichment. I am sure that the staff is doing everything in their power to provide the best life for those animals. Nonetheless, giving them the space to design a zoo befitting of such special needs is extremely important. I recognize the tough place the zoo is in. Do they use resources to fix what they have, putting band-aids on just to survive (maintain their association credentials), or do they save and hope for relocation? There are so many amazing animals that our zoo could host if they had the ability. The opportunities for conservation of endangered species are severely limited. There aren't elephants, hippos, bears, rhinos- all staples of other zoos. A few big cats remain, housed in small quarters with no room to truly run or explore. If left as is, the zoo will eventually be made up of only small animals and insects because housing larger animals will become impossible (zoological associations won't approve) and irresponsible. Using Sleep Train Arena's land for the zoo would mean we are doing our part to help preserve and benefit endangered species.

Adding an unknown amount of homes, with tens of thousands of people, will negatively affect Natomas. I don't believe Natomas' infrastructure will be able to handle the repercussions an influx of residential and commercial spaces. The roads are in need of repair and the traffic-light system isn't working effectively enough to process so many more vehicles. Quite a few locations within the area that have been for sale for a long time. This land should be developed before the Sleep Train Arena. There are already 2,600 residential units and 33,500 housing projects in development in the county and areas of Natomas. The accompanying strip malls built to serve those houses will sit half empty. A primary example of this: the "mall" off of Natomas Boulevard and Del Paso Road, which used to house Borders and Bed, Bath and Beyond. Those major retailers have been gone for 10 years. How are we as residents and consumers expected to take seriously the claim that retail space is desperately needed, when that area has been vacant for 10 years?

I, along with the many other people who have reached out to, would be happy to use revenue and bond-sales to help the Sacramento Zoo open a new zoo. The Golden One Arena bond sale was approved, for what I can figure is a far greater sum and debt to Sacramento. Does the city want to send a message that they care more about a sports team, whose prices prevent the very people paying for the arena to attend, rather than a fairly priced, educational resource for the valley?

Please consider and approve the Sleep Train Arena rezoning for the Sacramento Zoo.- Sincerely,
Ashley Van De Pol

From: Anastasia Wanser
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Proposed arena use
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 1:30:44 PM

Hi there- I am a resident in North Natomas and I would love it if the former Arco Arena site was converted into you the new Sacramento zoo! I am in favor of the zoo!

Thank you,
Ana Wanser
(916) 524-5297

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

From: Audrey Wyatt
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train
Date: Sunday, March 17, 2019 9:39:32 AM

Hi,

As a community member of Natomas for the past 7 years, I can say it's very frustrating to have to drive to Arden or Roseville for kid/family activities. I would love to see things like trampoline/jump, bowling, mini golf, arcade, better variety of restaurants, a clubhouse for teens to hang out instead of roam around or get in trouble (the high school is right there). This is a very family oriented neighborhood and we would love to invest in our neighborhood/community instead of having to drive 20 to 30 minutes. More indoor/outdoor activities are a must! I'm grateful for the swimming complex coming soon, but that is one piece of a big puzzle.

Thanks for your time,

Audrey Wyatt-Upshur
2432 Bayless Way
95835

From: Brenda Borge
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas construction
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 1:14:56 PM

It was suggested that we contact you about the possible use of the old Arena site. We do not need more housing. I'm not thrilled about a zoo either. I really do think we need a hospital in Natomas. Maybe a community center. A bowling alley. High end restaurants.
I really liked having an arena for events here in Natomas. Downtown is too crowded.
Thank you for your attention.
--
Brenda Borge
bborgeca@gmail.com
NTA President
School Counselor

From: Beth Brink
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: We Want a Zoo
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 10:24:37 AM

Hello,

WE WANT A ZOO! I have been a resident of North Natomas for over 16 years and my family and I all support having the Sacramento Zoo take over the Sleep Train Arena site. I have talked with many of my neighbors and other Natomas residents and all are supportive of having the Sacramento Zoo come to the site.

Natomas needs more entertainment for families. My tax dollars go to Roseville or Elk Grove when entertainment is concerned. Other than parks Natomas has very little to offer in the way of entertainment for families. We need zoo, museum, bowling alley, updated movie theater, mall, etc. We do NOT need more residential housing, commercial and retail.

Please hear the call for Natomas residents, WE WANT A ZOO!

Thank you,

Lorabeth Brink

2181 Raymar Way

Sacramento, CA 95835

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Arena reuse comment - no more housing!
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:29:30 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:18 AM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Arena reuse comment - no more housing!

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** "Becky C." <bkykorea@yahoo.com>
> **Date:** March 19, 2019 at 12:37:39 PM PDT
> **To:** "srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org" <srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Cc:** Councilwoman Angelique Ashby <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Arena reuse comment - no more housing!**
>
> Good Afternoon,
>
> I'm writing to strongly oppose the proposed Arena reuse plan as submitted by the Sacramento Kings. This plan is not what Sacramento and especially North Natomas needs in terms of more high-density housing. As a resident, we already dread driving over from the west side of the Arena to Target or further north to the Raley's area, traffic is horrendous and only getting worse. There is a unique opportunity to do something impactful with that site, that could have benefits for the whole city and even state and that is to create a special destination facility for The Sacramento Zoo. This Arena location is large enough to truly allow for transforming our zoo into a facility that would provide habitats that enrich the animals in captivity, and create a travel destination spot for families from all over, similar to what San Diego enjoys. There is another, very real and important need for animals in our city, and that is our own Front Street Animal Shelter. Located in a tiny footprint far off the beaten path, it is aged and extremely out of date. Should we be lucky enough to develop the Arena location for the zoo, a logical and already well set up buildings at the old zoo would be a logical reuse location to move our local animal shelter. Help build a true animal shelter, where the holding facility for the dogs and cats would be a place the public and potential adopters want to visit and reduce the unnecessary stress and mental decline for animals that are waiting for that forever home.
>
> As a resident of North Natomas since 2000, I have seen our area shortchanged many times and burdened unfairly with high-density low-income housing and to see the proposed Arena also be one of those broken promises is incredibly frustrating. I implore you to consider alternatives. I would welcome a neighbor such as the Sacramento Zoo in this location and definitely no more high-density housing, whether it is apartments or homes on lots so crowded you could walk on the rooftops for blocks without touching the ground. We want a zoo!
>
> Thank you,

Becky Correia

From:	Becky C.
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	Angelique Ashby
Subject:	Arena reuse comment - no more housing!
Date:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 12:37:46 PM

Good Afternoon,

I'm writing to strongly oppose the proposed Arena reuse plan as submitted by the Sacramento Kings. This plan is not what Sacramento and especially North Natomas needs in terms of more high-density housing. As a resident, we already dread driving over from the west side of the Arena to Target or further north to the Raley's area, traffic is horrendous and only getting worse. There is a unique opportunity to do something impactful with that site, that could have benefits for the whole city and even state and that is to create a special destination facility for The Sacramento Zoo. This Arena location is large enough to truly allow for transforming our zoo into a facility that would provide habitats that enrich the animals in captivity, and create a travel destination spot for families from all over, similar to what San Diego enjoys. There is another, very real and important need for animals in our city, and that is our own Front Street Animal Shelter. Located in a tiny footprint far off the beaten path, it is aged and extremely out of date. Should we be lucky enough to develop the Arena location for the zoo, a logical and already well set up buildings at the old zoo would be a logical reuse location to move our local animal shelter. Help build a true animal shelter, where the holding facility for the dogs and cats would be a place the public and potential adopters want to visit and reduce the unnecessary stress and mental decline for animals that are waiting for that forever home.

As a resident of North Natomas since 2000, I have seen our area shortchanged many times and burdened unfairly with high-density low-income housing and to see the proposed Arena also be one of those broken promises is incredibly frustrating. I implore you to consider alternatives. I would welcome a neighbor such as the Sacramento Zoo in this location and definitely no more high-density housing, whether it is apartments or homes on lots so crowded you could walk on the rooftops for blocks without touching the ground. We want a zoo!

Thank you,

Becky Correia

From: Brenda Dubon
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena in Natomas
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 3:20:17 PM

Hello,

I was told I can email you in regards to the plans for Sleep Train Arena.

I think a zoo would be a great new addition to Natomas. I think we have more then enough homes and schools are already full. Adding more homes will add more problems to an already not so great school district.

I am a realtor who works and lives in the Natomas area and I am surprised as to how many people are not very familiar with this area. We have lots of restaurants in Natomas that seem empty most of the time. I feel a zoo would bring in more people to our area and help out the local businesses.

Thank you!

Brenda Dubon

From: Brian Eberly
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas PUD Plan
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:30:54 PM

Please do not allow the plan to go forward. We need the Sacramento Zoo instead. Something to make Natomas a excellent destination not Urban snooze zone……

Brian Eberly
2511 Cantara Way
95835

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Sleep Train Arena
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 9:55:43 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 7:20 PM
To: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Sleep Train Arena

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Bryan Ginter <bryan@ginterfamilylaw.com>
> **Date:** April 1, 2019 at 4:27:15 PM PDT
> **To:** <srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Cc:** Angelique Ashby <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>, 'Leslie Ginter' <leslieginter@icloud.com>
> **Subject: Sleep Train Arena**
>
> Hello Mr. Johnson,
>
> This email relates to the comment period for the current proposal by the City for thousands of additional homes in the Sleep Train Arena area. As a Natomas resident, I strongly oppose further construction of housing to the greatest degree possible, particularly “track” housing, dense housing, apartments and condos. A statistic was given to me years ago that Natomas has more dense and/or low-income housing than any other suburb in Sacramento. More houses equals more problems, including more pollution, more congestion, the need for more public services, etc. I urge the City to look beyond the property tax dollar (as an aside, I would also like ever week recycling again, too), and add more community-based facilities, including parks for the Arena area, and perhaps some shopping and

entertainment areas. For brevity's sake, I echo the feelings of my neighbor, Kalpesh Shah, who also recently submitted feedback by email. I was born in an area where homes actually had some land (1-2 acres). I would like to see this in Natomas and everywhere in California. Economics will dictate price, so I don't think affordability will be a concern. I don't know anyone who actually likes to be able to touch their neighbor's house and look into a neighbor's kitchen when opening the blinds. If houses were built with an acre or more of land on them, congestion would be limited, but this hasn't been done in Natomas to date.

Natomas is a beautiful area and is already becoming too congested. I see many more new homes already in construction. Natomas doesn't need anymore homes with a quarter acre or less. Please do not allow it and keep Natomas the way it is.

Regards,

Bryan Ginter
Family Law Attorney & Mediator
www.GinterFamilyLaw.com
(916) 419-1160
Ginter Family Law News

From:	Bryan Ginter
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	Angelique Ashby; "Leslie Ginter"
Subject:	Sleep Train Arena
Date:	Monday, April 1, 2019 4:27:25 PM

Hello Mr. Johnson,

This email relates to the comment period for the current proposal by the City for thousands of additional homes in the Sleep Train Arena area. As a Natomas resident, I strongly oppose further construction of housing to the greatest degree possible, particularly "track" housing, dense housing, apartments and condos. A statistic was given to me years ago that Natomas has more dense and/or low-income housing than any other suburb in Sacramento. More houses equals more problems, including more pollution, more congestion, the need for more public services, etc. I urge the City to look beyond the property tax dollar (as an aside, I would also like ever week recycling again, too), and add more community-based facilities, including parks for the Arena area, and perhaps some shopping and entertainment areas. For brevity's sake, I echo the feelings of my neighbor, Kalpesh Shah, who also recently submitted feedback by email. I was born in an area where homes actually had some land (1-2 acres). I would like to see this in Natomas and everywhere in California. Economics will dictate price, so I don't think affordability will be a concern. I don't know anyone who actually likes to be able to touch their neighbor's house and look into a neighbor's kitchen when opening the blinds. If houses were built with an acre or more of land on them, congestion would be limited, but this hasn't been done in Natomas to date.

Natomas is a beautiful area and is already becoming too congested. I see many more new homes already in construction. Natomas doesn't need anymore homes with a quarter acre or less. Please do not allow it and keep Natomas the way it is.

Regards,

Bryan Ginter

Family Law Attorney & Mediator
www.GinterFamilyLaw.com
(916) 419-1160
Ginter Family Law News

From: Brent McCarthy
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Comments for arena reuse plan
Date: Thursday, March 28, 2019 8:05:17 PM

Hello,

I am supportive of the arena reuse plan as currently proposed. The housing units will help alleviate the rising housing costs we are experiencing. The commercial space will encourage the creation of jobs in the area.

Regards,
Brent McCarthy
(916) 397-4765

From:	SactoWriteMama
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	North Natomas Infill Redevelopment PUD
Date:	Thursday, March 21, 2019 3:56:07 PM

March 14, 2019

Scott Johnson, Senior Planner

City of Sacramento Community Development Department

300 Richards Blvd., Third Floor

Sacramento, CA 95811

RE: North Natomas Infill Redevelopment PUD

Mr. Johnson,

I am writing today in regards to the Sacramento Kings proposal to re-zone and develop the former arena site in Natomas with more than 2,000 high-density housing units and more than 1 million square feet of commercial space.

I have been a resident of Sacramento since 1997 and moved to Natomas in 2001 with my husband, where we own a home. In August 2011, I attended a Think Big Subcommittee meeting with nearly 100 other Natomas home and business owners. At that time, both Kings and city officials emphasized that arena reuse should reflect what Natomas **wants** for its community and the merits of several options were discussed.

None of those options included more housing or commercial space, which is exactly what the Kings are currently proposing. I oppose the North Natomas Infill Redevelopment PUD for the following reasons:

- The proposal does not reflect the development of an “economic engine” promised by the Kings and the city.
- A Kings representative was quoted in the *Sacramento Business Journal* as saying, “We have diligently worked with city leaders, stakeholders and interested parties to gather feedback and develop a flexible master entitlement plan.” To my knowledge, there have been no opportunities for the Natomas

community to collaborate or provide feedback to the Kings on arena reuse since that meeting almost **eight years ago** in August 2011. I find it disingenuous that team officials tell the *SBJ* they plan to "host community meetings to get more feedback and suggestions" after the fact.

- That same *Sacramento Business Journal* article reads that team officials expect a "several-decade … buildout." The Kings and the city promised Natomas a shovel-ready project for the former arena site by the time Golden 1 opened its doors – which was a year ago. That site should not continue to sit idle for "several" **decades**.

- The *Sacramento Business Journal* article also indicates the Kings do not have a development partner – in other words **funding** – for their proposal. The Kings have not given the City Council a "quarterly" update on arena reuse since December 2015. How can Natomas residents and business owners feel confident that filing the North Natomas Infill Redevelopment Plan is not just a stall tactic which will further delay the Kings keeping their promise to the people who live and work in the Natomas community?

- The proposal allows for the possibility of "significantly denser" housing and "buildings as tall as seven stories" per the *Sacramento Business Journal* article. This is not in keeping with the North Natomas Master Plan.

- The proposal suggests high-density housing of which North Natomas already has a disproportionate amount compared to the rest of the city. There are also several already approved housing projects in the works or already under way. More housing is not needed and rezoning the arena site to allow high-density housing would negatively impact transportation and other existing infrastructure.

- The proposal includes thousands of square feet of commercial/retail space. North Natomas already has thousands of square feet of **vacant** retail space. Less than two miles from the arena site, one 25,000 square foot retail space has been vacant for **10 years.** An adjacent 24,000 square foot retail space has been vacant for **seven years.** It is clear, more commercial space is not needed.

- The proposal is not aligned with existing lightrail to the airport.

Finally, the Sacramento Zoo is in trouble. It needs to move in order to continue to be a community amenity, but also to continue its important conservation work helping save endangered animal species.

Two different city-sponsored feasibility studies have determined that the former arena site in North Natomas is the No. 1 best spot within the city limits for a larger Sacramento Zoo. And zoo officials are confident that with city support and private fundraising, a new zoo could be up and operating well within the next decade. That sounds a lot better to me than a proposal that lacks funding and vision and hundreds of my neighbors agree.

Sincerely,

Brandy Tuzon Boyd

27 Vestry Court

Sacramento, CA 95835

(916) 541-5384

_____

Brandy Tuzon Boyd

From: Courtney Borders
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo at Arco
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 10:22:34 PM

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I just wanted to send this email as a Natomas resident. I am a mother of four children, three of whom are under five. My family loves to go to the zoo. It is a wonderful teaching opportunity and an affordable family day out. I would love to see the zoo relocated to the old Arco Arena. It would be good for this community. We do not need more shopping centers! I think that if there was anyway to convert that space to affordable housing that would be even better! I look forward to seeing what happens. Thank you for your time.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From:	Christopher B
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Comment for Arena EIR
Date:	Saturday, March 16, 2019 4:17:36 PM

Hello, please accept my comment on the proposed planning of the old arena site.

I would like to request there be no high density homes on site. Natomas already has several other apartments and high density homes, along with an influx of several other high density sites coming up:

Expansion of the boot apartments; creekside apartments expansion; complex next to arena going up; in addition to the dozen complexes already in North Natomas.

As a home owner, I would like to see something that increases value in the location. Apartments have brought nothing more than crime from residents who do not care about the condition of the neighborhood as they have no skin in the game.

Traffic enforcement is nearly non-existent and will only grow worse on our crumbling and congested roads. We can't even keep people from doing donuts and running stop signs and lights in our neighborhood with the current leasing tenants as is.

Please reject the high density housing and bring something that provides positive impact for the current homeowners.

Christopher Borsh

From: Christine Browning
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco Arena
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 5:25:30 PM

Here's my suggestion for the arena. Make it into a homeless city. The homeless run it. Pets are allowed. People can live either indoors or outside. There will be social workers, doctors, dentists, & vets available. Cooking staff. The Kings pay for it since they still owe on the facility. Finally give back to the community. Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Cynthia Connell
To: Scott Johnson
Cc: cynthia connell
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Comment Submittal
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 8:37:21 AM

I'm writing to submit my comments regarding use of the land parcel currently called the Sleep Train Arena in Natomas. A lot of ideas have been generated regarding the use of this land, now that the arena has been relocated. As a resident of Natomas it's in my interest to weigh in, and hope that the comments of all Natomas residents bear weight on the final decisions regarding the ultimate use of this parcel.

I am opposed to the ideas presented by the current owner. More housing and strip mall construction here is unnecessary; we have tons of developments being built out currently, in the plots that were left stagnant by other developers for a decade after the housing crisis hit us hard. Natomas residents are tired of empty promises from developers and the City not holding them to their agreements; tired of the stagnant fields, empty housing development plots, empty buildings and partially constructed business complexes left behind when the economy turned downward. If this were to happen again, we know we'd be left with the unfinished work at the Arena land. Housing/development is the wrong way to go here. Bringing in a business with a personal stake in the investment they make here is what we need.

This is a unique opportunity to bring a positive force to our community in two ways: creating jobs for local residents and recent graduates (we have five high schools in Natomas, as well as a community college campus), and increasing local business revenues via customers/clients to the new facility To that end, I like the following ideas:

A teaching hospital or other educational facility would *create jobs* for local residents, and potentially *bring business* to our local enterprises. Additionally it could *provide a valuable partnership* with our local school district and it's offerings in the fledgling Career Tech program.
A hospital would *bring jobs*, a *needed resource*, and *revenues to local businesses*. We have lots of hotels in the immediate area and are adjacent to the airport, so a medical facility with a specialization would be a great fit.
A zoo would *bring jobs* and *increase local business revenues*. It would also provide a *local hotspot* for our families and schoolchildren, and *create a partnership opportunity* with the local school districts. The best thing about bringing the Sacramento Zoo to Natomas is that it would *solve two local Sacramento-specific problems*: the Zoo is currently looking to relocate, and we have the land that meets their needs. Also, in the case of a zoo or a specialized health clinic, because of our great location, families from all over would have easy access to the facility, accommodations, groceries, restaurants and other activities.

Thanks for adding my comments to others, and for giving all of our input serious consideration.

Cynthia Connell
Natomas Resident
2241 Bradburn Drive
Sacramento CA 95835

From:	Wood, Dylan@Wildlife
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	Wildlife R2 CEQA
Subject:	Comments on the NOP for the Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development (SCH: 2019039011)
Date:	Friday, March 22, 2019 2:54:06 PM

Mr. Johnson,

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has received and reviewed the **Notice of Preparation** for the **Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development** (Project) in Sacramento County. CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist the Lead Agency in adequately identifying and, where appropriate, mitigating the project's significant or potentially significant, direct and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife resources.

The proposed Project footprint falls within the boundaries of the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP). CDFW recommends the City of Sacramento discuss the Project's place within the NBHCP.

A search of CNDDB and CDFW's BIOS reveal three special-status species occurrences within the Project footprint or within 150 meters of the Project site. These species include: giant gartersnake (*Thamnophis gigas*), Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), and burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*). CDFW recommends the draft EIR specifically analyze potential impacts to these species.

Since known burrowing owl habitat is present on and adjacent to the Project site, CDFW recommends a qualified biologist complete surveys for burrowing owl in accordance with the *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012). The staff report guidelines state that "the survey methods used and results including the information described in the Summary Report and to include the reports within the CEQA documentation." As such, CDFW recommends following survey methodology below to determine burrowing owl use of the Project area prior to circulation of the final EIR. The survey includes: 1) at least one site visit between 15 February and 15 April, and 2) a minimum of three survey visits, at least three weeks apart, between 15 April and 15 July, with at least one visit after 15 June. Surveys will be conducted on the Project site and within 150 meters of areas that will be directly or indirectly impacted by the Project, where feasible. Surveys shall not be conducted during inclement weather, when burrowing owls are typically less active and visible. If burrowing owls or evidence of burrowing owls (e.g. whitewash or pellets) are not observed during any surveys, no additional mitigation is necessary. If the birds are present, take could occur. If any new burrowing owl colonizes the Project site after the CEQA document has been adopted, it may constitute changed circumstances that should be addressed in a re-circulated CEQA document (CDFG 2012) if those potential impacts have not been disclosed.

Migratory nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 U.S.C., §§ 703-712). CDFW implemented the MBTA by adopting the Fish and Game Code section 3513. Fish and Game Code sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3800 provide additional protection to nongame birds, birds of prey, their nests and eggs. Potential habitat for nesting birds and birds of prey is present within the Project footprint. The initial study should disclose all potential activities that may incur a direct or indirect take to nongame nesting

birds within the project footprint and its close vicinity. Appropriate avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures to avoid take should also be included. Measures to avoid the impacts can include species specific work windows, bird surveys, biological monitoring, installation of noise attenuation barriers, etc. As a part of the draft EIR, CDFW recommends identifying any trees slated for removal and said trees be properly analyzed for potential impacts to nesting birds. Likewise, any plans for the plantings of new trees should also be included with the number and species to be planted (CDFW recommends using native California species when feasible).

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the project that may affect California fish and wildlife. I am available for further consultation if the City has questions regarding these comments or fish and wildlife issues that arise when drafting the EIR.

Sincerely,

Dylan Wood
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Environmental Scientist
(916) 358-2384

From: Casandra Dheri
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Rezone the arena in Natomas
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 6:10:34 AM

We don't need more retail stores, restaurants, or houses. There are a lot of families with young children who would love to see the Zoo get that land. Give our community something to attract visitors not just shoppers.

Casandra Dheri
4819 Winamac Dr
Sacramento Ca 95835

From: Chris
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: A Zoo In Natomas
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 4:57:45 PM

Hello Mr. Johnson.

I have been a resident of North Natomas for 16 years. We have seen our community go through many ups and downs.

We have been raising our three elementary school-age children here. District 1 of Sacramento has little to offer in terms of family recreation. Except for family time in our bathroom-less parks, we leave Natomas for almost everything else we do. We head to Woodland for skating and nerf wars, to West Sacramento for bounce houses, bowling and the aquatic center, to Land Park for the Zoo and Fairytale Town. Off to Folsom we go to visit their zoo or the the new aquarium. In Roseville there is Top Golf, laser tag, bowling, ice skating and more opportunities for family entertainment than we can count. Our district is made up of mostly families. Our community and businesses should reflect that.

So many of our shopping centers sit empty. Why would we want more of that? Our District already has a disproportionately amount of dense and low-income housing. We don't need any more. Our police and fire are understaffed to meet our current needs. There is already new home building planned near the airport that we don't have emergency services to support. We don't need to make the situation worse.

We need to focus on serving the needs of our current community. Do the right thing - give us a Zoo! Help make Natomas a haven for families.

Sincerely,

Christina Fagan Sanders

Sent from my iPhone

From: Cat Fanklin
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Development of Natomas/old arena site
Date: Saturday, March 16, 2019 9:35:47 PM

Good evening -

I would like to add my voice to the idea that the old Arco Arena site in Natomas be developed into something other than commercial space and high density housing. We would love to see the Sacramento Zoo added to this space - it would be wonderful for all the families of Sacramento!

Natomas does not need more commercial building, apartments or housing developments. We are close to downtown, have great freeway access, lots of local restaurants and other businesses - it would be a perfect location for all of Sacramentans to enjoy the zoo here!

Please consider this idea as the city moves to approve plans for that area.

Thank you
Cat Franklin

Sent from my iPhone

From: chris hirschmann
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena
Date: Monday, April 1, 2019 11:58:46 AM

I am a North Natomas resident. I would like the zoo to have a significant amount of the land from the Sleep Train Arena site dedicated to their use. This area would be prefect to keep the zoo within the Sacramento city limits, and provide it with enough land to provide large enough habitats for the animals. Shopping centers, houses, and restaurants will not attract tourists and visitors from other parts of the city.

From:	Clint Holtzen
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	Tom Pace; Greg Sandlund; Matt Hertel; Dov Kadin; Jennifer Hargrove
Subject:	Natomas Arena Reuse NOP- SACOG Comments
Date:	Monday, April 1, 2019 12:27:42 PM
Attachments:	Natomas Arena Reuse Letter_Signed.pdf

Hi Scott,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NOP for the Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development. SACOG's comments are attached. Please feel free to reach out if you have any questions.

Cheers
Clint

Clint Holtzen | Planning Manager
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
916-340-6246
choltzen@sacog.org

From: Candy Li
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena reuse.
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 5:37:57 PM

Greetings.

Short and simple -

Natomas needs a hospital. Forget that the “closest” hospital is downtown (Dignity Health, J street).

Natomas/Woodland are developing areas and traffic at peak hours can result in a 45 minute commute to get downtown (for us fortunate enough who live near a freeway).

Let’s be realistic. We don’t need a zoo, we need a hospital.

-Candy Li
Resident of Natomas, 95835

Sent from my iPhone

From: Christina Luttig
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas - Sleep Train
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 1:09:48 PM

Hello- my name is Christina Luttig, I have been a resident of both South and North Natomas since I was 10 years old. I now have my own family, which includes 2 kids ages: 8 & 12. We have chosen Natomas to raise our children. Both of my children attend Westlake Charter School. We are a family that is active in our community with our school, sports programs and community service. I have always loved Natomas because of the smaller community atmosphere. I feel like everyone in Natomas some how is connected to one another. My husband and I went to our fair share of Kings games at Arco/Sleep Train...as well this is where my children both attended their first NBA game. Along with this location we attended multiple concerts, and Disney on Ice Shows. It was great to have Arco/Sleep Train in our area because it was reachable to us by driving down the street and others by the freeway.

When the Kings left, we always hoped that it would be replaced with another building/location for us to do more things as a family/community. My suggestion is BRING THE ZOO TO NATOMAS! Natomas having this opportunity would be huge. There would be job opportunity's, summer programs for the youth, volunteer work for youth/adults, possibly internships for our local high schools and bring money to the nearby establishments. Natomas needs a family place....WE DON'T NEED MORE HOMES! I5 in the morning is already backed up at Del Paso as early of 7AM. Placing homes in this area is going to cause major congestion, I can see some unsafe situations coming with more traffic. With more homes comes more crime as well.

Today, I ask you to please consider being on Natomas side and help us make Sleep Train into a family location…NOT AN OVER POPULATED COMMUNITY!

Thank you for your time, please contact me with any questions at: cstinaluttig@yahoo.com 916-838-2195.

Christina Ortiz-Luttig

From:	Christina Parker
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Re: NATOMAS ARENA REUSE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
Date:	Monday, April 1, 2019 10:36:57 AM

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm writing to share my comments on the reuse plan for the previous Sleep Train or Natomas Arena space.

I've lived in Natomas for a good portion of my time in Sacramento and I'd love to see it have something unique that builds community. There's been a decent amount of dense housing built in the area and still more going in as well as quite a few empty commercial properties. We do not need even more dense housing and more empty commercial space. I think it's important to give Natomas something unique as it expands, not more cookie cutter apartments stacked on top of each other and chain restaurants. The Kings secured a new home with help of the tax payers and the city with unique restaurants and activities nearby their new home and Natomas deserves the same. It deserves some character and unique activities to draw people in!

I think the Sacramento Zoo is a perfect fit for this area. They have been requesting city support for expansion for over 15 years and it's time they were given a chance to show us all that they can be with some space to grow. They outgrew their small acreage a long time ago and have been hobbling along on small piece meal improvements. Those aren't sustainable. The zoo provides not only a unique family activity, but character to our city, and education for our schools. The zoomobile visits lots of schools around the area and the stage shows provide a chance for children and their families to see animals up close. The conservation education is important to a well balanced school curriculum and the veterinary medicine there partners with programs at UC Davis. These are important partnerships that contribute to the local area and would be gone without this expansion. The state's capital should not be left behind in science and environmental education and access!

Please consider the value of having a zoo in the Sacramento area as this may be the last chance to keep this educational family activity going in the Sacramento area. We don't need more housing in a flood zone, but a zoo would provide an attraction to the Natomas area like the arena use to.

Sincerely,

A Natomas Resident

Christina Parker
5350 Dunlay Dr. Unit 3413
Sacramento, CA 95835

From: Chris Peters
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Planned Arena Site comments
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 2:02:16 PM

Hi, I'm writing to oppose the proposal by the Kings ownership to build housing and commercial space at the old arena site. While I understand there is a need for more housing in communities throughout northern California, I do not believe this proposal is the best way to remedy that housing problem. The former Arena site presents a unique opportunity to implement a bigger vision, and simply adding more of the same is a huge waste of that opportunity. Natomas already has many empty store fronts and commercial spaces, and has plenty of other open land that would be more suitable to housing. The location of the Arena site, however, is centrally located, close to highways and other businesses, and has existing infrastructure that would be more suitable to entertainment type of development.

I believe this space should be turned into a family entertainment district. The zoo should be allowed and helped to relocate to the site and to expand. With the zoo as an anchor, other family friendly entertainment options could be added such as an expanded Children's Museum, a water park, themed restaurants, bowling alley, a farm-to-fork complex, etc. Granted, this sort of development would take time, effort and vision to get off the ground, but the potential rewards would also be much greater for our community and Sacramento as a whole, which seems to be lacking in any sort of tourist draws, especially for families. As I've visited other cities around the country, those that have taken risks to develop tourist friendly destinations are now reaping the rewards of those ideas. I feel that the current proposal put forth by the Kings ownership is near-sighted and simply takes the easy way out for a site that has so much potential.

Please oppose the Kings reuse plan and support an alternative that has vision and will make our community better.

Chris Peters Architect
Natomas Resident

From: Cheryl Reuben
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: The proposed development for the reuse of Sleep Train Arena in Natomas
Date: Thursday, March 21, 2019 5:33:20 PM

Dear Mr. Johnson!!

I am a resident of Natomas Park!!! Please NO MORE APARTMENTS!!!! They will bring more crime and traffic congestion to an area that doesn't need any more!!! Give us something nice!!! A pleasant shopping mall with upscale restaurants , maybe a Trader Joes??? Anything but apartments!!!!

Sincerely,

Cheryl Reuben
10 Michelson CT.
Sacramento, Ca. 95835

From: Christina Rubio
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Plans for Natomas Sleep Train Arena
Date: Sunday, March 17, 2019 10:47:14 AM

Hello
As a Natomas resident I would like to vote that area be used for a new home for the Sacramento Zoo.

Thank you

Christina
916-474-1608

From: Carrie Tan
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena Plans
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 8:33:19 AM

Good morning,

I wanted to voice my family's concern over the Kings' proposed redevelopment plan for the Arena site. We truly do not think Natomas can handle thousands more housing units, especially in a small area like the Arena site. Traffic is already a nightmare and I can't imagine the congestion that would come if this project is approved. Additionally, we don't have enough schools, grocery stores, restaurants, etc. to handle current residents, let alone thousands more. We already have the massive housing community going up near the airport; we don't need yet another housing area in North Natomas, especially one that doesn't seem planned with our neighborhood in mind.

My family and I want the Arena area redeveloped as much as anyone but we also want to see it done in a way that will positively impact our beloved suburb. This project is not it.

Thank you,
Carrie Tan

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: We want the Zoo
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:28:00 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:09 AM
To: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: We want the Zoo

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Cynthia Taylor <cindy.taylor17@att.net>
> **Date:** March 23, 2019 at 11:08:03 AM PDT
> **To:** aashby@cityofsacramento.org
> **Subject: We want the Zoo**
>
> Dear Angelique Ashby,
>
> My name is Cindy Taylor and I have enjoyed the Sacramento Zoo ever since I was a small girl in the 1940s. Now I'm 75 and I live in the Natomas District near my two grandsons who like to visit their favorite animals at the Zoo. It would be great if the Zoo moved closer to us and expanded here. I know there are lots of families who would frequent the Zoo in Natomas and our family is certainly one of them.
>
> I am writing to you in support of relocation of the Sacramento Zoo to Natomas.
>
> Thanks very much for anything you can do to make this happen.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Cindy Taylor
> 1580 Aimwell Avenue

From: Christine Vankesteren
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo!!!
Date: Thursday, March 21, 2019 7:40:26 PM

I want a Zoo my whole family wants a zoo we deserve something wonderful here in Natomas it was also bring more tourist here
Thank you
Sent from my iPhone

From: Carol Williams-Manson
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: We Need a ZOO in Natomas!
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 11:05:09 AM

Hello - this is Carol and I have lived in
West Natomas since 2002. Please turn the land that was the Kong's Arena on Arena Blvd. into land use for a new and improved Sacramento zoo. We need a new zoo badly and I do not want to see more apartments in the area than what is already planned here. A zoo would be added value to the area and bring revenue and visitors to the city of Sacramento.

Carol Manson
3801 Gresham Ln
Sacramento 95835

Sent from my iPad

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad

carolhere@sbcglobal.net
"Do not let the behavior of others destroy your inner peace." Dalia Lama

From: Da Vinci Photography
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: ARCO ARENA - ZOO PLEASE
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 12:43:06 PM

Please have a Zoo instead of Arco Arena - that will be a great happy place and will help to make the area more green - right now there is not enough parks there even!

Sent from my iPhone

From: Daniel Bui
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Old Arco Arena
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 6:53:37 PM

To whom it may concern,
I am current a Natomas resident, in 95835 zip code.
I would like to suggest to move the Sacramento zoo to replace the old arena instead of more buildings in Natomas.
Thank you,
Daniel Bui

From: Douglas Cole
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco Arena
Date: Sunday, March 24, 2019 10:32:55 AM

Dear Scott,

I am a resident and home owner in Natomas Park. I have lived in Sacramento now for 20 years. The best idea I've heard in those entire 20 years is that of moving the zoo to the old Arco Arena site! It would set our area of town apart from the others in a very positive way and bring businesses and other desirable traffic to the area. I would love to see that idea explored seriously with an official proposal brought to the table. We don't need a 6000 more houses in Natomas.

Thank you very much for your consideration and for excepting my feedback.

Douglas Cole
2001 N. Bend Dr.
Sacramento, 95835

From: Devid
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: No more apartments
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:06:29 PM

Please no more apartment in the Natomas area bring in some sort of attraction that will bring business to the area not more people to live in the area schools are full traffic is horrible at the very least fix truxel blvd

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: Don Gibson
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Site Comments
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 10:59:06 AM

Hello,

I am Don Gibson, living in the River Oaks neighborhood in Natomas and living in Hansen's council district.

I just want to comment that I really liked the idea of a world-class Zoo to take over the former Sleep Train Arena site. A modern high-end zoo would be a great amenity for our community. As someone who wishes to support conservation and opportunities for the next generation to learn about animals and the environment a zoo with the space needed for proper animal welfare is needed.

I am not opposed to new housing development but if it becomes housing I would want to see a walkable, densely built community much denser the average of Natomas.

Additionally, if there could be pre-planning for a light rail station to be built in the heart of this area whether it is a zoo or housing development would be very helpful for sustainability.

-Don Gibson
3157 Spinning Rod Way
Sacramento, CA 95833
925-872-0570

From: Mike and Donna Graf
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Development Proposal
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 12:55:40 PM

Good afternoon,
I'm sure you have been inundated with community comments regarding the proposed development of the Sleep Train Arena site. While it's obvious that it's necessary to begin the redevelopment process in this area I also feel it's important to consider the long-term future of Natomas while evaluating the options.

With the previously approved developments currently going on the addition of another 2,000 housing units would most definitely negatively impact the area and quality of life for Natomas residents. Then, you have the newly proposed Upper Westside project wanting to add another 10,000 homes! Will the city allow the developers to continue until every bit of open space is gone?

What began as a quaint suburb to downtown, surrounded by family farms, open land and community parks, is seemingly on track to become just another overly populated, congested housing farm. My family and I have lived in the area for over 30 years and are now seriously considering leaving as we have no desire to live in such a populous area. The proposed addition of more commercial space is also questionable as there is not shortage of empty commercial and retail space in Natomas, some of which has never been occupied since it was built.

I urge you and the City Council to not rush to judgement on these issues, please consider the impact your choices will have on the residents of the area. Please reach out to *us* and ask *us* what we'd like to see in our future. I can almost guarantee the opinion of most will be to please slow the development and allow us to maintain the Natomas we love.
Thank you,
Donna Graf
Natomas Resident
grafless@yahoo.com

From:	Danae Harris
To:	Scott Johnson; Angelique Ashby; Mayor Steinberg
Subject:	Natomas Arena Reuse Project (P18-077) EIR Scoping
Date:	Tuesday, April 2, 2019 9:47:51 PM

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I'm writing to comment on the proposed development plan submitted by the Sacramento Kings for the reuse of Sleep Train Arena in Natomas. My husband and I, along with our children ages 10 and 2, have been Natomas residents since 2012.

We are deeply concerned that the proposed development plan submitted for the reuse of Sleep Train Arena in Natomas will negatively impact our community in several ways. Our concerns are as follows:

1. The Kings propose to change the zone designation of the Arena property to C-2 General Commercial. This site was designated as zone SPX to "provide for the education, information, recreation, culture, or entertainment of Sacramento area residents and visitors." While the site can no longer realistically be used to house a sports arena, the city council should remain true to its original intent and the desires of the Natomas community in maintaining this property zoning to allow for "education, recreation, culture, or entertainment."

2. This Project proposes to add up to 2,000 residential units which were were not anticipated in the North Natomas Community Plan. We have serious concerns about the City's ability to provide “a police protection standard of 1.60 police officers per 1,000 residents and 1.0 non-sworn personnel for every 1.60 police officers (2035 General Plan/NNCP, NN PHS 1.2).

3. Regarding "...the geographic area bounded by the East Drain, I 5, Del Paso Road, and Arena Boulevard (this area comprises about 340 acres and includes several PUDs)…." (2035 General Plan/NNCP, NN.LU 1.19). For any development to remain consistent with policy NN.LU 1.19, several findings must be made. Two of those findings are particularly relevant in the context of the proposed Project:

• "The proposed increase in residential use will not result in an over-concentration of multi-family projects in the area"
• "The total amount of acreage devoted to residential use(s) within this geographic area does not exceed 25 percent"

Satisfying these two findings does not appear to be realistic, given the amount of this property already dedicated to residential use. Please investigate whether this plan can go forward without resulting in an over-concentration of multi-family projects in the area.

Suggested Alternatives to consider in the EIR:

• Alternative 1: Rezone the entire property to A-OS Agricultural-Open Space.3 A-OS is far more consistent with the intent of the current SPX zone designation. (For

reference, the North Natomas Regional Park is designated A-OS.) The Sacramento Zoo is currently seeking to relocate and expand, and has identified the Arena property as a suitable and desirable location. While not a sports team, a relocated Sacramento Zoo would fulfill the original NNCP vision for an amenity that provides for the "education, information, recreation, culture, or entertainment of Sacramento area residents and visitors."

• Alternative 2: Rezone ~120 acres to A-OS, and rezone the remainder to EC Employment Center.4 EC would permit the same uses as C-2, but is better suited to the vision of the North Natomas Community Plan.

Please honor the hard-fought community design outlined in the North Natomas Community Plan, and deny the Sacramento Kings' proposed development plan.

Respectfully,

Danae Harris
4206 Malta Island St.
Sacramento, CA 95834
danaeharris@gmail.com

From: Phil Rosenberg & Deb Heymann
To: srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org.
Subject: WE REALLY WANT A ZOO
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 3:15:57 PM

We've been told for years that it is better to have the old arena site developed right than be developed quickly. More offices and apartments is neither.
You have a golden opportunity to create a learning trail from the museums in Old Sacramento, through the new science center to the new improved zoo in Natomas at the old arena to the Natomas Basin Conservancy. You have this chance to transform this area through thoughtful stewardship, enhanced conservancy and impactful education.

WE WANT A ZOO. Please.
Thank you
Deb Heymann

From: Donna Homan
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Proposed Use Old Arena Site
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 12:06:56 PM

To Whom it May Concern,

I would like to voice my STRONG objection to a plan being proposed for the old arena site in Natomas.

First and foremost, we must call it like it is. Natomas is a neighborhood. It is not a stand-alone city. The idea that you could simply jam another couple thousand housing units in there is obscene. What about the traffic? What about our schools? What about our sense of community?

Natomas has already taken on the bulk of new housing in Sacramento, much of it high-density and low income. Those of us who purchased homes here have done our part to help maintain the look and feel and unity that has kept this NEIGHBORHOOD from going to the dumps. We have kept our homes clean. We have raised our kids right and have participated in all activities meant to foster a sense of well being. We've shelled out our own money to pay for our own private security to help keep crime stats down. We kept quiet when the city ignored Natomas and encouraged the construction of a new hospital in the Railyards instead of north of the river (where there is not a single emergency facility!). Centene is bringing THOUSANDS of new workers who will be coming and going at pretty much the exact same time. Then add Amazon, the airport, major retail, tens of thousands of houses and apartment units. YOU have created a traffic nightmare -- on our residential streets and our only route to that hospital you demanded be built Downtown. It would be another slap in the face if the city ignores our voice and rams **yet another** high-density project with more vacuous retail space.

Natomas residents have paid high property taxes, which have been used to prop up services throughout the city of Sacramento. Seeing the rapid fire building going on and the negative impact this is already having on our neighborhood is prompting MANY of my neighbors to consider moving away (mostly out of state). Most of us moved here because of the quick commute and that sense of community. Your actions are removing some of the last reasons for staying here. If the heart of this community is removed, seriously think of what you will be left with. Is it worth it?

I would strongly urge you to reconsider the high-density housing plan and look to establishing something beautiful for this neighborhood and the region. We Want a Zoo! We want the type of amenity that we can enjoy and we can be proud of. Something we can see as a benefit. We want something open, yet meaningful. Something that people from all over will remember...a true gem in Natomas and a destination point! The type of thing that we enjoy when visiting relatives in other states. Old Sacramento and the Capitol are not enough to lure tourists and their tourist dollars here.

Please don't lose sight of the fact that Natomas is part of Sacramento. It's one of many NEIGHBORHOODS which you are responsible for. Please stop dismissing us. We are men, women and children. Natomas is our home .. hear us!

Donna Homan
Natomas Resident

From:	Erica Castillo
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	FW: Zoo Relocation
Date:	Friday, March 29, 2019 10:27:16 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:07 AM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Zoo Relocation

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Danielle Hurley <Danihurley@hotmail.com>
> **Date:** March 25, 2019 at 12:01:47 PM PDT
> **To:** "aashby@cityofsacramento.org" <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Zoo Relocation**
>
> Dear Ms. Ashby,
>
> I live within District 1 and am thankful that we have you as our representative. I appreciate all that you do for Natomas.
>
> I was recently at the Sacramento zoo and reading about their relocation needs, I am writing in support of the zoo being able to relocate. Whether they relocate to North Natomas or not, the zoo needs a bigger home. I have two small kids and would love to have the opportunity to bring them to a big zoo with a variety of big animals as I was able to go to when I was a kid. If the zoo does not relocate it will become a niche zoo. The zoo brings tourism, education, and life to a big city like Sacramento and I would hate to see it be downgraded due to a lack of space.
>
> I hope that you will support the zoo relocation when it is presented to the city council this Spring.
>
> Thank you,
> Danielle Hurley

2157 Bradburn Drive
Sacramento, CA

From: Discount Appliance Repair
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: ZOO instead of Arco Arena !!!!
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 12:44:21 PM

Please have a Zoo!
Thanh you

Sent from my iPhone

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Sacramento zoo
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:27:37 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:08 AM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Sacramento zoo

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** <djpjdj@charter.net>
> **Date:** March 24, 2019 at 9:30:31 AM PDT
> **To:** "'aashby@cityofsacramento.org'" <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>, "'awarren@cityofsacramento.org'" <awarren@cityofsacramento.org>, "'jsharris@cityofsacramento.org'" <jsharris@cityofsacramento.org>, "'jschenirer@cityofsacramento.org'" <jschenirer@cityofsacramento.org>, "'rjennings@cityofsacramento.org'" <rjennings@cityofsacramento.org>, "'lcarr@cityofsacramento.org'" <lcarr@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Sacramento zoo**
>
> Dear Mayor and City Council members,
>
> I'm a long-time resident of Reno, Nevada. My family and I have enjoyed an annual membership at the Sacramento zoo for at least 15 years. We visit Sacramento and the bay area on a regular basis. Unfortunately, the Reno zoo is very small and does not really compare to the wonderful Sacramento zoo in both size and loving environment for the animals.
>
> I strongly encourage your support for the zoo's relocation and/or expansion. The zoo's efforts to educate people about the diversity of the worlds animals and participation in live saving endangered species programs is priceless. Please allow these efforts to flourish!
>
> Thank you for your time.
>
> David Jones
> Reno, Nevada

775-851-7377.

From: Dina Levkov
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Kings Arena - What to Replace it With
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 5:06:07 PM

Hello,

As a resident and homeowner of Natomas I would like to express my desire to use the arena space for the Sac Zoo. I don't think we need more retail and high density housing- traffic is already nuts in some areas and certain bridges are so narrow that they already create 1 lane bottlenecks, adding to congestion.

There are already also plenty of available and unfilled retail spaces, we don't need more of them. I really agree with so many of our neighbor's comments regarding the benefits of relocating the zoo instead.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our thoughts.

Dina Levkov and David Hill
Natomas Residents and Homeowners

From: David Lockwood
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Plan
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 11:26:43 AM

Hello,

As a resident of North Natomas with a 10 year old child. I would love to see the zoo moved to this area. It would allow for an incredible experience that I could have only dreamed of as a child for my son.

I am turned off by the idea of more housing and shopping centers when the area is already saturated by housing developments and shopping strip malls.

Although I am just one voice of many I hope this email helps make a decision!

Thank you for your time.

David Lockwood

Sent from my iPhone

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Arco Arena Site
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:28:16 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:14 AM
To: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Arco Arena Site

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** "McFarland, Donald" <Donald.McFarland@calhr.ca.gov>
> **Date:** March 22, 2019 at 11:14:43 AM PDT
> **To:** "'aashby@cityofsacramento.org'" <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Cc:** "'MayorSteinberg@cityofsacramento.org'" <MayorSteinberg@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Arco Arena Site**
>
> I truly hope that real consideration goes into using the old site for a family friendly attraction. Natomas, has lost the destination to attract tourist to experience what Natomas has to offer.
>
> Even more so, we need to have a place where residents can visit and get to know each other. The zoo makes too much sense, but any and all attractions should be considered. The daily commute during business hours is already over exhausting and there is already plenty of housing being built.
>
> **Donald McFarland**

From: Diane Otterlei
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 9:33:25 PM

I am totally for the Sacramento zoo moving to Natomas. There is really not much for kids to do in Natomas.

My grandkids have been to the zoo so many times and they loved being there.

I think this would attract families who would eat at the restaurants in Natomas, etc.

Diane Otterlei

Sent from my iPhone

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Move the Zoo!
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2019 9:37:57 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 10:37 PM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Move the Zoo!

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Dave Parker <daveparkerfree@gmail.com>
> **Date:** April 2, 2019 at 2:48:27 PM PDT
> **To:** SWhyte@cityofsacramento.org, JBytel@cityofsacramento.org
> **Cc:** aashby@cityofsacramento.org, awarren@cityofsacramento.org, jsharris@cityofsacramento.org, shansen@cityofsacramento.org, jschenirer@cityofsacramento.org, rjennings@cityofsacramento.org, lcarr@cityofsacramento.org, eguerra@cityofsacramento.org
> **Subject: Fwd: Fw: Move the Zoo!**
>
> **Subject:** Move the Zoo!
>
> 2 April 2019
>
> Dear Mayor Steinberg and City Council Members;
>
> I am writing to support expanding and moving SacZoo. The zoo is a precious community resource, a place where we can teach the public about the animals housed there, about conservation and the role we play in the balance of nature, about the importance of protecting the wild habitats of all animals, and about the environment and how we impact it.
>
> Sacramento, as the state capitol, should have a world-class zoo that residents and visitors from all over the world can enjoy. SacZoo should be a tourist destination and a new,

larger zoo can be designed to draw not only tourists but also the millions of local residents and school children. Without expansion, our zoo will be forced to house even fewer animals than it does now in order to meet the high standards of the American Association of Zoos and Aquariums.

My wife is a docent at SacZoo (she was recently given the "Most Enthusiastic Veteran Docent of the Year" award for 2018), and she keeps me well informed about the zoo's accreditation challenge. Expansion is of the utmost importance if we expect SacZoo to survive and thrive.

SacZoo's future is uncertain. But we know that relocating and building a world-class zoo for California’s Capitol would benefit our region, attracting more visitors who will not only enjoy the zoo but will also visit other parts of our city and surrounding area. The time is now! We need to move the zoo and make it spectacular!

Thank you for considering this request,

David S. Parker

8112 Peak Forest Way

Elk Grove CA 95757

Home: 916-896-3992

Cell: 559-284-1571

From: Debbie Pate-Newberry
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Future of Sleep Train Arena
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 10:53:10 AM

March 26, 2019

RE: The future use of the old Sleep Train Arena site

Hi –

I'm was born and raised in Sacramento and have lived in North Natomas with my family for 19 years. We were one of the first families to buy and move into our home in Natomas Park. We've raised two children here, with the second about to graduate high school. We hope to have grandchildren here someday, too.

When we moved to North Natomas there was nothing here … we had to wait for the Raley's to be built to do grocery shopping! Now there's homes, apartments, shops, fast food and traffic, traffic, traffic.

We ask for the zoo to be relocated here … or something else that helps to promote the idea that Sacramento is special. It's clear the City Council has a vision for the city. The renovation of K Street with the Golden One; looking at making improvements to Old Sacramento, etc.

You have an opportunity to do something really special with the old Sleep Train Arena site. Something that will help bring tourists, bring locals to the greater downtown area, and strengthen our sense of pride in our community.

More housing and retail won't do any of that.

The City Council needs to decide what kind of city they want Sacramento to be. I personally want my hometown to be someplace special.

Respectfully,

Debbie Pate-Newberry
4607 Fenugreek Way
Sacramento, CA 95835

From: David Patty
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: RE: Arena ideas
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 8:18:05 PM

We suggest a go kart and indoor family fun park that doesn't cost outrageous amounts of money! We need quality family time that is affordable and can also host fall/winter birthdays.

Sheila K. Patty
Sent from my iPhone

My blessing is this: I know a God who gives hope to the hopeless. I know a God who loves the unlovable. I know a God who comforts the sorrowful. And I know a God who has planted this same power within me. Within all of us.
And for this blessing, may our response always be,"Use me."

From: David Rhines
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 8:33:51 AM

You took the arena from us put it down town please give us the zoo not more apartments and more housing housing were already oversaturated and still building

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From:	David Salyer
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Move th Zoo to Natomas
Date:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 6:14:28 PM

Scott,

I am writing to you to urge your support for the relocation effort of the Sacramento Zoo to the Natomas area. I feel it would be an economic draw for the community once it moves to a larger site. As it is now, the zoo brought in almost a half million visitors in 2017 to its 14 acre site. The San Diego Zoo at nearly 100 acres had 5 million visitors. That many visitors would provide quite an economic boost for the area not to mention putting Sacramento on the destination list of many potential tourists.

I know that some people may oppose the Zoo feeling that the animals suffer or should not be exploited. I visited the Sacramento Zoo about a decade ago and at that time it was sad to see some of the animals in cages that looked to be too small for the animal. After hearing that the Zoo might move to Natomas I visited the Zoo again for the first time in about a decade. I now feel that for the space that they have they have done an amazing job with animal conservation. I now have an annual membership and have taken some of their behind the scenes tours. I can say that the animals have the best care available. However you can only do so much in the approximately 14 acres is currently occupies. The plans that I have seen for the proposed new site are amazing. If this were to come to fruition I have no doubts that it would be of fantastic benefit to the region, but do not take my word for it, visit the Zoo and then look at the plans. I am sure you can see the benefit. Sincerely, David Salyer Natomas resident

From:	Diane Waters
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Relocation of the Sacramento Zoo
Date:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 5:31:31 PM

Dear Scott Johnson,

City of Sacramento Community Development Department Environmental Planning Services 300 Richards Blvd., 3rd Floor Sacramento, CA 95811 (916) 808-5842
srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

Please consider relocating the Sacramento Zoo to the old Sleep Train Arena. Our zoo could lose it's certification next year due to limited space. Sacramento has had one since 1927. It needs to move and enlarge in order to be viable. Although the Kings would like to build high rises and commercial space in the arena property, this will only add to traffic congestion and other environmental concerns in Natomas. There are plenty of high rise buildings downtown, which have vacant space. We don't need large commercial developments so far from the city center. But a community asset, like a larger modern zoo, will enhance this great city.

If the city is going to allow more large commercial development in Natomas, you should improve public transportation like adding a new Light Rail route to connect to the downtown area.

Climate Change is a serious concern, and creating traffic congestion that forces more cars on the road would move Sacramento backwards.

Sincerely,
Diane Waters
Dcwarch@yahoo.com
916-267-9781

From: Elizabeth Brushwyler
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: North Natomas Infill Redevelopment PUD
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:46:43 PM

I am writing in my strong opposition to the proposed plan at 1 Sports Parkway, Sacramento, CA 95834

The proposal calls for unique, higher density, transit supportive, mixed use environment. First of all - this is not unique to Natomas. This is ALL we have. This does not bring value to our region, only more traffic and more of the same development we already have.

The Kings ownership promised to "get it right" This is not following that plan. I feel a hospital would have been a valuable addition. But thanks to our friend Kevin Johnson, that is proposed for the Railyards - bringing yet another hospital to downtown. I wonder what adding the proposed housing units would do to the already deplorable transport times to the hospitals downtown.

Now the We Want a Zoo proposal is something I could get behind. I would think the City would see the long term benefit to having a destination like this for our region. What an incredible opportunity to have an Infill project that actually increases the value of the entire region.

I ask that you reject the current residential and commercial proposal.

Elizabeth Brushwyler
91 Rockmont Circle
Sacramento, CA 95835

From:	Emily Delk
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	What to do with Sleep Train...?
Date:	Tuesday, March 26, 2019 11:40:00 AM

Hello! As a new home owner in North Natomas, I'd like to see that space used to add culture and value to our community. Make it a destination spot with flexibility of use--maybe something like The Barn in West Sac. Maybe it would include an outdoor stage. Maybe it would include a library. Maybe it would include more sophisticated retail. Maybe some mid-upper scale restaurants. Maybe more park space. Maybe a movie theater. Maybe a hospital.

From: looney.erica@gmail.com
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: NATOMAS ARENA REUSE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 8:17:16 PM

This email is in response to the Sacramento King's Proposal to the city for the Natomas Arena Reuse area Planned Unit Development Project (NAR PUD). The comment period expires April 2, 2019.

As a long-time resident in North Natomas, this thriving community deserves more back from our local team then what is currently being proposed. When the Sacramento Kings moved downtown, we believed in the vision and promise that North Natomas would not be forgotten. That this land would be utilized in a way commensurate to a national sports arena.

We do NOT need more housing and commercial buildings. We don't want to replace this land which had brought joy to many people for years, watching our local sports team, be parceled off into more houses and vacant buildings. We have plenty of buildings that lay vacant in North Natomas already.

We want our community to stand out. We are a group of hard workers that care about each other. We know our neighbors, we participate in community activities, and we support our local schools.

What we need is to utilize this property in a way that supports not only our existing community but the larger sacramento area and Northern California. Let's do something great!

We have an opportunity with our local Sacramento zoo needing to expand. This is necessary to keep the existing animals and provide the space needed to support more animal conservation. We should be using this land to support our local Sacramento zoo! We have tons of homes and buildings; we don't need to rezone this space for more. That is a wasted opportunity!

Let's give a reason for people to travel here and stir up some tourism to further stabilize our local businesses and fill our existing vacant buildings. Let's give another reason why people want to live here and improve our property values. Let's give our local schools opportunities to participate in our sacramento zoo. Let's build awareness around animal conservation while cultivating community spirit.

A sports arena that once hosted national basketball teams and famous musicians from all over the world stood here. We were proud of our local arena! The North Natomas community deserves more!

WE WANT A ZOO!

Please feel free to reach out should you need any other assistance from a member of this community.

Erica Looney
2055 Moonstone Ave
Sacramento, CA 95835
looney.erica@gmail.com

Sent from my iPhone

From: Erin Masella
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep train arena
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 4:40:59 PM

I think the sleep train arena site should be used to build affordable housing. I am not talking about low income or income restricted housing. I am talking about nice houses at an affordable price (less than $400K) with decent size lots. Natomas has become far too expensive. The new houses are expensive and right on top of each other with tiny lots. It's becoming too expensive to live there for those of us who would like to move from an apartment or condo into a house. Hopefully more housing will bring down the price.
Erin Masella
North Natomas resident

Sent from my iPhone

From: Pixguy
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 9:46:43 PM

Please don't allow high density housing to replace the arena. We want a zoo! It would provide so much tax income and bring tourism to the area. The current Sacramento zoo is sad and depressing.

From: Ed Perez
To: Scott Johnson
Cc: Erica Castillo; sactowritemama@yahoo.com
Subject: EIR Scoping: NAR Project #P18-077
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 4:11:49 PM

April 2, 2019

Scott Johnson, Senior Planner
City of Sacramento Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

RE: Scoping Comments on the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Regarding the Natomas Arena Reuse (NAR) Project # P18-077

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the matter noted above. I would recommend that the Applicant address the following concerns in the EIR for the Project. I should note that for purposes of these comments, I would refer to the Applicant (SBH Natomas LLC) as the "Sacramento King".

A. THE EIR SHOULD ADDRESS THE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT OF UP TO 2,000 OR MORE ADDITIONAL VEHICLES THAT MAY FLOOD THE I-5 AND I-80 CORRIDOR DURING COMMUTE HOURS

The Project proposes to build up to 2,000 additional residential units. Assuming conservatively that each residence would have one vehicle, this will result in potentially up to 2,000 additional vehicles that may use the I-5 and I-80 corridor during commute hours.
The Natomas area has grown exponentially over the last twenty years and is nearing a point when it will start to have detrimental effects on the community. This is even more likely with another large proposed planned development to the North (Greenbriar with 3,000 homes) and to the South (Upper West Side with 10,000 homes).
Additionally, the Centene Campus adjacent to the Project site, is scheduled to bring an additional 3,000 workers to Natomas. While that project is a welcome addition to the community, the additional vehicles that will be brought by those workers to the area would certainly be part of the traffic dynamics.
The Applicant should provide a clear plan for mitigating this potential impact.

B. THE PROJECT IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE SITE'S INTENDED USE AND THE SPIRIT OF THE GENERAL PLAN FOR SACRAMENTO AND THE COMMUNITY PLAN FOR NORTH NATOMAS

The City of Sacramento's General Plan provides for six themes that thread through the General Plan: (1) Making Great Places, (2) Growing Smarter, (3) Maintaining a Vibrant Economy, (4) Creating a Healthy City, (5) Living Lightly – Reducing Our "Carbon Footprint", and (6) Developing a Sustainable Future. As I review the Applicant's proposed project, it is difficult to reconcile it with these themes for the City's future. During a city council meeting

when the future plans for the NAR were being discussed, then Sacrament Kings President Chris Granger said:
"We want to get it right. If this were just about speed, like, we could get this done by the end of this meeting. We could sell this property off and build 8,000 homes down there and be done with it. Or we could sell it to someone who has approached us on "I want 100 acres. I want to build an auto mall", but we're not going to do those things. We have higher aspirations as a company, and we have higher aspirations as Sacramentans. **We envision something that makes a difference in the world**."
This was a promise made by the Sacramento Kings to the residents of Natomas and the citizens of Sacramento that was part of the grand bargain that allowed the Kings to build the new downtown entertainment complex. **It's a promise made that must be kept**. The Applicant must made it clear how the proposed project fulfills that promise.

SUGGESTED ALTERNATIVES TO CONSIDER IN THE EIR:

ALTERNATIVE #1 – CONSIDER ALLOWING THE SACRAMENTO ZOO TO EXPAND AND RELOCATE TO THE PROJECT SITE

I recommend exploring the possibility of the Sacramento Zoo's expansion and relocation to the project site. I believe that the zoo meets the six themes outlined in the City's General Plan and would become an economic magnet for Sacramento. I've included the following narrative from the Sacramento Zoo to provide some context to this suggestion:

"At various stages throughout the zoo's history, the concept of relocation has been explored as part of an effort to ensure the zoo's long-term viability as a vital conservation and education-based amenity for our region. In the 1980s, in 1996 and again in 2010, the need for a new, larger, modern Sacramento Zoo was explored by both the zoo and the City of Sacramento."

"A 2010 feasibility study, commissioned by the City, delved deeper into the need for zoo relocation and several potential relocation sites within city limits. The study once again determined that a new, much-expanded and modern zoological facility was necessary to secure a viable future for the region's zoo, and all that it stands for."

"Fast-forward to 2018 when, at the City's request, the Sacramento Zoo contracted to have an updated feasibility study done that would again examine the need and the potential for relocation and a reimagination of the Sacramento Zoo people have known and loved for generations."

***"The future of the Sacramento Zoo is predicated on obtaining a site large enough to accommodate 21st -Century standards for animal welfare and conservation, meeting the expectations of today's visitors and of course, providing access to adequate parking**. Among other things, such a site will allow for the return of some of the iconic animal species that the zoo has had to say farewell to over the years as these animal welfare standards have evolved. These key species, and providing space to accommodate their needs, is paramount to the Sacramento Zoo's ability to fulfill its mission, realize its vision and become a premier destination for tourists, as well as a source of pride for local residents."*

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide these comments. I look forward to the Applicant's responses to the community's concerns.

Sincerely,

ED PEREZ
5212 Glimmer Way
Sacramento, CA 95835

ED PEREZ

April 2, 2019

Scott Johnson, Senior Planner
City of Sacramento Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

RE: Scoping Comments on the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Regarding the Natomas Arena Reuse (NAR) Project # P18-077

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the matter noted above. I would recommend that the Applicant address the following concerns in the EIR for the Project. I should note that for purposes of these comments, I would refer to the Applicant (SBH Natomas LLC) as the "Sacramento Kings".

A. THE EIR SHOULD ADDRESS THE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT OF UP TO 2,000 OR MORE ADDITIONAL VEHICLES THAT MAY FLOOD THE I-5 AND I-80 CORRIDOR DURING COMMUTE HOURS

The Project proposes to build up to 2,000 additional residential units. Assuming conservatively that each residence would have one vehicle, this will result in potentially up to 2,000 additional vehicles that may use the I-5 and I-80 corridor during commute hours. The Natomas area has grown exponentially over the last twenty years and is nearing a point when it will start to have detrimental effects on the community. This is even more likely with another large proposed planned development to the North (Greenbriar with 3,000 homes) and to the South (Upper West Side with 10,000 homes).

Additionally, the Centene Campus adjacent to the Project site, is scheduled to bring an additional 3,000 workers to Natomas. While that project is a welcome addition to the community, the additional vehicles that will be brought by those workers to the area would certainly be part of the traffic dynamics.

The Applicant should provide a clear plan for mitigating this potential impact.

B. THE PROJECT IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE SITE'S INTENDED USE AND THE SPIRIT OF THE GENERAL PLAN FOR SACRAMENTO AND THE COMMUNITY PLAN FOR NORTH NATOMAS

The City of Sacramento's General Plan provides for six themes that thread through the General Plan: (1) Making Great Places, (2) Growing Smarter, (3) Maintaining a Vibrant Economy, (4) Creating a Healthy City, (5) Living Lightly – Reducing Our "Carbon Footprint", and (6) Developing a Sustainable Future. As I review the Applicant's proposed project, it is difficult to reconcile it with these themes for the City's future. During a city council meeting when the future plans for the NAR were being discussed, then Sacramento Kings President Chris Granger said:

"We want to get it right. If this were just about speed, like, we could get this done by the end of this meeting. We could sell this property off and build 8,000 homes down there and be done with it. Or we could sell it to someone who has approached us on "I want 100 acres. I want to build an auto mall",

5212 GLIMMER WAY | SACRAMENTO CA 95835 | ETPONEBOX@HOTMAIL.COM

but we're not going to do those things. We have higher aspirations as a company, and we have higher aspirations as Sacramentans. **We envision something that makes a difference in the world.**"

This was a promise made by the Sacramento Kings to the residents of Natomas and the citizens of Sacramento that was part of the grand bargain that allowed the Kings to build the new downtown entertainment complex. **It's a promise made that must be kept.**

The Applicant must make it clear how the proposed project fulfills that promise.

SUGGESTED ALTERNATIVES TO CONSIDER IN THE EIR:

ALTERNATIVE #1 – CONSIDER ALLOWING THE SACRAMENTO ZOO TO EXPAND AND RELOCATE TO THE PROJECT SITE

I recommend exploring the possibility of the Sacramento Zoo's expansion and relocation to the project site. I believe that the zoo meets the six themes outlined in the City's General Plan and would become an economic magnet for Sacramento. I've included the following narrative from the Sacramento Zoo to provide some context to this suggestion:

"At various stages throughout the zoo's history, the concept of relocation has been explored as part of an effort to ensure the zoo's long-term viability as a vital conservation and education-based amenity for our region. In the 1980s, in 1996 and again in 2010, the need for a new, larger, modern Sacramento Zoo was explored by both the zoo and the City of Sacramento."

"A 2010 feasibility study, commissioned by the City, delved deeper into the need for zoo relocation and several potential relocation sites within city limits. The study once again determined that a new, much-expanded and modern zoological facility was necessary to secure a viable future for the region's zoo, and all that it stands for."

"Fast-forward to 2018 when, at the City's request, the Sacramento Zoo contracted to have an updated feasibility study done that would again examine the need and the potential for relocation and a reimagination of the Sacramento Zoo people have known and loved for generations."

*"**The future of the Sacramento Zoo is predicated on obtaining a site large enough to accommodate 21st-Century standards for animal welfare and conservation, meeting the expectations of today's visitors and of course, providing access to adequate parking**. Among other things, such a site will allow for the return of some of the iconic animal species that the zoo has had to say farewell to over the years as these animal welfare standards have evolved. These key species, and providing space to accommodate their needs, is paramount to the Sacramento Zoo's ability to fulfill its mission, realize its vision and become a premier destination for tourists, as well as a source of pride for local residents."*

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide these comments. I look forward to the Applicant's responses to the community's concerns.

Sincerely,

ED PEREZ

From: Erica Romero
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena Reuse
Date: Thursday, March 28, 2019 2:47:16 PM

Good Afternoon:

As a resident, and voter, in Natomas, I would like to weigh in on the arena reuse proposal. When the Kings left for downtown, residents were assured something big would come in and replace the arena. We watched as the City courted a hospital...in downtown, not Natomas. Now the Kings are proposing more high density housing and small businesses? They didn't need to wait this many years for that, and quite frankly that isn't big or innovative.

As I understand it, the Zoo needs space to expand, and abide by regulations to maintain their accreditation. Why don't we instead use the old arena for a fantastic zoo? I may not have children but many in the area do, and there isn't much family friendly activities in our area.

Instead of giving the Kings what they want, let's do what is right by residents.

Thank you,
Erica M. Romero
531 Greg Thatch Circle
Sacramento, CA 95835
916-248-9534

From: Mrs Ruvi
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:24:01 PM

Good afternoon,

I'm writing to express my thoughts about the Sacramento Kings Proposal for the now-defunct Sleep Train Arena. As a resident and parent of Natomas I continue to have many concerns about the Natomas neighborhood and future plans. I have 4 children, who attend school on 3 different campuses - grade school, middle school, and high school. In about a year Centene will be bringing in 5,000 commuters every morning and it sits between my home, and our high school. Our infrastructure isn't built in any way to keep up with the development. When I hear about 2,000 homes going in the Arena proposal, in addition to thousands more on some outdoor mecca which was proposed for the El Centro land, plus the other 3,000 going in near the airport, plus the Beazer development taking place on W. El Camino, I'd like to ask where are the new schools being built, and how soon will they be ready to take these students?

I am well aware of the housing crisis, but building all these new homes and apartments is not going to make a dent in the housing crisis because the cost of living in a brand new development is too high for those currently without homes.

Now that I've expressed my feelings, what Natomas severely lacks is family entertainment. Other than the movie theater what can I do with my family in Natomas? We have to travel to the other side of town (i.e. Roseville, Rancho Cordova) for any birthday parties, miniature golfing, bowling, roller skating, etc. Where can my teenagers hang out with their friends on a Saturday evening? All I ever hear about is homes and corporate complexes and more shopping. Why don't we focus on filling our empty stores, before we build more?

Concerned Natomas Residents,
Eduardo & Tiffany Ruvalcaba
916-591-0596

From: Eunice
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Old ARCO arena site
Date: Sunday, March 17, 2019 6:44:56 AM

Hello, I oppose a retail site. We need Sacramento to be more of a destination site. Having the zoo at this location allows for more space and a better zoo. So close to 2 high schools will also give teens opportunity to view different career avenues and give them something to do besides shopping. With the creation of the aquatic center nearby this will just add to a family friendly rich environment. The zoo will create a better community, shopping will not.

Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Elizabeth Wood
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Old Arco Arena
Date: Saturday, March 16, 2019 10:25:30 PM

Good evening -

I would like to add my voice to the idea that the old Arco Arena site in Natomas be developed into something other than commercial space and high density housing. As a family of 5, we would love to see the Sacramento Zoo added to this space - it would be wonderful for all the families of Sacramento.

Natomas does not need more apartments or housing developments. The schools are overcrowded and the district is stalling plans to build the one and neighborhood elementary school in the Westlake/Westshore area although thousands of new homes have been built.

Natomas is close to downtown, has great freeway access, lots of local restaurants and other businesses - it would be a perfect location for all of Sacramentans to enjoy the zoo.

Please consider these issues as the city moves to approve plans for that area.

Thank you,
Elizabeth Wood

From: EY
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Former Kings Arena site
Date: Saturday, March 16, 2019 10:25:44 PM

Hello,

I would like to recommend needed recreational activities for preteen and teens at this Natomas site. There are not many options for recreation for preteens and teens here in Natomas. Roseville, Elk Grove have many more options for recreation for our youth.

It would be great to put in an indoor sports complex, bowling facility, ninja warrior-type obstacle training course, trampoline park, youth-focused movie theaters, laser tag, TopGolf type facility, miniature golf, and food complex for our youth. Better yet, an art/science/STEM/natural history type museum for them to explore.

The zoo idea would be great as well...something like the one near Palm Springs or San Diego safari park. Gosh, even Fresno's Zoo has more open spaces for animals than the Sacramento Zoo. However, there still needs to be more activities to keep our youth positively engaged in this community!

Sincerely,
Eileen Yamada
Natomas resident

Sent from my iPhone

From: EY
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas plan
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 3:54:57 PM

If the options proposed, I support the zoo.

Eileen Yamada
2100 Riggs Ave
Sacramento Ca95835

Sent from my iPhone

From: Farah Arsala
To: Scott Johnson
Date: Thursday, March 21, 2019 10:29:43 AM

We need an Hospital which is one of PRIORITY...PLEASE PAY ATTENTION ON THIS. THANK YOU.

From: Greg Brushwyler
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Future of Sleep Train Arena site
Date: Saturday, March 30, 2019 8:55:32 PM

As a Sacramento resident (and North Natomas) resident since February 2000, I am writing to oppose the Sacramento Kings' plan for the Sleep Train Arena site. North Natomas does not need more housing and commercial space on this site. There are currently thousands of housing developments being built in Natomas and the surrounding areas and our shopping centers and office complexes have had vacant spaces for many years.

In 2015, the Kings promised to do something special with the arena site, not just sell of the land to build homes, yet that is exactly what their "grand" plan is. Adding 2,000 housing units along Truxel would add more traffic and pollution, increase commute times and decrease our quality of life.

In the fight to keep the Kings in Sacramento, the city gifted the land to the Kings, and now the Kings are trying to drive the the value of that land by rezoning it for residential use. Let's hold them to their word and bring something great to the old arena site!

The hope for those of us that live in Natomas was that we would see something that would benefit our community, such as a hospital or medical center. Since that didn't come to fruition, The Sacramento Zoo has a plan to move to create a world class zoo to this site. A zoo there would bring more revenue to the city, benefit the UC Davis veterinary program, and become a premier destination for Northern California.

Thank you.

Greg Brushwyler

From: jaws319230
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Redevelopment
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 2:14:44 PM

Good Afternoon,

I am writing to Express my concern about additional apartment complexes in the North Natomas area. There are already so many complexes in the area we need to build more single family homes instead. I am concerned that more apartments will lower home values and drive people out of the area. Please consider this when approving the new Redevelopment.

Thanks,

George

From: Gregory Heilner
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena Site Proposal
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 11:46:21 AM

Good Afternoon,

Im writing to strongly oppose the proposed Arena reuse plan as submitted by the Sacramento Kings. This plan does not take into account the unique opportunity that Sacramento has before it. So rare is the opportunity to make something special for our city in an are so close to downtown. We (as a city) have already swung and missed on the railyards, it would be a shame to miss another opportunity to make this area a statement destination for our city. The Sacramento Zoo has made it clear in recent months that it needs a new location in order to transform itself into the world-class location it longs to be. As a resident of Natomas for over 16 years, I would welcome a neighbor such as the Sacramento Zoo in this location. The Natomas area has been subjected to so many unfulfilled promises during its short existence, and the Zoo would be a refreshing change to the empty shopping centers and unfilled warehouse locations. I implore you to consider alternative proposals to the one suggested by the Sacramento Kings for the Arena site.

Thank you,

Greg Heilner
916-595-1308

From: Gene Lam
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 2:47:27 PM

Hi Scott,

Hope this finds you well. As a resident of North Natomas, there is nothing more we would love to see than a community that attracts others to visit. Moving the Sacramento Zoo seems to make the most sense to bring excitement and much needed recognition to the area. The positive financial impact a zoo will bring, not only to the site itself, but surrounding businesses in Natomas will be significant. We don't need more residential structures, such as apartments, condos or houses. Our morning commute is already congested, I'm not sure adding 2000+ more homes is the answer to easing the traffic during peak commute hours and our class sizes at schools are already at maximum capacity, this will affect the quality of education for all students across the board. I hope our comments/suggestions don't fall on deaf ears, we pay high taxes to live in the area, so I hope we have a voice that will be heard. Thank you for taking time to read my email.

Concerned Natomas Resident,
Gene Lam

From: HARWINDER BAL
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: #wewantazoo
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 4:50:41 PM

I am a Natomas resident and would like a zoo in the old arena site.

Harwinder Bal

Sent from my iPhone

From: Helena Frazier
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco area plans
Date: Sunday, March 24, 2019 9:13:40 PM

I propose a mercy hospital. Many people in south natomas not only have to commute far to other hospitals that are Kaiser. Some of us don't have Kaiser and don't want Kaiser. If we could have something like a mercy or a satyr something that covers our plan. Think about it it works it's not like you can put in the more fast food restaurants over there we have plenty of those but if you think about it works it's a lot of land. We don't need any dental offices or any type of offices were building plenty of those already I know a lot of us are probably saying more jobs or Trader Joe's or things like that but I rather do something that helps most people.
Best regards, Helena Frazier

From: Holly Hein
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena Land
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:42:49 PM

Hello!

As a Natomas resident of nearly 16 years, I beg you to reconsider the current plan to add more houses and retail to Natomas. We need something more beneficial to the community. Something more beneficial to Sacramento! I like the plan to relocate the Sacramento Zoo! I feel that this is something that will bring purpose to Natomas and purpose to our city. With our proximity to UC Davis Veterinary School, this could be an amazing partnership! Please look at the Sac Zoo proposal for the Arena site! We deserve better than more high density housing and retail.

Thanks!

Holly Hein
Please excuse the typos
Sent from my iPhone

From: Hami Kitsuda
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: zoo
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 11:49:37 AM

To Whom it May Concern,
>
> I've lived in Natomas for the past 14 years. I've seen it grow, stop, then grow again. Please improve our locality with a zoo, we do not need anymore housing. With new housing, you will need more schools, and more law enforcements. Please help our community obtain a zoo. Location is key, and Natomas is perfect.
>
> Sincerely,
> The Kitsuda Family
>
> Sent from my iPhone

From: Howard Knudsen
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: I support a Zoo in Natomas at former Sleep Train Area
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 10:53:15 AM

Hello;

My wife and I, residents of North Natomas, support a zoo at the former Sleep Train Arena.

--
-Howard Knudsen CPA
Dr Sunny Xiang PhD
775-240-4216
401 Barnhart Cir, Sacramento, CA 95835

From:	Erica Castillo
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	FW: Expansion of the Sacramento Zoo
Date:	Tuesday, April 2, 2019 9:55:25 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Sunday, March 31, 2019 10:34 PM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Expansion of the Sacramento Zoo

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** HELEN MOREY <helenemorey@msn.com>
> **Date:** March 29, 2019 at 2:32:18 PM PDT
> **To:** "aashby@cityofsacramento.org" <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Expansion of the Sacramento Zoo**
>
> Dear Councilmember Ashby,
>
> This email is in support of finding a location to expand and improve the Sacramento Zoo. We are residents of Heritage Park, in your district. We have recently visited the San Diego Zoo, again, and as always, are impressed with it. We would love to see a zoo of that caliber in Sacramento. Beside being a great visitor asset to our city, it would serve to educate and inspire an interest in animals, worldwide, in our residents and especially, our young people. Helen grew up in SF. and frequently visited the zoo there. It has resulted in a lifelong interest in animals, ecology and the environment.
> We would appreciate your support in this endeavor as we feel it would be a benefit to all (including the animals).
>
> Thank you for your attention to this important subject.
>
> Paul and Helen Morey
> 180 Mill Valley Cir. N.
> Sacramento, Ca.

From: Heliodoro Santiago
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco Arena proposal /Sacramento Zoo
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 12:01:43 PM

To whom it may concern,
I am a life long resident of Natomas my father worked at Arco man a days and nights I spent at events making memories. It was the premier place to be in all the city as far as I was concerned as a child. I would like to see that area used for something that would bring shock and awe and lasting memories to the next generation on Natomas/Sacramento residents. I strongly am against new housing in that area. As you know many new residential buildings are going up all over natomas with many more thousands planned we have restaurants that sit vacant sometimes now that we don't have the arena to draw crowds to our part of the city. I think bringing a new vibrant and expanded Sacramento Zoo can really deliver an economic boom to the city and Natomas if the area is used properly. With the Zoo's 500,000 annual visitors how many more can we add with an updated zoo site. Many families travel to Oakland, San Diego, or the San Francisco zoo to experience exhibits that the current Sacramento zoo can't have do to space constraints. I hope you would earnestly consider making Sacramento/Natomas a premier destination for families near and far and a reason for the all generations to say. Have you been to Sacramento yet they have a phenomenal zoo and let's hope they love the rest of our fair city once they visit. Thank you for taking the time to listen to a resident who is invested in wanting to see the best version or Natomas/Sacramento on display for CA and the world to see.
Sent from my iPhone

From: Inderpal Biring
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep train arena
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 5:59:44 PM

Hello,

My name is Inderpal Biring and I have been a resident of North Natomas for the last nine years. I have two young children who are elementary school aged.

My concerns about having housing development to take over the area were sleep train arena are the following:

1. With more people projected to live and move into Natomas, our already impacted schools will become more overcrowded. What we need is more schools, smaller classrooms, more teachers.

2. More apartments in North Natomas means bringing down the values of our homes.

3. More apartments or " temporary housing," creates a feeling of "bedroom community," rather than a family community, where people invest in homes to stay long term.

4. More housing in that area At sleep train arena also means more traffic a longer commute times to get from one side of Natomas to the other.

5. A zoo will still be able to bring in revenue as well as jobs into our community without giving the feel that Natomas is becoming more of a "bedroom community."

I hope that you take all of these factors into consideration.

Sincerely,
Inderpal Biring
5888 DaVinci Way
Sacramento, 95835

From: Irene Llavata
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena reuse
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 9:52:50 PM

Hello,

We think a Kaiser Hospital or Costco would be great in that area.

Thank you,
Mr Mrs Frank Llavata

Sent from my iPhone

From: Irene Llavata
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena reuse
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 9:55:48 PM

Hello again,

Another idea would be to put in a Bank if the West at the arena area.

Thank you,

Mr Mrs Frank Llavata

Sent from my iPhone

From: Irene Ogbonna
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Zoo, Yes!
Date: Saturday, March 30, 2019 2:26:56 PM

Please consider the Zoo proposal favorably. Sleep Train Arena already has good freeway access and sufficient roads were built to accommodate basketball fan access so Zoo visitors are already accomodated. There is already sufficient parking at the abandoned arena site. It is close to Sacramento International Airport for distant visitors, and Natomas could really use a world class amenity like a spacious, state-of-the-art zoo to compliment the area. Please use the abandoned arena site to build something that benefits the entire Sacramento region. We could really use the arena site to boost visits to our region. Soon we will have a redeveloped waterfront in Old Sacramento and a Natomas Zoo would be a great additional attraction to bring visitor dollars to Sacramento.

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From: John Andre
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Investing in natomas
Date: Saturday, March 23, 2019 8:32:18 AM

As a brand new resident of natomas, on
e commerce, right in front of the arena,
I vote for the zoo to move here, out of their crowded space in land park
Easy access to businesses, like restaurants, hotels, and the freeways
This property has sat idle long enough.
I urge you to work together, in a businesslike manner, to bring the zoo to this area
John Andre
Brand New resident to Natomas
916 517 8005

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From:	Erica Castillo
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	FW: Sacramento Zoo
Date:	Friday, March 29, 2019 10:26:09 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 9:53 AM
To: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Sacramento Zoo

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Jackie Arrington <jackie2654@gmail.com>
> **Date:** March 28, 2019 at 12:13:11 AM PDT
> **To:** MPT Ashby <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Sacramento Zoo**
>
> Hi , I would like to see the Sleep Train Arena area be the new site for the Sacramento Zoo. We could have a zoo that reflects the World Class Zoo this city needs and would bring the kind of business that the city wants at attract, families.
> I live in Natomas and feel this fits into the neighborhood.
> Please forward this to our mayor Darryl Steinberg.
> Jackie Arrington
> 2654 Heritage Park Lane
> Sacramento, Ca.95835
> 916-515-1753

From: Judy Alsop
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: North Natomas Zoo not apartments
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 4:11:09 PM

Hello,
I have lived in North Natomas since 2004 and have seen many changes in our neighborhood. I would love to have the Sacramento Zoo in our community and I am against the addition of the numerous apartments. I wanted to let my opinion be heard.

Thank very much,
Judith Alsop
1785 Harwood Way
Sacramento, CA 95835
916 285-6518
jaalsop@comcast.net

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From: Jason Bariel
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Proposed arena development
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 5:31:06 PM

Good afternoon,
My name is Jason Bariel. I live at 1592 Golden Cypress Way in North Natomas.
My family and I support some kind of recreation facility for families. The zoo would be a great option. My daughter's sports club (Olympus sports coluseum) where she plays volleyball is being forced out by marijuana growers. Kids need more places to recreate not less! Fewer ways to ruin their lives not more.

We recently moved from Woodland and crime here is terrible. It really is shocking. Anything not bolted down gets stolen, our neighbors car windows were busted out (I have it on video), people are constantly cruising by at 2,3,4 am looking in windows and on porches for stuff to steal.

The last thing we need is MORE high density housing. Del Paso traffic is already ridiculous.

From: JAYMES BUTLER
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena Reuse Plan
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 5:14:21 PM

Hello,

I'm a resident of Natomas Park for 14 years & a fire captain for the City of Sacramento for 25 years. I strongly oppose the proposed Arena reuse plan as submitted by the Sacramento Kings. The plan does not take into account the city resources (fire & police) that hasn't kept up with the growth of the city. The Sacramento Zoo has made it clear that it is in need of a new location in order to maintain its accreditation & is unable to expand its 13 acres in Land Park. Natomas is slowly fulfilling its promise with a Fortune 500 company, infill projects (hotels, commercial, residential) & community/aquatic center in the regional park. The Sacramento Zoo/Safari Park (180 acres) would be a welcome addition & a destination for all the surrounding areas. Please consider the Sacramento Zoo/Safari Park over reuse plan suggested by the Sacramento Kings for the Arena site.

Thank you,

Jaymes Butler

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: New zoo
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:27:05 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:04 AM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: New zoo

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Janelle Cameron <janelleshara@gmail.com>
> **Date:** March 25, 2019 at 4:16:43 PM PDT
> **To:** aashby@cityofsacramento.org
> **Subject: New zoo**
>
> Council member Ashby,
>
> I'm writing as resident of North Natomas, an educator, and a mom.
>
> My family and I recently purchased a home in Westlake after renting for a few years, and in that time, we've come to really enjoy the neighborhood. Thank you for the annual Santa visits- they are a hit with all three of our kids and foster a great sense of community.
>
> *Regarding the Zoo*
> With both the pending plans for Arco Arena's future use and the upcoming proposal for the zoo to expand, I would like to add my voice to the many already making the case for an updated zoo. We are currently members of the zoo and appreciate the opportunity to learn about animals from all over the world through the many dedicated employees and volunteers of the Sacramento Zoo.
>
> However, the zoo is in need of updated facilities for the animals. It's sad to see the big cats, giraffes, and apes all confined to such small exhibits. I know that the zoo will not be able to maintain these popular animals and others in their current setting, and it would be a tragedy for our city to see the zoo decline or even close as it parts with its featured animals.

We previously lived in Fresno, which recently enlarged its zoo and I believe it to be one of the best I have ever visited due to the large enclosures for the animals and the incorporated visitor areas. Surely we can do better than Fresno! And the old arena is the perfect spot to add something to Natomas other than more housing.

I hope you support the zoo's proposal to expand so that we can add an even more appealing attraction to this great city.

Thank you.

--
Janelle Cameron

From: JC Meza
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Fwd: Proposed development for Natomas Arena
Date: Saturday, March 16, 2019 7:57:38 PM

>
> Good evening,
>
> I would love to see the old arena be developed to Sacramento's new zoo. Creating a state of the art zoo that consists of music and art, tying in fine dining bringing in locally grown produce. Being so close to the airport, ease of access to the freeway, abundant parking, hotels being built left and right; the zoo would be an attraction for thousands and millions of people. I look forward to seeing this come into fruition.
>
> Thank you for your time! Love the growth Sacramento is getting. Let's get Natomas part of this success.
>
> Best regards,
> JC Meza
>
>
> Sent from my iPhone

From: Davis, Jordan
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas arena site Sacramento Kings Proposal
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:28:14 PM

Dear sirs,

I am a homeowner in Natomas and am writing to express my strong opposition to the current proposal from the Sacramento Kings for the proposed Arena reuse plan. The area is already choking on seemingly endless housing units with new units under construction in various locations throughout North Natomas. There are dozens of retail sites in Natomas with empty store fronts already. It makes very little sense to use this space to just produce more the same thing Natomas is already filled, much of which is not yet used to capacity. The proposed plan is not the answer that Natomas nor the city of Sacramento need at all. The site should instead be used for something more unique that provides a benefit to the citizens of Sacramento beyond more of the same endless suburban sprawl we already have.

My most favored idea for the space is as the location for a relocated and expanded Sacramento Zoo. The existing Zoo has outgrown its current location and needs additional space to expand and thrive. A world class zoo is something that only a handful of cities can claim to have and an expanded Zoo could serve to further make Sacramento a destination for people from throughout the region to visit.

Another alternative that would be preferable to yet more population dense housing and strip mall retail would be for a more upscale retail experience – whether that be something like a Galleria style mall or something smaller similar to The Fountains in Roseville or El Dorado Town Center in El Dorado Hills. Currently regional residents bypass Sacramento and head into Placer and El Dorado County for these types of shopping experiences and having something similar in the Sacramento City limits would beneficial for both revenue and reputation.

I urge you to please use this unique opportunity to help shape Natomas into something more than an endless sprawl of housing and strip malls - please embrace this chance to do something unique and special for our northern Sacramento neighborhood. Please be leaders of vision and find an alternate proposal to the flawed, and boring, plan currently proposed by the Sacramento Kings for the arena site.

Jordan Davis
Natomas Resident
5578 Dalhart Way, Sacramento, CA 95835

From: J. Deems
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: We Want A Zoo In Notomas At the Old Arco Arena
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 3:14:22 PM

Hello my name is Jonathan Deems, as a tax paying voter within Sacramento, I fully approve all measures to acquire the land from the Kings and to put in a zoo that this area, and ultimately, the city of Sacramento deserves. Thank you.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: josilii
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Relocation of Zoo
Date: Monday, March 25, 2019 4:34:27 PM

My husband and I live at Heritage Park in Natomas, and want to add our names in favor of having the Zoo relocated here. We are not in favor of more apartments, etc., but would love the Zoo.

Thank You!

JoAnn & Don Silva
42 Dunswood Place
Sacramento, CA 95835

From: Justina Erpelding
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 11:58:22 AM

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed Arena Reuse Plan as submitted by the Sacramento Kings. This plan does not take into account the unique opportunity that Sacramento has before it. So rare is the opportunity to make something special for our city in an are so close to downtown. We, as a city, have already swung and missed on the rail yards, it would be a shame to miss another opportunity to make this area a statement destination for our city.

The Sacramento Zoo has made it clear in recent months that it needs a new location in order to transform itself into the world-class location it longs to be. As a resident of Natomas for over 9 years, I would welcome a neighbor such as the Sacramento Zoo in this location. The Natomas area has been subjected to so many unfulfilled promises during its short existence, and the Zoo would be a refreshing change to the empty shopping centers and unfilled warehouse locations. I implore you to consider alternative proposals to the one suggested by the Sacramento Kings for the Arena site.

Thank you,

Justina Erpelding

From: jfong
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:32:20 PM

I am opposed to the redevelopment of Arco Arena into more high density housing. Businesses and restaurants left Natomas since the exodus of the arena. Our once promising neighborhood is now a farm of high density track homes harvested for taxes. Not to mention the lack of schools, public transportation and police protection. We were promised a new, enticing attraction. Not more of what we already have-- an over abundance of apartments, property crime, hotels, fast food, zero-lot-line housing and abandoned shopping centers.

We want a Zoo!
Or the next best thing-- which is definitely not outlined in the Planning Entitlement Application.

A concerned neighbor,
Jinnelle Fong
130 Bankside Way
Sacramento, CA 95835

From: John Franklin
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: #WeWantAZoo in North Natomas
Date: Sunday, March 17, 2019 7:09:17 PM

We would appreciate you responding positively to our, the residents of North Natomas, request.

From:	joanne
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	Angelique Ashby
Subject:	North Natomas Infill Redevelopment PUD (File No. P18-077)
Date:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 5:10:24 PM

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I am writing you about the Planning Entitlement Application for the project titled "North Natomas Infill Redevelopment PUD" submitted by Jeffrey K. Dorso on behalf of SBH Natomas LLC filed on 11/08/2018. I have concerns about the project which intends to create more commercial, residential, and mixed use developments in an area already burgeoning with the same (current as well as prospective construction) throughout the surrounding area of North Natomas. Upon leaving Arco Arena to build Golden 1 the Sacramento Kings ensured the residents of North Natomas that there would be transformative reuse of the development area, not the usual residential and commercial mix. This proposal does not fulfill that intention. This proposal is quite disappointing as a North Natomas resident. The ratio between commercial and residential is concerning - it includes too much potential for housing - and didn't seem to be the original interest for the space. The residential density of the proposal is significantly higher than the rest of Natomas, and will be an added strain on the major transportation corridors already congested.

I hope you will consider these concerns such that the proposal can be revised to adjust the applicant's designated proposed land use (as shown in Table 1; attached for your convenience) to 1) better balance commercial and residential use, 2) decrease the density of the residential use parcels, and 3) adequate consideration of transportation planning for major streets.I am uncertain of the status of the General Plan amendment for the current designation and zoning of this site. But regardless of the General Plan status, it would be desirable for the applicant to engage/contact the neighborhood project area for the input in this application.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Joanne Graham
Nathan Hitzeman
(North Natomas Residents)

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: North Natomas Infill Redevelopment PUD (File No. P18-077)
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:28:53 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:16 AM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: North Natomas Infill Redevelopment PUD (File No. P18-077)

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** joanne <jmg0123@gmail.com>
> **Date:** March 20, 2019 at 5:09:51 PM PDT
> **To:** srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org
> **Cc:** Angelique Ashby <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: North Natomas Infill Redevelopment PUD (File No. P18-077)**
>
> Dear Mr. Johnson,
>
> I am writing you about the Planning Entitlement Application for the project titled "North Natomas Infill Redevelopment PUD" submitted by Jeffrey K. Dorso on behalf of SBH Natomas LLC filed on 11/08/2018. I have concerns about the project which intends to create more commercial, residential, and mixed use developments in an area already burgeoning with the same (current as well as prospective construction) throughout the surrounding area of North Natomas. Upon leaving Arco Arena to build Golden 1 the Sacramento Kings ensured the residents of North Natomas that there would be transformative reuse of the development area, not the usual residential and commercial mix. This proposal does not fulfill that intention. This proposal is quite disappointing as a North Natomas resident. The ratio between commercial and residential is concerning - it includes too much potential for housing - and didn't seem to be the original interest for the space. The residential density of the proposal is significantly higher than the rest of Natomas, and will be an added strain on the major transportation corridors already congested.
>
> I hope you will consider these concerns such that the proposal can be revised to adjust the applicant's designated proposed land use (as shown in Table 1; attached for your convenience) to 1) better balance commercial and residential use, 2) decrease the density of the residential use parcels, and 3) adequate consideration of transportation planning for major streets.I am uncertain of the status of the General Plan amendment for the current designation and zoning of this site. But regardless of the General Plan status, it would be desirable for the applicant to engage/contact the neighborhood project area for the input in this application.
>
> Thank you for your time.
>
> Sincerely,
> Joanne Graham
> Nathan Hitzeman
> (North Natomas Residents)

Table 1 sets forth a set of development scenario for the PUD Area that will be utilized in the environmental review of the entitlement set.

TABLE 1
North Natomas Infill Redevelopment Planned Unit Development
Development Assumptions

Parcel	Approximate Land Area In Acres	Land Use	Efficiency assumes 20% to 30% roads/other: Avg. 25%	Net Residential Acres	Net Commercial Acres	Density	FAR	Units	Gross Floor Area (sf)
A	12	Commercial	9.3		9.3		0.7		282,716
B	40	Commercial	30.1		30.1		0.6		787,910
C	17	Mixed-Use Comm'l/Resi	12.6	6.3	6.3	35	0.4	221	109,975
D	46	Residential	34.5	34.5		20		690	
E	29	Residential	22.1	22.1		50		1,106	
ROW	38	Major Streets							
TOTAL	**183**		**109**	**63**	**46**			**up to 2,017**	**up to 1,180,601**
		Total Net Developable Area	109						
		Total Roads/OS/Other	7						
		% NDA / Total Land Area	59%						

From:	Jen Gross
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Build a zoo
Date:	Monday, April 1, 2019 8:51:42 AM

Greetings Mr. Johnson,

As someone who used to live in the North Natomas area and currently works in the South Natomas region, I am urging the city to consider using the former Sleep Train Area space as a new location for the Sacramento Zoo.

The North Natomas region needs something educational and family oriented as its shining star. With the moratorium on building lifting, there is no shortage of new construction in the area. The freeways are already congested on the 5 corridor, so adding to that already large population will only turn that stretch into something that rivals our LA counterparts.This was part of the reason we left that town.

Natomas needs something fantastic. Otherwise it'll just be crammed housing and strip malls full of empty storefronts because rent is too high.

Jen Gross
Venture Oaks Way, Sacramento CA 95833

From: James Huffman
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train arena project
Date: Saturday, March 23, 2019 8:47:42 AM

Hello my name is James Huffman, long time voting resident of North Natomas. I would like to go on record as opposing any development of the Arena area that includes housing and retail shops. North Natomas area already has multiple housing developments and empty retail locations. I am in favor of the Zoo, or other development that would enhance, our community. Thanks Jim

From:	John Kessler
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	"gREGG CORDAS"; Douglas Cole (douglasacole62@gmail.com); Karen Landwehr
Subject:	THE ZOO should come to NATOMAS
Date:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 5:53:09 PM

Scott,

We can't lose our ZOO!

Natomas doesn't need another BAZILLION homes built in our backyard.

I vote to bring the Sacramento ZOO to the old Arco Arena lot. Tear that aging structure down and create a new zoo experience – something with REAL VALUE for our community!

Johnny Kessler
Change, Communication and Program Development Specialist

Retirement Readiness
California State Teachers' Retirement System
jkessler@calstrs.com | CalSTRS.com
916-414-**6831**
Mailing address: P. O. Box 15275, Sacramento, CA 95851-0275
Stay Connected on Social Media

From: Joleane King
To: Scott Johnson
Cc: Angelique Ashby
Subject: Arena Re-use proposals
Date: Monday, March 25, 2019 10:37:36 PM

I urge our City Council to continue to search for a mixed use zoning for the former arena lands for commercial/light industrial: whatever zone that can support state or corporate offices, research facilities and/or education.

Please do not approve multifamily housing, as the arena property is already surrounded/engulfed by more than enough apartment/condo complexes.

Thanks for listening!

Joleane King
2635 Heritage Park Lane
Sacramento, CA 95835

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Arena Re-use proposals
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:26:25 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:02 AM
To: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Arena Re-use proposals

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Joleane King <joleanek@gmail.com>
> **Date:** March 25, 2019 at 10:37:28 PM PDT
> **To:** srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org
> **Cc:** Angelique Ashby <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Arena Re-use proposals**
>
> I urge our City Council to continue to search for a mixed use zoning for the former arena lands for commercial/light industrial: whatever zone that can support state or corporate offices, research facilities and/or education.
>
> Please do not approve multifamily housing, as the arena property is already surrounded/engulfed by more than enough apartment/condo complexes.
>
> Thanks for listening!
>
> Joleane King
> 2635 Heritage Park Lane
> Sacramento, CA 95835

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Arena Re-use proposals
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:26:57 AM

From: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:04 AM
To: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: RE: Arena Re-use proposals

Thanks for forwarding! Erica and I are going to begin a folder w/all arena re-use correspondence.

Best Regards,

Karina Talamantes
Office of Mayor Pro Tem Angelique Ashby, City of Sacramento | Council District 1
Chief of Staff |
City Hall 915 "I" Street | Sacramento, CA 95814 |
direct 916.808.7339 | **main** 916.808.7001 | **fax** 916.264.7680 |
ktalamantes@cityofsacramento.org | www.AngeliqueAshby.com

City of SACRAMENTO
Councilmember Angelique Ashby

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:02 AM
To: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Arena Re-use proposals

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Joleane King <joleanek@gmail.com>
> **Date:** March 25, 2019 at 10:37:28 PM PDT
> **To:** srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org
> **Cc:** Angelique Ashby <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Arena Re-use proposals**

I urge our City Council to continue to search for a mixed use zoning for the former arena lands for commercial/light industrial: whatever zone that can support state or corporate offices, research facilities and/or education.

Please do not approve multifamily housing, as the arena property is already surrounded/engulfed by more than enough apartment/condo complexes.

Thanks for listening!

Joleane King
2635 Heritage Park Lane
Sacramento, CA 95835

From:	Julie Li
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Proposal for Sleep Train Arena Space
Date:	Tuesday, April 2, 2019 8:04:26 PM

To whom it may concern:

Please register the collective opinions of Natomas residents who do NOT want the Sacramento Zoo to relocate to the Sleep Train Arena space. There have been multiple ideas I've stumbled upon that are of a better use for the building, e.g. **a hospital**, and/or a safe recreational facility for the public to use.

For transparency, could your team publically publish the ideas that have been submitted?

Thanks,
Julie Li

From: J Account
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas arena reuse
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 5:21:07 PM

Rather than running around the project's perimeter, the rt alignment should run through the property to reduce the sharp turns and increase passenger access. The alignment needs to be decided before building permits get approved. The reuse needs to be an economic engine.

All Transportation modes need to be considered to reduce reliance on automobiles. Less roads increases water absorption, more active citizens, safer seats and more profitable land use. There needs to have recreation and education opportunities as well.

Plan on reducing flood risks rather relying on current infrastructure to prevent floods.

Make the redeveloped area merge and connect with the city, airport, community park, and shopping.

If relocating the zoo here is to be considered, animal relocation plans need to be developed for flood potential.

Joseph McDole
North Natomas resident since 1980

From: jeff mitchell
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: sleep train
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 3:21:29 PM

Dear Mr Johnson,

i think the most cost effective course of action with Sleep train property Is to keep in its current form . First thought is a new home for the Stockon Kings. renovation of the property will be at a Minimum and remain In the Kings family without the messy details of realestate transactions .It could also be Utilized as venue for Local sports, arts an entertainment. It would be a constant source of revenue and provide employment year round.

Thanks for listening

Jeff Mitchell

From: Jonathan Mortensen
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleeptrain arena rezoning
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 1:30:03 PM

Mr Johnson,
As a member of the Sacramento community for 36 years and also becoming a recent father, I would like to express my great support in relocating Sacramento's zoo to the old Sacramento King's arena site. I believe this would be a positive move for Sacramento and for the current and future children of Sacramento.

Thank you,
Jonathan Mortensen

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: RE: Move the Zoo!
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 9:55:53 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 7:23 PM
To: Darrell Steinberg <DSteinberg@cityofsacramento.org>
Cc: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Move the Zoo!

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** judy parker <jllparker@hotmail.com>
> **Date:** April 1, 2019 at 12:10:01 PM PDT
> **To:** "kfrivas@cityofsacramento.org" <kfrivas@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Cc:** "aashby@cityofsacramento.org" <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>, "awarren@cityofsacramento.org" <awarren@cityofsacramento.org>, "jsharris@cityofsacramento.org" <jsharris@cityofsacramento.org>, "shansen@cityofsacramento.org" <shansen@cityofsacramento.org>, "jschenirer@cityofsacramento.org" <jschenirer@cityofsacramento.org>, "rjennings@cityofsacramento.org" <rjennings@cityofsacramento.org>, "lcarr@cityofsacramento.org" <lcarr@cityofsacramento.org>, "eguerra@cityofsacramento.org" <eguerra@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Move the Zoo!**
>
> 1 April 2019
>
> Dear Mayor Steinberg and City Council Members;
>
> As a docent at the Sacramento Zoo, I support expanding and moving the zoo. The zoo is a precious resource for our community, a place where we teach the public about the animals housed there, about conservation and the role we play in the balance of nature, about the importance of protecting the habitats of all animals, and about the environment and how we impact it every day.
>
> Sacramento, as the state capitol, should have a world-class zoo that residents and visitors from all over can enjoy. SacZoo

should be a tourist destination and a new, larger zoo can be designed to not only draw the visitor but also the many thousands of local families and school children. Without this growth, our zoo will be forced to house even fewer animals than it does now in order to meet the high standards of the American Association of Zoos and Aquariums.

Each time I work at the zoo I meet wonderful guests of all ages, including people from Reno, Redding, Modesto and the East Bay who come for the day just to enjoy the zoo. I work with Zoo Previews, where Kindergarten, First and Second grade classes come for a half-hour introduction to the zoo before venturing out to tour. I also work with Tea and Tours, a program for seniors, which offers a wonderful docent-led tour and light lunch for guests 6 times a year. Of course, all docents work specific animal stations or walk around talking to the public. As a retired teacher, this is the perfect "job" and I love doing it. But we can and should do so much more.

Our future is uncertain. But we know for sure that relocating and building a world-class zoo for California's capitol would benefit our region, attracting more visitors who will not only enjoy the zoo but will also visit other parts of our city and surrounding area. The time is now! We need to move the zoo and make it spectacular!

Thank you for your attention.

Judy Parker – SacZoo Docent, Class of 2014

From: Jeff Pawelczyk
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena in Natomas
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 1:23:23 PM

Hello,

I have lived in Natomas for 19 years and I love the community. Now, as I raise my family here, I would like to see more effort to expand the recreational and entertainment opportunities here in Natomas. This could be bowling centers, expansive indoor play facilities for soccer, baseball, etc..., perhaps a Topgolf, or the world class zoo proposal. The zoo would be my preference as it offers boundless opportunities for our Natomas Unified School District's STEAM focus of education. Please think of improvement to the community and not another set of bedrooms that will travel outside of the city for their entertainment pursuits.

Thank you,

Jeff Pawelczyk

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Jenifer Pearsall
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	We Want a Zoo in Natomas!
Date:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 2:16:27 PM

Hello,

I am writing today to express my family's interest in moving the Sacramento Zoo to the old Sleep Train Arena location in Natomas. My husband and I purchased our home in Natomas in 2001, when there was nothing out here except for the arena and farms. We chose Natomas to buy a home and raise our family because it was not as crowded with housing as other parts of Sacramento. Over the years we have seen a huge increase in housing, retail, restaurants and TRAFFIC CONGESTION. Don't get me wrong, having the retail, restaurants, etc. is nice, but we have enough!!! An increase in homes would only add to the daily congestion on the side streets around Natomas. It already takes almost a half hour just to get down Del Paso Road to get my daughter to school in the morning, when it should only take 10 minutes! Please do not add to the already crowded streets by building more housing.

I just recently helped to put on the 18th Annual Crab Feed Fundraiser for Natomas Charter School's Performing and Fine Arts Academy. My job as Donation Chair was to solicit local businesses for donations, whether through items for our silent auction, the live auction or simply to be used/served at the event. One thing that I noticed when researching places to contact, specifically "Family Fun" places, is that we don't have anything like that in Natomas! We are forced to drive to either Roseville/Rocklin area or Elk Grove for places to go on the weekends with our kids. Natomas is such a wonderful community and is full of families like ours, with children who deserve to have a family friendly place to go that is near us!

The old arena has sat empty for years and the zoo is a perfect use of the space. It is easily accessible, has a large space for the necessary expansion of the zoo, and will bring families from other parts of Sacramento to Natomas, which will also lead to an increase in revenue for the businesses in Natomas.

I hope you will consider moving the zoo to Natomas. Thank you for reading.

Sincerely,

Jenifer Pearsall

From: Jessica Peters
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena site comments
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 1:32:09 PM

Hi. I'm writing to oppose the proposal by the Kings ownership to build housing and commercial space at the old arena site. This will harm our schools, harm our community, cause traffic and generally be negative. Natomas already has many empty store fronts and commercial spaces. This will exacerbate blight in the community. Adding too much housing in this location will overwhelm our school district.

The worst part about the plan is that it totally lacks vision or leadership for what Sacramento and Natomas can become. I believe this space should be turned into a family entertainment district. The zoo should be allowed and helped to relocate to the site and to expand. With the zoo as an anchor other family friendly entertainment options could be added. Maybe the children's museum could relocate and expand? There would be space for a water park, or something like the Crayola Experience or even a small amusement park. In addition fun restaurants could be added like a Rainforest Cafe. Or maybe a bowling alley. Or really any sort of family entertainment would be nice. Our community is a family community but other than a movie theater there are limited family entertainment options. Creating a family entertainment district with the zoo would serve the community and all of Sacramento and would increase our economy by being a tourism draw for families.

Please oppose the Kings reuse plan and support an alternative that has vision and will make our community better.

Jessica Peters
Natomas resident

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Support for zoo relocation
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2019 9:37:43 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 10:39 PM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Support for zoo relocation

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Jessica Peters <jayd_80@att.net>
> **Date:** April 2, 2019 at 1:29:48 PM PDT
> **To:** aashby@cityofsacramento.org
> **Subject: Support for zoo relocation**
>
> Hi. I'm a resident in your district and want to voice my support for the zoo moving to Natomas and expanding. I have submitted comments on the arena EIR and want to follow up to also voice support for the zoo. Please help make the old arena site a premiere family entertainment district starting with the zoo!
>
> Jessica Peters
>
> Sent from my mobile device.

From: Jay Ross
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco arena plan
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 6:28:07 PM

Mr. Johnson,

I am a resident of the Natomas area of Sacramento, and drive by the acres of land that is Arco arena daily. The land is already surrounded by medium and high density housing, and already has traffic and congestion problems.

The last thing we need in this area is more medium and high density housing. For our City of Trees we need more local green use space, and more effective use of the wide space. A much better use of this space would be a mixed use park and a new home for the SAC Zoo.

Place the medium and high density housing in the railyards where it is walking distance to transit and downtown services.

The City already supported the Kings with a new arena, we don't need to let them destroy a neighborhood with too much high density housing.

Jay Ross
11 Java Ct
Sacramento, CA, 95835

From: John Sanborn
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena
Date: Sunday, March 24, 2019 3:05:34 PM

City Leader,

I would like you to do everything you can to support a local attraction (ie Zoo) or Hospital where the current Sleep Train Arena is.
Please take heavy consideration in the total amount of housing coming in to Natomas. While the housing may be needed, it is important to have an infrastructure that can accommodate the growing population.
Trading one destination venue for public gathering and entertainment for more congestion in the form of high density housing (or any housing) is not ideal for what is currently planned for Natomas.

I live in the Westshore area, a brand new development, and the fact that the city is pulling away from community parks in favor of regional parks, allowing builders to slim street development so they can build more homes, and current homes that were built a 3 years ago that still haven't sold are all troubling to me.

John Sanborn
Natomas community member
509-432-4858

Sent from my iPhone

From: Jessie S.
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Former Arena Site
Date: Sunday, March 17, 2019 8:28:04 AM

Me Johnson,

PLEASE, no more high density housing or commercial space in the Arena site in Natomas. I would personally like to see the zoo relocated to that site. An aquarium would also be a nice destination for the Sacramento region. Another option would be something along the lines of Top Golf, a destination where families can get food and play with their families. But please please please, no more housing. I've lived in Natomas for almost 7 years, and there's already enough traffic. Building thousands of new homes in that site will make it much worse. Thank you for your time.
Jessica Silverbrand
Natomas Park resident

From: Julie Slobodnik
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo in North Natomas
Date: Saturday, March 23, 2019 4:34:01 PM

To those whom it may concern,
I would Love a zoo in Natomas. In Natomas there are already so many houses going up and plenty of residents. We don't need more congestion with excess housing, we need something educational like a museum or zoo for our families. It will help bring in business to the Natomas area and give the people of Natomas a spot of pride. Please don't approve more housing, there's already enough of that here.
Thank you,
Julie Slobodnik

From: Jennifer Souza
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco Arena plan
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 10:37:28 AM

I'm in support of this plan as presented, but hope they plan to build several schools. We need another comprehensive high school on the scale of Inderkum and we need more elementary, middle and K-8 schools.

From: Main SBC
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Development Plan
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 9:09:21 PM

Dear Mr. Johnson,

As Natomas Park homeowners for the past 19 years, we strongly oppose the Sacramento King's proposal for the Arena and its surrounding land. The Sacramento Zoo or a unique landmark would boost our culture and enhance our city's appeal. Please listen to Natomas residents like us who have witnessed unoccupied and wasted space time after time in this area.

Thank you,
Jennifer and Tim Akin

From: jannsen tan
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: ARCO ARENA Repurpose into Zoo
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 11:30:25 AM

Greetings! I am a resident of Sundance Lake, Natomas. I would like to give my comment in support of the transformative reuse of the old arco arena into the zoo. When the Kings left, they promised a game changer. They promised a transformative reuse that would not be the same old generic residential and commercial mix. Their current EIR shows a betrayal of that promise. The Kings, as part of the arena deal, obtained public subsidies. We, the citizens of Sacramento kept our end of the bargain. The Kings should uphold their promise as well.

From: JULIE
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco Arena
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 1:54:38 PM

Please give serious consideration to placing the zoo in thus location. We have more than enough housing within the current infrastructure capacity.

JULIE

From:	Jamee Villa
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Scoping Meeting for the Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project
Date:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 11:18:50 AM

Hello,

After reviewing the documents submitted for this project, I was wondering what is the plan for all of the trees at the current site?
Complete removal?
Replanting nearby?
Reuse?

Thank you for your feedback!

Jamee Villa
916.755.8807

From: Kavisa Cyprian Wood
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: We want a zoo
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 10:37:09 AM

Greetings,

Currently the only proposals being discussed for the former Arena in Natomas are more retail and high density housing or a zoo. My family moved from NYC to Sacramento and specifically Natomas to avoid the high density housing and enjoy seeing green space around us. However, Natomas has been building tons of new developments that create a crowded look and remove wide green space. We want a zoo! Not more housing or shopping.

Thanks,
Kavisa

--

K a v i s a C y p r i a n W o o d

"Justice is what love looks like in public." Dr. Cornel West

From: Ken Farrell
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Proposal
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2019 6:52:05 AM

I am in favor of moving the Zoo to the Sleep Train Arena location. I see multiple benefits from this proposal. Most important; the Zoo needs more space for the animals.

Thank You, Ken

From:	karen mcevoy
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Reuse of Sleep Train Arena in Natomas
Date:	Tuesday, April 2, 2019 1:21:31 PM

Hello,

I have lived in North Natomas within sight of the arena for the last 19 years. I am very disappointed that the proposal submitted to the city by the Sacramento Kings for reuse of the arena space is for more retail and housing. When the Kings were lobbying to to move the arena downtown the City of Sacramento council and the Kings promised the residents of Natomas that that a large job creator or equivalent would occupy that space. We currently have a lot of housing being built throughout Natomas and there is still a lot of unoccupied retail space so I don't think the current proposal in a fair plan for our neighborhood .

Most people I speak with would like a large business or medical center in our area. I am also in favor of the proposal circulating to move the Sacramento Zoo to the old arena space it would be ideal for this kind of use as it has large open area and great freeway access.

I strongly urge you to reject the current plan submitted by the Kings organization. I think that our neighborhood deserves better.

Sincerely,

Karen McEvoy
12 McKilt Court
Sacramento, CA 95835

From:	Erica Castillo
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	FW: Opposition to Proposed Rezone of Sleep Train Arena Site
Date:	Friday, March 29, 2019 10:26:19 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 9:57 AM
To: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Opposition to Proposed Rezone of Sleep Train Arena Site

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Karen O'Haire <kohaire@mac.com>
> **Date:** March 27, 2019 at 11:55:26 AM PDT
> **To:** srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org
> **Cc:** Angelique Ashby <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Opposition to Proposed Rezone of Sleep Train Arena Site**
>
> Mr. Johnson,
> I strongly oppose the current proposal to rezone the Sleep Train Arena site for 2,000 residential units, commercial and mixed use development and support locating the Sacramento Zoo expansion at the site. An expanded zoo would be the highest and best use of this property. The zoo will serve as a regional attraction for the city providing jobs, educational and conservation opportunities, and entertainment. In addition, hospitality businesses in the area will prosper as people from outside Sacramento come to visit the zoo. This site's location already contains infrastructure and adequate parking and is located with easy access to three highways and the airport.
> The City gave the Kings the 100 acres the City owned adjacent to the Kings' 85 acre site in Natomas to expedite reuse as part of the 2014 deal to build the downtown arena. As a Natomas resident I was surprised that the City would give city land that would double the developers' property to facilitate reuse. The gift was portrayed as a subsidy to achieve a land use that would benefit Natomas. The developers' proposal to simply provide more housing, commercial, and mixed use does not justify a gift of 100 acres of public land. I urge the City to honor its commitment to Natomas residents and oppose this proposal to rezone the Sleep Train Arena site.
> This land should be developed for the highest and best use that benefits the Natomas residents and the City. Location of an expanded zoo at the site is the highest and best use. An expanded zoo would be a highlight for the City and is a preferred option to more housing, retail and commercial development.

I request that I be added to the interested persons list for this proposal.
Respectfully,
Karen O'Haire
270 Vista Cove Circle
Sacramento, Ca. 95835

From:	Karen O"Haire
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	Angelique Ashby
Subject:	Opposition to Proposed Rezone of Sleep Train Arena Site
Date:	Wednesday, March 27, 2019 11:55:31 AM

Mr. Johnson,

I strongly oppose the current proposal to rezone the Sleep Train Arena site for 2,000 residential units, commercial and mixed use development and support locating the Sacramento Zoo expansion at the site. An expanded zoo would be the highest and best use of this property. The zoo will serve as a regional attraction for the city providing jobs, educational and conservation opportunities, and entertainment. In addition, hospitality businesses in the area will prosper as people from outside Sacramento come to visit the zoo. This site's location already contains infrastructure and adequate parking and is located with easy access to three highways and the airport.

The City gave the Kings the 100 acres the City owned adjacent to the Kings' 85 acre site in Natomas to expedite reuse as part of the 2014 deal to build the downtown arena. As a Natomas resident I was surprised that the City would give city land that would double the developers' property to facilitate reuse. The gift was portrayed as a subsidy to achieve a land use that would benefit Natomas. The developers' proposal to simply provide more housing, commercial, and mixed use does not justify a gift of 100 acres of public land. I urge the City to honor its commitment to Natomas residents and oppose this proposal to rezone the Sleep Train Arena site.

This land should be developed for the highest and best use that benefits the Natomas residents and the City. Location of an expanded zoo at the site is the highest and best use. An expanded zoo would be a highlight for the City and is a preferred option to more housing, retail and commercial development.

I request that I be added to the interested persons list for this proposal.

Respectfully,

Karen O'Haire

270 Vista Cove Circle

Sacramento, Ca. 95835

<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->
<!--[endif]-->

From: Karen Pardieck
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Natomas redo
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 12:13:21 PM

I'd like to see an Aquarium and educational center, comparable to Monterey Bay's or San Francisco.

Thank you. Karen Pardieck
Sent from my iPhone

From: kristymichele@sbcglobal.net
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Future home of Arco Arena
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 8:25:55 AM

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I am writing to share my input for the future home of the current Arco Arena. I moved here to Natomas in 2009, and I love where I live. I would love to see the Sacramento zoo move to this current location, because I believe that it would bring even more to our already amazing community. We do not need anymore housing or apartments!! It would be a perfect location, close to downtown and the airport. It would bring more business to our hotels and restaurants and be a major attraction. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Kristy Patterson

Sent from my iPhone

My name is Kerri Price and I have been a Natomas Resident for 19 years, 17 years in South Natomas and 2 years in North Natomas.

I remember when I first moved to Natomas, I would stop by Perry's "Garden Highway" produce stand on West El Camino. Then the land was sold for development, and I watched on the day that the Perry family house and the produce stand were demolished. Now I'm watching as Beazer builds its 2nd phase of high-density homes in that spot, with the 1st phase directly across Interstate 80 from phase 2.

When Beazer's 1st phase of high-density housing was complete (between I-80 and San Juan Road), I drove through the neighborhood out of curiosity. I immediately felt claustrophobic! Two-story houses piled one on top of each other, with narrow streets and lack of public spaces. The development gave a whole new meaning to "reach out and touch a neighbor", as there was barely room to walk between homes.

Beazer is just one of the companies that received approval to put in housing developments like this all over Natomas. Except for the Natomas Marketplace, the stretch of land between I-5 to the west, Truxel to the east, Arena to the North, and San Juan to the south is currently being built out with high-density housing.

There is a large area of high-density housing on the west side of El Centro, as part of the West Parke neighborhood. There is high-density housing at the north end of El Centro, as part of the Westlake Community. There is high-density housing from H.Allen Hight Middle School all the way out to Macon Drive. There are apartments to still be built along the I-5 freeway between San Juan and Arena.

In addition, there is now the proposed development by the County of the land in the "Y" section where Highway 99 and I-5 split, which was supposed to be reserved as open-air space for the airport. There is also proposed development of the last remaining open farmland along El Centro.

Development is inevitable. And some housing that is more affordable than the standard single-family home is needed too. I believe Natomas residents agree on that. But I also believe that Natomas needs smart, thought-out growth. Homes are being completed at an alarming rate, with no accountability for additional schools, additional roads, public transportation (where's that Light Rail?), and all the other factors that play into large-scale development. I've heard SO many people say, "we don't want Natomas to turn into Elk Grove!"

Natomas does not need another large-scale, high-density housing project. What we do need is a reason for the rest of the greater Sacramento area (and beyond) to visit Natomas. And that reason should be a new, beautiful, large zoo. Sacramento's zoo has served the community well for many, many years. But the need for larger, better facilities is more than long-overdue. The drawings for the new zoo are amazing; benefitting the animals, the hard-working staff, and are in keeping with the Mayor's vision for a "world-class city".

I understand that there are people out there that think zoos are “bad”. And unfortunately, that is true in some cases. But the Sacramento Zoo is one of the great ones, and has the potential to be so much more with a move and expansion. Our Zoo believes in and teaches conservation. Our Zoo protects animals that may be near extinction in the wild, preserving that those animals will be around for future generations. Our Zoo teaches children and adults through classes, camps, tours and school visits.

The Zoo currently offers classes all year long, but one of it’s biggest draws are the summer camps. Zoo camps are wildly popular, but due to space restrictions, only about 1/3 of the kids that want to attend are able to be accepted to the camps. Waitlists are lengthy. A new Zoo in Natomas has the potential to offer more classes, involve more children, hire more people. And to continue the ongoing efforts of the Zoo to protect animals, promote conservation, and teach the public.

Arco Arena benefitted Natomas for a long time. And the new Golden One Arena is wonderful. Natomas already has great residents, great schools, and now it needs a new, great destination. The residents of Natomas DESERVE to be a destination of choice again.

From:	Karen Reichert
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Arena purposal
Date:	Tuesday, March 26, 2019 11:46:24 AM

To whom it may concern,
I would love for the zoo to be in the arena location but if that's not possible I would love to see a huge indoor play area similar to wacky tacky in Natomas. We are a family filled city and for myself, being a stay at home mom, I need more places to take my kids year round. What we have available is not suitable. We only have two indoor play areas for families on Natomas. McDonald's and climbaroo. Neither are sufficient. I believe it could bring in high revenue having something for Natomas families to enjoy. Profit can be made for parties, corporate events etc. I know the overhead can be a bit of an undertaking with liability and all but I believe word of mouth would be worth it.
Please consider these options for the arena space. If not another idea would be a ice skating rink.
Thank you
Karen Reichert

From: Karen Schechter
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Reuse Proposal
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 1:38:37 PM

Good Afternoon,

Im writing to strongly oppose the proposed Arena reuse plan as submitted by the Sacramento Kings. This plan does not take into account the unique opportunity that Sacramento has before it.

So rare is the opportunity to make something special for our city in an are so close to downtown. We (as a city) have already swung and missed on the railyards, it would be a shame to miss another opportunity to make this area a statement destination for our city. The Sacramento Zoo has made it clear in recent months that it needs a new location in order to transform itself into the world-class location it longs to be. As a resident of Natomas for over 14 years, I would welcome a neighbor such as the Sacramento Zoo in this location.

The Natomas area has been subjected to so many unfulfilled promises during its short existence, and the Zoo would be a refreshing change to the empty shopping centers and unfilled warehouse locations. I implore you to consider alternatives to the one suggested by the Sacramento Kings for the Arena site. There is already a plan in place to build more housing near the airport. Natomas does not need to be Roseville or Elk Grove with overcrowding and too much traffic.

If not a Zoo, then some other attraction to allow Sacramento to become the destination city you want it to be. Didn't wait for the flood moratorium to end to become an over populated neighborhood.

Thank you,
Karen Schechter.

From:	K
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	FW: Natomas Arena - Comment Submittal
Date:	Tuesday, March 19, 2019 5:33:59 AM

From: K
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 5:31 AM
To: srjohnson@cityofsacramento.com <srjohnson@cityofsacramento.com>
Cc: Angelique Ashby
Subject: Natomas Arena - Comment Submittal

Hello Mr. Johnson.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment regarding the Natomas Arena Reuse Project. As a North Natomas resident, I wanted to better understand the potential impact of such a large scale change in our community. We benefit greatly from the Regional park, library, new planned aquatic center, etc. however I'm growing in concern with the scale and mix of residential/commercial structures compared to open greenspace/restaurants/small business retail planned for buildout in the reuse project.

It appears from the proposed plan the build out will be very high density construction and population that will likely impact and deviate from the greenspace consistent with the established North Natomas area, traffic congestion & noise pollution are also a growing concern. Also, the need for proportionate resources in our growing area for an emergency hospital, first responders, city maintenance services, and as desired more outdoor attractions for food/restaurants/small business retail/etc. The Downtown Commons is an example of a nice upscale outdoor environment with shops and food options centralized, elevating our local atmosphere for more community, small business, and family engagement. Hopefully, many factors including safe bike lanes or pedestrian/bike bridge over Del Paso, as well as, other creative ideas will be rigorously considered before proceeding with a traditional mixed use residential/commercial solution. Also, incorporating some heritage or legacy of the Kings on the site would be impactful opportunity not to miss (e.g. small youth training center, education center for local kids, business incubator, etc.).

Thank you for listening and appreciate you & your teams contributions.

Best Regards,
Kalpesh Shah
Natomas Resident, Local Business Owner, Natomas Chamber Member
916-252-9848
btygerbar@gmail.com

cc: Angelique Ashby

From:	Erica Castillo
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	FW: Natomas Arena - Comment Submittal
Date:	Friday, March 29, 2019 10:29:37 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:19 AM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Natomas Arena - Comment Submittal

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** K <btygerbar@gmail.com>
> **Date:** March 19, 2019 at 5:31:23 AM PDT
> **To:** "srjohnson@cityofsacramento.com <srjohnson@cityofsacramento.com>" <srjohnson@cityofsacramento.com>
> **Cc:** Angelique Ashby <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Natomas Arena - Comment Submittal**
>
> Hello Mr. Johnson.
>
> Thank you for the opportunity to comment regarding the Natomas Arena Reuse Project. As a North Natomas resident, I wanted to better understand the potential impact of such a large scale change in our community. We benefit greatly from the Regional park, library, new planned aquatic center, etc. however I'm growing in concern with the scale and mix of residential/commercial structures compared to open greenspace/restaurants/small business retail planned for buildout in the reuse project.
>
> It appears from the proposed plan the build out will be very high density construction and population that will likely impact and deviate from the greenspace consistent with the established North Natomas area, traffic congestion & noise pollution are also a growing concern. Also, the need for proportionate resources in our growing area for an emergency hospital, first responders, city maintenance services, and as desired more outdoor attractions for food/restaurants/small business retail/etc. The Downtown Commons is an example of a nice upscale outdoor environment with shops and food options centralized, elevating our local atmosphere for more community, small business, and family engagement. Hopefully, many factors including safe bike lanes or pedestrian/bike bridge over Del Paso, as well as, other creative ideas will be rigorously

considered before proceeding with a traditional mixed use residential/commercial solution. Also, incorporating some heritage or legacy of the Kings on the site would be impactful opportunity not to miss (e.g. small youth training center, education center for local kids, business incubator, etc.).

Thank you for listening and appreciate you & your teams contributions.

Best Regards,
Kalpesh Shah
Natomas Resident, Local Business Owner, Natomas Chamber Member
916-252-9848
btygerbar@gmail.com

cc: Angelique Ashby

From:	Katherine Weston
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Natomas Arena Redevelopment
Date:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 6:07:33 AM

Good morning,

Thank you for taking input on the Natomas Arena redevelopment project. As a Natomas resident (with a family of five), I greatly support the concept of bringing the zoo to Natomas, and hope that the city considers the following:

-Please listen to Natomas residents regarding this major change to our community. It will impact our quality of life significantly. Natomas both wants and needs positive recreational opportunities much more than it does housing, which will further increase traffic and crowd our schools.

-This is a unique opportunity to do something special for the city. I have loved living in Natomas for the past 20 years, and for all of that time I have heard leaders in Sacramento talk about their efforts to build a world class city. A world class zoo will draw visitors to our region and really put Sacramento on the map. More housing would make Sacramento a less desirable tourist destination.

-The zoo will have to go somewhere, and the Natomas area is perfectly located for a major tourist attraction. It is accessible by two major freeways, and the proximity to UC Davis cements a valuable partnership with their veterinary program for high quality care of the animals.

-The zoo has been part of Sacramento's community for decades - it would be a tragic loss for us if the zoo moves to another city that would be more supportive. That kind of history is irreplaceable.

Please bring the zoo to Natomas!

Thank you,

Katherine Weston

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Natomas Arena Redevelopment
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2019 9:37:30 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 3, 2019 7:32 AM
To: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Natomas Arena Redevelopment

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Katherine Weston <stillsmallvoice99@yahoo.com>
> **Date:** April 3, 2019 at 5:42:10 AM PDT
> **To:** "aashby@cityofsacramento.org" <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Natomas Arena Redevelopment**
>
> Good morning,
>
> Thank you for taking input on the Natomas Arena redevelopment project. As a Natomas resident (with a family of five), I greatly support the concept of bringing the zoo to Natomas, and hope that the city considers the following:
>
> -Please listen to Natomas residents regarding this major change to our community. It will impact our quality of life significantly. Natomas both wants and needs positive recreational opportunities much more than it does housing, which will further increase traffic and crowd our schools.
>
> -This is a unique opportunity to do something special for the city. I have loved living in Natomas for the past 20 years, and for all of that time I have heard leaders in Sacramento talk about their efforts to build a world class city. A world class zoo will draw visitors to our region and really put Sacramento on the map. More housing would make Sacramento a less desirable tourist destination.
>
> -The zoo will have to go somewhere, and the Natomas area is perfectly located for a major tourist attraction. It is accessible by two major freeways, and the proximity to UC Davis cements a valuable partnership with their veterinary program for high quality care of the animals.
>
> -The zoo has been part of Sacramento's community for decades - it would be a tragic loss for us if the zoo moves to another city that would be more supportive. That kind of history is irreplaceable.

Please bring the zoo to Natomas!

Thank you,

Katherine Weston
1999 Kane Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95835
925-303-5509

From: Kay Worthington
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Please no zoo!
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 12:00:16 AM

I would honestly rather a hospital, but its not the table. So, just please no zoo.

From: Kristina Zumstein
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: NAR-PUD-P18077
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:27:05 PM

Dear Scott Johnson,

I would like to express and add my concern to having the old Sleeptrain Arena be rezoned for more housing in Natomas. Please please please listen to residents' voices and concerns that additional housing developments is NOT what Natomas residents want. Housing demand is not high enough to warrant more developments. Nor have there been anything from City Planners or Kings organization to address additional traffic concerns or impacts in schools. The schools (especially Inderkum and Natomas High are already over capacity with no additional solid plans for a new high school to be built. The same goes for commercial storefronts. There are so many empty and vacant commercial lots as it is. DO NOT add more. We can't keep adding housing and commercial store fronts without a way to actually draw and keep those businesses to the area.

Don't be swayed by just money. Please be responsible and think of the long term needs of Natomas.

Concerned resident,
Kristina Zumstein
240 Eastbrook Cr
Sacramento, CA 95835

From: LADI BAL
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: #WEWANTAZOO
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 3:37:18 PM

I am a Natomas resident wanting a zoo to replace the old arena.

From: libby@teamworxteambuilding.com
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: EIR - Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 11:58:12 AM

To whom it may concern:

As a resident of Natomas I am not in favor of the Arena land being used for more high density housing. We have houses being built all over Natomas, we don't need more housing. Our neighborhood needs more amenities not houses, we have enough traffic congestion. I would be in favor the land being sold to the zoo, that would be excellent use of the land and a fabulous amenity for Natomas.

Libby Crawford Bennett
5073 Dodson Lane
Sacramento, CA 95835
916-335-2331

From: Liz Clark
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo for Natomas
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2019 12:00:59 AM

Hello:

I would like to voice my strong support for bringing an expanded zoo to Natomas, at the site of the old arena. As a parent and member of the community, I feel it would add great value to Natomas.

We do NOT need high-density housing in that location.

Thank you!
Liz Clark
Natomas resident

From: cobbarmy1
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep train Arena proposal
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 12:30:58 PM

The proposal for sleep train is unwarranted. The last thing Natomas needs is more housing and more commercial/shopping.

There is absolutely nothing for families or youth to do outside of our parks.

A large multi use family entertainment center like Strikes or similar would be more beneficial.

Lynn Cobb

From: Lee Dragon
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sacramento Zoo Relocation
Date: Monday, March 18, 2019 9:24:33 AM

Please do not let the Kings build high rises, etc., in the old arena area. This is a flood zone and should not be heavily populated. Instead of green space and a great zoo they want to contribute to smog, congestion, and MAKE MONEY.

The Sacramento Zoo needs a new and larger home. It is absolutely shameful that the capitol city of the great State of California does not have a world class zoo. Remember the old library? Shameful. Took years until we built a decent library.

Paired with the UC Davis vet school a new and larger zoo is not a dream. It is a necessary reality. We need to take positive and permanent steps to insure the facility is used to better Sacramento, not line the pockets of a sports team.

Please consider the impact not only on our environment, but on our quality of life, for our children and grandchildren. Let's build a bigger and better zoo!

From: Linda T Felix
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Proposed Plans
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 10:34:08 AM

Hello,

I am a current Homeowner in North Natomas. We purchased in this area because of the established newer communities and community amenities. After living here for just over one year I can tell you that the last thing we need is more residential housing.

The infrastructure to support the current Natomas communities is already sorely lacking. Schools are overcrowded and impacted, which puts our children at an academic disadvantage to other planned communities in Sacramento county. Traffic and parking are atrocious, retail stores are unable to stay afloat (because they are not the stores we want), and there is extremely limited police support to protect our communities.

The area would be better served by providing relevant recreational, medical, and police support opportunities for the residents and the surrounding communities. Some things to consider for the space:

Hospital or Lab/XRay/Medical Offices for Sutter, Mercy, and UC Davis patients. We live too far from established Emergency rooms and other medical services.

Police Station that serves Natomas

Recreational center that includes a Dave & Busters (or video game center), Batting Cage, Race Car Track for little and big kids, Miniature Golf, Paddle Boat Rides, etc

Zoo or Petting Zoo

Senior Center, Youth Center, Church, Gym facility

Specialty stores like Trader Joes, Nugget Market, Whole Foods, A real Day Spa like Burke Williams...

The opportunities are endless, but more housing isn't needed in this area.

Thank you for considering the resident's needs and requests.

Linda T Felix, Homeowner
450 Rick Heinrich Circle

From: Leslie Ginter
To: Scott Johnson
Cc: Angelique Ashby; Bryan Ginter
Subject: Re: Sleep Train Arena
Date: Monday, April 1, 2019 11:01:16 PM

Hi Mr. Johnson,

I strongly oppose the construction of additional housing in the Sleep Train Arena area also, and agree with what Bryan Ginter is saying below.

Thank you for your consideration.

Leslie Ginter

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 1, 2019, at 4:27 PM, Bryan Ginter <bryan@ginterfamilylaw.com> wrote:

> Hello Mr. Johnson,
>
> This email relates to the comment period for the current proposal by the City for thousands of additional homes in the Sleep Train Arena area. As a Natomas resident, I strongly oppose further construction of housing to the greatest degree possible, particularly "track" housing, dense housing, apartments and condos. A statistic was given to me years ago that Natomas has more dense and/or low-income housing than any other suburb in Sacramento. More houses equals more problems, including more pollution, more congestion, the need for more public services, etc. I urge the City to look beyond the property tax dollar (as an aside, I would also like ever week recycling again, too), and add more community-based facilities, including parks for the Arena area, and perhaps some shopping and entertainment areas. For brevity's sake, I echo the feelings of my neighbor, Kalpesh Shah, who also recently submitted feedback by email. I was born in an area where homes actually had some land (1-2 acres). I would like to see this in Natomas and everywhere in California. Economics will dictate price, so I don't think affordability will be a concern. I don't know anyone who

actually likes to be able to touch their neighbor's house and look into a neighbor's kitchen when opening the blinds. If houses were built with an acre or more of land on them, congestion would be limited, but this hasn't been done in Natomas to date.

Natomas is a beautiful area and is already becoming too congested. I see many more new homes already in construction. Natomas doesn't need anymore homes with a quarter acre or less. Please do not allow it and keep Natomas the way it is.

Regards,

Bryan Ginter
Family Law Attorney & Mediator
www.GinterFamilyLaw.com
(916) 419-1160
Ginter Family Law News

From: Libby
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco Arena Reuse
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 12:29:07 PM

I would like to formally submit comments relating to the proposed Arco Arena reuse project by the Sacramento kings. The proposed rezoning indicates that there will be a mix of new medium density housing and commercial space. This is not within the best interest of the community.

The community had been promised that an economic driver of significance would be taking the place of the Arena in the agreement to move it downtown. This does not live up to that promise. This area does not need more dense housing or commercial space. There is already a surplus of commercial and retail space that has been left vacant throughout the north Natomas area. This proposal would have significant negative economic impacts on the vacant commercial and retail space that proliferates this area. There are tons of vacant office spaces, retail spaces and even half finished large commercial buildings scattered throughout the North Natomas area that have sat unoccupied for nearly a decade.

The strain on public services such as schools law-enforcement and emergency services is not adequately addressed. Especially the issue with the schools, which are already overcrowded. North Natomas is known for being a Hub of charter schools. With the recent change in governorship of the state of California, Gavin Newsom has made no secret of his distain for charter schools. Our area and school resources are under serious threat of closure and this will only exacerbate a strained situation.

Our community deserves to be honored in the commitment that the Sacramento Kings made to us. We would like something of cultural significance to take its place. An economic driver for our area. Not more housing and warehouses and retail space. The Zoo concept would be an excellent option and highly supported by our community. It would also help support the City plans and goals to extend lightrail service.

The community members and leaders of north Natomas are prepared to mobilize in Support of a Zoo, or other culturally significant options, against this proposal. Community activist are already organizing campaigns against this frankly offensive and demeaning proposal by the Sacramento Kings. Our community made a huge sacrifice in moving the huge economic engine of the Arena downtown. We deserve better than this and we are prepared to speak out about it and make a lot of noise.

Regards,

Elizabeth Ludwig
251 Martis Valley cir. Sacramento CA 95836
925-348-7817

From: Liliya Kaltakchi
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Tower 301 Comment Submittal
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:58:35 PM

North natomas needs family entertainment. For example: Zoo, some kind of water park or mall.
No more apartments.

Lily Fines
5463 Banderas Way, Sacramento, CA 95835

From: lifelovingal007
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena site
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 7:26:13 AM

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I am in stand woth the grass roots organization We Want a Zoo. Although I an in Rio Robles I live 2 miles from Sleep Train Arena on on the same side as the arena I have watched the development of Natomas develop and continue to grow. With that the added traffic not just on the highways but the surface streets as well. Off Gateway between Truxell & Main in 2007 600 homes were started and 2008 came to a screeching hault due to the industry meltdown. Within last couple years development started back up. I am sure you are aware of the 10k homes slated for Natomas.

The another large development off 80 between Northgate and Norwood on the south side, and another large development off I80 and west ElCamino (south side). There is already a plethra of homes being built. Lets not add to the urbanizational sprawl and give the opportunity for increased crime and congestion that comes with it.

Sacramento has had a zoo since 1927, now we need to move and enlarge this vital community resource. There is a grass roots move to purchase the old arena in Natomas which would be an ideal space for an enlarged and better zoo, creating a sanctuary for wild and endangered species, offering educational services to the community living here or visiting. The relocation of the zoo can put Sacramento on the map for a destination, there is nothing in Ca that offers what they are perposing. The site is only a short distance from UC Davis, the No. 1 ranked university in the U.S. for agriculture, environmental, human and **animal sciences that can offer additional draw not to mention expertise in the animal care, habitat, etc.**

The Kings would like to build high rises and commercial space, adding to congestion and other environmental concerns. They moved the Kings out leaving only empty promises. When the team left so did many businesses, franchises and local mom & pops establishments. Crime increased and continues to do so.

Thank you so much for your time reading this and considering my thoughts. Hopefully you agree.

Sincerely,

Lorraine King
305 Pinedale
Sacramento CA 95838

From: Lynnette Williams
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: RE: Sac Arena Proposal
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 9:40:21 AM

Dear City of Sacramento & Sacramento Kings,
>
> You can leave a legacy to this city that's supported you for years by approving the proposal for a zoo. No one will remember another shopping center or housing development; let's do something big!
>
> The city is evaluating ideas for a wonderful new waterfront development. With Natomas so close to downtown, the zoo will expand the tourism to include Natomas. So Kings, be Sacramento proud, and do the zoo!
>
> Lynnette Williams
> 916-606-7656
> Natomas resident
>
> Sent from my iPhone

From: Maggie Bellafatto
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: NATOMAS ZOO
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 2:53:27 PM

Good afternoon,

I'm writing to you as a long-time resident of Natomas and a former volunteer for the City of Sacramento, District 1. As business comes and goes in the area, I firmly believe that the addition of the zoo would be a steady and wise investment. The space has been unoccupied for far too long and many of us would truly like to see this happen!

In fact, as the location is very close to the airport, I suspect that may play a roll in increased revenue. Beyond that, the popularity of the zoo will most likely attract other businesses and help Natomas continue to bloom as much of the land has yet to occupied. I would like to see more attractions in Natomas !

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Maggie Bellafatto
(916) 747-8900

From: Margarita Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Proposal - ZOO !!!
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:40:56 AM

I vote that the Sleep Train Arena location be used to move the Sacramento Zoo to that location. It is my opinion that the current location for the Zoo is too small and as a developing region, it needs a much larger location to expand. Even the parking where the current Zoo is located is difficult. Anytime there is a special event there or nearby it gets very congested. The Sleep Train Arena location is perfect to move the Zoo to and be able to also add other family friendly activities for the entire region to enjoy.

I vote for the ZOO.

Margarita Castillo
Manager, Meetings and Incentives
margaritac@istours.com
I. S. Tours, Inc.
5080 Robert J. Mathews Pkwy.
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
Tel. (916) 939-8484
www.istours.com

From: Matthew Floro
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo for Natomas Sleep Train Arena
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 1:40:00 PM

To whom it may concern

As for the future use of the Sleep Train Arena area in Natomas, I would request it be converted to a new Sacramento Zoo to provide jobs, economic growth, and a landmark to draw in new visitors to the Natomas area.

Thank you
Matthew Floro

From: Mooney Gow
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Former Arco arena site
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 11:25:25 AM

I'm voting for a zoo at the old arena

From: Matt Gross
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Potential zoo at Arco Arena site
Date: Monday, April 1, 2019 8:57:21 AM

Hello,
I would like to comment in favor of moving the Sacramento Zoo to the Arco Arena site. I believe it would be an excellent use of the land, and would also give a boost to local businesses. Thank you for your consideration.
Matt Gross

From: Mandy Heilner
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena Reuse Plan
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 1:27:29 PM

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to strongly oppose the proposed Arena reuse plan as submitted by the Sacramento Kings. This plan does not take into account the unique opportunity that Sacramento has before it. The Sacramento Zoo has made it clear in recent months that it needs a new location in order to transform itself into the world-class location it longs to be. As a resident of Natomas for over 16 years, I would welcome a neighbor such as the Sacramento Zoo in this location. A brand-new zoo would be a refreshing change to the empty shopping centers and unfilled warehouses already existing in Natomas! I implore you to consider alternative proposals, such as a zoo, instead of the proposal for more housing suggested by the Sacramento Kings for the Arena site.

Sincerely,

Mandy Heilner

From:	Erica Castillo
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	FW: Arena area
Date:	Friday, March 29, 2019 10:28:07 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:09 AM
To: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Arena area

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Myra Hess <myrah123@aol.com>
> **Date:** March 22, 2019 at 5:21:23 PM PDT
> **To:** aashby@cityofsacramento.org
> **Subject: Arena area**
>
> Hi Angelique, I'm writing to you because of the choices floating around for the use of the Arena land. The possibility of 2000 more homes and stores in this already congested area is so frightening and unappealing to me. Also the idea of a zoo will bring so many tourists here that the roads will be clogged!
>
> What's necessary for that site is a UCDavis hospital or medical offices. With so many people here now including senior citizens, adults and children, it would be so helpful to not have to drive to Stockton Blvd area every time a specialist is needed. Who else can I contact besides you to put in my two cents? Why isn't a medical building not in the equation?
>
> Thanks for all your good work here.
>
> Myra Hess
> 973-945-9454
>
> Sent from my iPhone

From: Michael Hutchings
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Tower 301 Comment Submittal
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 4:52:27 PM

Hello,

My wife, daughter and I are residents of North natomas. We recently moved here and love the community. The amenities are fantastic and the people could not be more welcoming. One thing we have noticed is that the amount of housing planned for our region is quickly becoming a logistical challenge with the schools in our district and available space for the residents to get around. My worry with the kings plan for the old arena would be more housing is going to lead to more people with a lesser quality of life. Noise pollution, congested streets, overcrowded schools and grocerers will not help natomas or Sacramento thrive. I would look forward to the inclusion of a new wildlife habitat/zoo, hospital or the ever - rumored soccer statium which was eyeing the rail yards.

Thank you!

Michael Hutchings
Cherry Laurel Avenue
Sacramento CA 95834

From: Mary Lee
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo in Natomas - I vote "NO"
Date: Monday, April 1, 2019 11:05:04 PM

I am a resident and I don't care to have a Zoo in Natomas.

We have other companies coming in with jobs for the community. Like Centene.

Mary

From: mlrudman
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Tower 301 Comment Submittal
Date: Saturday, March 16, 2019 1:40:50 PM

I would like to see a joint hospital built with different floors and staff run my Sutter, Mercy and UCD. Lab, xray and all ancillary sevices could be cost shared. Many older people in this part of the city with no means to visit those in downtown or further locations. Great salaries and day and night activity, and much needed. We don't need more office buildings or malls. Myrna Rudman@mlrudman@att.net.

From: Michelle McDonald
To: Scott Johnson
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 11:44:16 AM

Hello,

I'm a resident of Sundance Lake for 20 years & a teacher for the City of Sacramento for 25 years. I strongly oppose the proposed Arena reuse plan as submitted by the Sacramento Kings. The plan does not take into account the city resources (fire & police) that hasn't kept up with the growth of the city. The Sacramento Zoo has made it clear that it is in need of a new location in order to maintain its accreditation & is unable to expand its 13 acres in Land Park. Natomas is slowly fulfilling its promise with a Fortune 500 company, infill projects (hotels, commercial, residential) & community/aquatic center in the regional park. The Sacramento Zoo/Safari Park (180 acres) would be a welcome addition & a destination for all the surrounding areas. Please consider the Sacramento Zoo/Safari Park over reuse plan suggested by the Sacramento Kings for the Arena site. I will also send this to the city.

Thank you,

Michelle McDonald
Sent from my Box of Crayons

From: Miguel Mojado
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: proposed zoo
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 6:20:40 PM

Those animals produce smelly waste. Will it stink up the community?
Sent from my iPhone

From: MJ Pascual
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: We Want A Zoo
Date: Sunday, March 31, 2019 6:44:56 AM

To Whom It May Concern:

It is a perfect vision for that location. For it being near the airport and yet near downtown-makes it the ideal place for such a vision of this magnitude. High density housing will not bring more tourists and potential revenues into the city, it will bring more problems for crowded classrooms, parking and daily traffic (vs controlled traffic limited to hours of operation). The high end shopping center will also kill our already struggling retailers in the area.

I lived near the SF Zoo for 5 years. I noticed first hand how their foot traffic went exponentially more after they renovated their zoo. Out of town visitors occupied nearby small local motels.

No more high density housing pls.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Michael Pettigrew
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Build Proposal
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:49:07 PM

Hello Mr. Johnson,

Instead of more houses and shopping in natmoas why not anchor the area with the zoo. The area is used to crowds from the arena so why not put another large and busy replacement like the zoo. The zoo is looking to expand and this would keep the zone within the city limits and allow for the collection of taxes. If the zoo expands, like it desires, it's doubtful the zoo can find another area that fits their needs with infrastructure like currently available at the previous arena site.

Regards,
Michael Pettigrew

From: Marlene Placencia
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena land usage
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 7:34:38 PM

I would love to see a zoo or some type of museum with parks for all uses. No more homes. Are schools can hardly handle the traffic now to and from drop offs. And all retail should be higher end and restaurants also.
We need to upgrade Natomas area and not with more homes or small retailers Poor el centro road is not enjoyable anymore. Loved the country road. Hard to find anymore.
Thank you for looking out for our community.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Monica Robinson
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Fwd: Use of Arco Arena Site North Natomas
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 2:00:18 PM

April 2, 2019

Scott Johnson, Senior Planner
City of Sacramento Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd., Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811
srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse Project (P18-077) EIR Scoping

Thank you for this opportunity to provide input on the subject EIR. Please include the following concerns in the EIR scope of analysis:

Concern 1:

The Project proposes to change the zone designation of the Arena property to C-2 General Commercial.1 [see footnote 1] The proposed zone designation is thoroughly inconsistent with the original use intended for that property; as such it represents a significant divergence from the hard-fought community design that is the North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP). The Arena property is currently zoned SPX Sports Complex.2 Given that the property is no longer the home of the Kings (moved downtown) or the Monarchs (defunct), and there are no other sports teams seeking to make it their home, "accommodating the design requirements of professional and amateur sports"2 is no longer a priority and is not a realistic pursuit. However, the intended use of that land was and still is to "provide for the education, information, recreation, culture, or entertainment of Sacramento area residents and visitors." The General Plan and Community Plans are official policy statements of the City Council, and by extension, the citizens they represent. The Project's proposed C-2 Zone designation demonstrates a callous disregard for the vision imagined by those stakeholders.

Concern 2:

With the Project's proposed addition of up to approximately 2,000 residential units, none of which were anticipated in the North Natomas Community Plan, please demonstrate how the City will meet goal NN PHS 1.2, specifically “a police protection standard of 1.60 police officers per 1,000 residents and 1.0 non-sworn personnel for every 1.60 police officers (2035 General Plan/NNCP, NN PHS 1.2).

Concern 3:

Regarding "...the geographic area bounded by the East Drain, I 5, Del Paso Road, and Arena Boulevard (this area comprises about 340 acres and includes several PUDs)…." (2035 General Plan/NNCP, NN.LU 1.19). For any development to remain consistent with policy NN.LU 1.19, several findings must be made. Two of those findings are particularly relevant in the context of the proposed Project:

• "The proposed increase in residential use will not result in an over-concentration of multi-family projects in the area"
• "The total amount of acreage devoted to residential use(s) within this geographic area does not exceed 25 percent"

Quick math tells us that 25% of 340 is 85 (acres). Some of the 85 acres are already devoted to residential use(s), reducing the availability of eligible acreage to something less than 85.

Of the 340 acres referenced in NN.LU 1.19, how many acres are already devoted to residential use(s)? What percentage (of the 340 acres) do those devoted acres represent? How many acres are still eligible for residential use(s)? Is it feasible to build ~2,000 residential units on the remaining eligible acreage, and not result in an "over-concentration of multi-family projects"?

Furthermore, NN.LU 1.14 of the 2035 General Plan/NNCP states "The City shall ensure the maximum size of an apartment complex is 200 units and 8 acres…." Please demonstrate how or if the Project could comply with policy NN.LU 1.14.

Other concerns:

Air Quality: The Project proposes to add up to 2,000 residential units in the plan area. Presumably, many of these new households would own one or more automobiles each, resulting in a permanent, long-term increase in vehicular emissions. The Sacramento region is already a non-attainment area with regard to air quality.

Biological Resources: Please evaluate the pond/potential wetland/riparian zone in the north part of the Project area. Also evaluate the Project's potential impact on the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Same as Air Quality...permanent, long-term increase in vehicular emissions.

Population and Housing: I am concerned that the Project would induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area. The Arena property was not planned/intended to be developed for intensive residential use(s).

Public Services: The Project would trigger a need for a suite of new public services, including one or more new elementary and junior high schools, and necessitating expansion of one or more of the existing high schools. The Project's proposed "bolt-on" growth was not a part of the original design of the North Natomas Community Plan. The fire, police and parks departments will all need to expand to meet the new, unplanned demand triggered by the proposed Project.

Traffic and Transportation: I am very concerned about the Project's impact on local traffic and transportation, by adding significant daily traffic to the system. Of particular concern are the freeway on- and off-ramps during morning and afternoon commute times, and traffic on I-5 itself, especially the segment between Del Paso Road and downtown Sacramento (LOS D&F at peak times, daily). Also, I believe this Project will contribute a significant amount of traffic to the Arena Boulevard and Del Paso Road overpasses; such traffic is an annoyance when it impedes commuters, but is a threat to public safety when it impedes emergency responders or citizens fleeing flood waters. The Snowy Egret and Natomas Crossing overpasses (currently

unbuilt) should be considered as possible mitigation to traffic impacts on the existing overpasses.

Insufficient Details: The Project would substantially influence the character of the Natomas community, but the Project plan is incredibly vague. (Compare to the Panhandle NOP.)

Suggested Alternatives to consider in the EIR:

• Alternative 1: Rezone the entire property to A-OS Agricultural-Open Space.3 A-OS is far more consistent with the intent of the current SPX zone designation. (For reference, the North Natomas Regional Park is designated A-OS.) The Sacramento Zoo is currently seeking to relocate and expand, and has identified the Arena property as a suitable and desirable location. While not a sports team, a relocated Sacramento Zoo would fulfill the original NNCP vision for an amenity that provides for the education, information, recreation, culture, or entertainment of Sacramento area residents and visitors.
• Alternative 2: Rezone ~120 acres to A-OS, and rezone the remainder to EC Employment Center.4 EC would permit the same uses as C-2, but is better suited to the vision of the North Natomas Community Plan.

Respectfully,
Monica Robinson
2141 Promise Way, Sacramento, CA 95835

Footnotes:

1 C-2 General Commercial "The purpose of the C-2 zone is to provide for the sale of goods; the performance of services, including repair facilities; office uses; dwellings; small wholesale stores or distributors; and limited processing and packaging."

2 SPX Sports Complex "The purpose of the SPX zone is to ensure the proper development and use of land and improvements to achieve a sports complex that, at a minimum, accommodates the design requirements of professional and amateur sports; and accommodates events, exhibitions, and performances that provide for the education, information, recreation, culture, or entertainment of Sacramento area residents and visitors, in accordance with the specific land use policies of the city general plan, community plans, and the planned unit development (PUD) guidelines. A conditional use permit is required for each use in this zone."

3 A-OS Agricultural-Open Space "The purpose of the A-OS zone is to ensure the long-term preservation of agricultural and open space land. This zone is intended to prevent the premature development of land to urban uses."

4 EC Employment Center "The purpose of the EC zone is to provide a flexible zone for employment-generating uses in a pedestrian-friendly setting with ample open space. The EC zone also provides for a variety of supporting uses, including retail, residential, and light industrial. The close proximity of supporting uses allows for pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and rideshare-connection opportunities, which collectively help reduce dependence on the automobile. Consequently, parking needs are reduced and shared parking opportunities increase. The EC zone was developed specifically for North Natomas, but may be applicable to other areas of the city if the site is appropriate for a flexible, mixed–use, employment-

generating complex."

From: Marja S.
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sacramento zoo relocation support
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 9:51:09 AM

My family and I are residents of North Natomas (95834) and we support the relocation of the Sacramento Zoo to the old Sleep Train arena area. We love the idea of bringing new life to this area, which is lacking in entertainment/tourist draws. Not only that, but the current zoo has exhibits which are quite small, and we would love for the animals housed at the zoo to have improved housing and for the zoo to be able to expand awareness and provide education to the thousands of people who visit the zoo on an annual basis.

Thank you for supporting this project!

--
Marja Sainio

From: Molly Springer
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: 183 acre site in natomas
Date: Sunday, March 17, 2019 10:20:52 AM

Mr Johnson,

As someone who only rents a home on Natomas, my voice might not be very important in this conversation bit allow me to explain.

Natomas absolutely is a thriving community and yes we need more housing. But the fear of the residents is simply so much traffic and not enough infrastructure being built to extend opportunities for transportation.

I work at Sacramento city college, every morning I have the 5 to sutterville exit for work. It's only 4 miles or so away. But currently it takes 40 minutes because of the all the trucks passing on the five and not enough lanes.

Adding increased housing to our area is a good plan, only if it comes with increase access to freeways and roads.

For example, if you get off the 80 at truxel Dr...there are no less than 10 stoplights until you reach del paso. It almost takes 15 minutes to go one mile.

The traffic near Inderdikum high school is horrendous and cars wait 20 minutes in traffic on north truxel to drop their kids off in the morning.

So, regardless that yes a zoo or a laser or something made out of that monster Oracle area would be wonderful to have...the real fear is traffic.

Thanks for hearing me out.

From: Morgan Watson
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse Plan
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 11:47:25 AM

City Council,

As a Natomas resident, I want to thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the proposed plan for the vacant Sleep Train Arena. The plan submitted by the current owner does not add the best value to our community and overall City. I realize homes are needed but we also need entertainment and the ability to attract tourist to our City. Adding more retail when we are already flush with shopping centers throughout Natomas, especially off of Arena Blvd., is not our best option, in my opinion. I implore the Council to seriously consider the option of rebuilding and expanding the Sacramento Zoo at this site. It would benefit the community, the Zoo would be able to maintain (and even greatly grow) its efforts and impact, and the City as a whole.

Thank you,
Morgan Lardizabal
Natomas Resident

Sent from iPhone, please excuse any errors.

From: Marcus Watstein
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco Arena Site
Date: Thursday, March 21, 2019 12:21:55 PM

Hello to who it may concern,

As a resident of Natomas I actually would like to see a professional Hockey team (nhl) and just renovate the arena so that we continue to have entertainment in the area. It would help our economy and give people choices of things to do. Besides the river cats and the kings and the republic it would be nice to see the capital of California have a hockey team. Also the minor league team is in Stockton just like the kings have which would be perfect. Just a suggestion and I feel would be better use than a zoo or more homes.

Thanks!
Marcus Watstein
3114 Touchman st Sacramento.

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Support for Zoo in Natomas!
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:26:47 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:04 AM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Support for Zoo in Natomas!

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Michael Weed <mikerachelle@hotmail.com>
> **Date:** March 25, 2019 at 5:43:13 PM PDT
> **To:** "aashby@cityofsacramento.org" <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Support for Zoo in Natomas!**
>
> Hello,
>
> My family and I live in Hansen's District (River Oaks) and do the majority of our shopping and entertainment in your District.
>
> We support a new and expanded Sacramento Zoo in Natomas, preferably near the old arena.
>
> The location would provide cultural and economic benefits to our neighborhood of Sacramento, and provide easy freeway access for people throughout the greater metropolitan region to visit and support the Zoo. Relocating an expanded Sacramento Zoo is a logical use of this land and promotes the development of Natomas as a desirable city neighborhood.
>
> Please consider this email our stated support for a new and expanded Sacramento Zoo near the location of the former arena in Natomas.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Mike Weed

From: natalya apostolou
To: Scott Johnson
Cc: Angelique Ashby
Subject: Bring the Zoo to Natomas, NOT more housing
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 11:43:36 PM

Greetings,

As a Natomas resident and parent of three small kids, I would like to express my strong support for bringing a world-class zoo expansion to our community in the space formally occupied by the arena. We are zoo members and fully support the plans for relocation and expansion. This is a win-win situation for the city and the zoo.

It would bring a MUCH-NEEDED cultural destination to the Natomas community. There is currently nothing to draw visitors from other parts of the city to Natomas. This is a wonderful opportunity for our community to participate and contribute to the vibrancy of Sacramento as a whole. The caliber of zoo being discussed would certainly be a tourism draw for Sacramento.

Natomas is a conveniently situated place to live, but we never spend our weekends hanging out here. We always seek out events and opportunities in Midtown and other parts of Sacramento. Frankly, Natomas just doesn't have much to offer in terms of things to do. It's currently a sea of track housing, strip malls and big box plazas. It lacks character and uniqueness and culture. We desperately need to change that in order to make this a great community. The people here deserve it, and it's time for Natomas to have a true destination that makes it an exciting place to live and visit.

I know the bottom-line profit margins of adding high-density housing would be in the best interest of developers. But it is NOT in the best interest of the existing community. Additional housing developments will do nothing for the value of our community, and will only add traffic and line the pockets of developers.

On a final and personal note: my almost-three year old is obsessed with animals and, prior to the last couple years, I hadn't visited a zoo in at least a decade. I honestly felt that they were inherently cruel institutions. But I've learned how wrong my assumptions were. In fact, it's given me a whole new appreciation for zoos and the work they do. Not only do they play an important role in conservation, but they also provide a vital pathway for humanity to interact with threatened and endangered species. I can attest to the power of putting people face to face with animals. It gives you a personal experience that generates compassion and appreciation for these creatures. It's important we have spaces that do this.

For adding value to our community, there is a clear obvious choice in what should happen with the arena space. We need a world-class destination, NOT more housing.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Natalya Apostolou
Natomas Resident (zip code 95834)

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Bring the Zoo to Natomas, NOT more housing
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2019 9:37:22 AM

Just a few more from yesterday coming your way…

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 3, 2019 7:31 AM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Bring the Zoo to Natomas, NOT more housing

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** natalya apostolou <apostol3@gmail.com>
> **Date:** April 2, 2019 at 11:43:29 PM PDT
> **To:** srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org
> **Cc:** aashby@cityofsacramento.org
> **Subject: Bring the Zoo to Natomas, NOT more housing**
>
> Greetings,
>
> As a Natomas resident and parent of three small kids, I would like to express my strong support for bringing a world-class zoo expansion to our community in the space formally occupied by the arena. We are zoo members and fully support the plans for relocation and expansion. This is a win-win situation for the city and the zoo.
>
> It would bring a MUCH-NEEDED cultural destination to the Natomas community. There is currently nothing to draw visitors from other parts of the city to Natomas. This is a wonderful opportunity for our community to participate and contribute to the vibrancy of Sacramento as a whole. The caliber of zoo being discussed would certainly be a tourism draw for Sacramento.
>
> Natomas is a conveniently situated place to live, but we never spend our weekends hanging out here. We always seek out events and opportunities in Midtown and other parts of Sacramento. Frankly, Natomas just doesn't have much to offer in terms of things to do. It's currently a sea of track housing, strip malls and big box plazas. It lacks character and uniqueness and culture. We desperately need to change that in order to make this a great community. The people here deserve it, and it's time for Natomas to have a true destination that makes it an exciting place to live and visit.

I know the bottom-line profit margins of adding high-density housing would be in the best interest of developers. But it is NOT in the best interest of the existing community. Additional housing developments will do nothing for the value of our community, and will only add traffic and line the pockets of developers.

On a final and personal note: my almost-three year old is obsessed with animals and, prior to the last couple years, I hadn't visited a zoo in at least a decade. I honestly felt that they were inherently cruel institutions. But I've learned how wrong my assumptions were. In fact, it's given me a whole new appreciation for zoos and the work they do. Not only do they play an important role in conservation, but they also provide a vital pathway for humanity to interact with threatened and endangered species. I can attest to the power of putting people face to face with animals. It gives you a personal experience that generates compassion and appreciation for these creatures. It's important we have spaces that do this.

For adding value to our community, there is a clear obvious choice in what should happen with the arena space. We need a world-class destination, NOT more housing.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Natalya Apostolou
Natomas Resident (zip code 95834)

From: NEELAM RANGARI
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Reg: Sleep Train Arena
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 9:40:36 PM

As a resident of Natomas I oppose the building of more residential houses as we already have had our fair or more than fair share of houses, rowdy reckless drivers etc.

Make something that adds community value to the Natomas Township like a hospital, museum, recreational park, sports stadium,zoo, big mall etc.

Enough of hotels & residential buildings !

Thank You,

Dr Neelam Bhambore M.D.

From: Natalie Davey
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas resident: feedback on Sleep Train Arena plan
Date: Saturday, March 30, 2019 8:50:47 AM

Angelique Ashby's office:

First of all, I would like to say, I am a big fan of your office and all you have done for our district!

I have been a resident of Natomas since 2010. We started out in a condominium and now own a home in Natomas Park. We love our neighborhood parks, farmers market, convenient location to our jobs in Davis and east Sacramento and the ever growing community pride.

As a working mom of two young kids I would love to see the zoo or another family attraction (Sac Republic Field, Aquarium, science center, etc) to replace the Sleep Train arena. We spend most of our weekends at the local parks, frequenting any local area/ Natomas eateries and attending the zoo (with our membership).

Our weeknights mostly consist of kiddos' bedtimes. We occasionally go out to eat but try to keep weeknight dinners at home.

It saddens me every time I see a new restaurant cycle through the numerous shopping centers we have in our area. While I would love to support our economy, we cannot afford to eat at all the places enough to sustain them. I cannot imagine more restaurants and more housing in Natomas being a positive move for our community.

I'm no economist but I imagine more housing increases consistent traffic/more cars/more people commuting (as opposed to occasional traffic for events if the location was an event center as it was previously). More housing impacts our schools and challenges classroom capacities. I realize more people could mean more commerce but would the type of housing really attract consumers or people in our same economic boat of just trying to raise happy, healthy kids without a huge fortune to spend on eating out?

Natomas is a community full of diverse, dynamic families and our commerce needs attractions to match.

Thank you for your time,

Natalie Davey

From: Natalie Green
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo expansion/Sleep Train Arena
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 11:10:44 AM

I live in North Natomas and would love to see our community host The Sacramento Zoo!

From: Nancy Kong-Vasquez
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Community Feedback - Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 11:38:07 AM

To whom it may concern,

My name is Nancy Kong-Vasquez and I have been a resident in Natomas Crossings, which is the neighborhood adjacent to the Sleep Train Arena site.

When my husband and I moved to Natomas from San Jose in 2001, we envisioned a community in which we would raise our children and be a place where we would live into retirement. Natomas has been good to our family beyond measure.

We supported the move of the Kings from Sleep Train and the building of Golden One Center. We believed in the promise that not only would G1C play a vital role in the revitalization of the Downtown, but that the Sleep Train Arena would be reused in a manner that contributed to the community and beyond.

We greatly support the expansion and relocation of the Sacramento Zoo to the Sleep Train Arena site. Not only would it bring value to the home property values, but having an education and conservation based center would benefit the region as a whole.

Additionally, I am a Board Member for Westlake Charter School and the Committee Chair for the Development Partnership Committee and I envision both educational and volunteer partnership opportunities that a Zoo would bring to our students.

I truly hope that both the City and the Kings reconsider building an urban center in an area which is already filled with homes and doesn't add to the number of empty retail spaces that already exist in Natomas.

By considering the site for a world class facility for the Sacramento Zoo, perhaps, it will fulfill a promise of "...something that makes a difference in the world." to the Natomas Community and bring economic growth to the region.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit input to the current request by the Sacramento Kings.

Sincerely,
Nancy Kong-Vasquez
nancykv@gmail.com
916.284.6625 mobile

From: Nicole Sarro
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: North Natomas housing
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 11:48:46 AM

To whom it may concern,

As a 16-year resident of North Natomas, I am pleading that you do not agreed to the proposed housing development at the Arco Arena site!! North Natomas is an amazing community with a lot to offer, yet so much more is needed. North Natomas cannot handle more housing developments.

Please please do not allow this to pass!!

Sincerely,

Nicole Sarro
Proud North Natomas resident

From: Nicole Waterman
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas
Date: Thursday, March 28, 2019 6:07:13 PM

As a current Natomas resident , I would like to see the zoo or an aquarium or both in the Sleep Train Arena site.

Nicole Waterman

From: Oksana Danilova
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: ARCO ARENA - WE WANT A ZOO!
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 9:56:14 AM

Hello! I would like to propose to have a Zoo instead of ARCO Arena ! That area will be perfect since few major freeways around and air quality need to be improved! Please - Animals need new bigger home too!!!!
ZOO PLEASE INSTRAD OF ARCO ARENA !!!!!!

Sent from my iPhone

From:	padavis@winfirst.com
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	office@ecosacramento.net; Jeff S. Harris; David Gonsalves; Jaycob Bytel; Jennifer Gress; Erica Kashiri; Andrew Kehoe; MMcKeever@cityofsacramento.org; Mariela Medina; Luis Montes; Kelly F. Rivas; Scott Whyte; Zachary Yeates; Ciana Yniguez; Angelique Ashby; Karina Talamantes; Erica Castillo; Deb Wurgler; Andre Favila; Steve Hansen; Allen Warren; Alisa Johnson; Daniel Savala; Shoun Thao; Jay Schenirer; Jasleen Escobar; Shjohnson@cityofsacramento.org; Sommer Hayes; Claudia Jasin; Rick Jennings; Dennis M. Rogers; Yoon Chao; Lisa Canfield; Lawrence R. Carr; Matthew Bryant; Jaime R. Cervantes; Joelle Toney
Subject:	Sleep Train Arena
Date:	Friday, March 22, 2019 1:26:01 PM

Regarding the "proposed development plan currently submitted by the Sacramento Kings for the reuse of Sleep Train Arena in Natomas." ...

I agree with my good friend Christine Browning's submittal to use the arena as a homeless city. It already has sufficient facilities for that purpose. The Kings can pay for it to give back to the city ... and for what they already owe and haven't paid ... The homeless can choose to live inside or outside. They run it. Pets allowed. Social workers, doctors, dentists and vets provided. Classes and education provided as well. There are already facilities for showers, bathrooms, and kitchens for preparing 3 meals a day.

Pam Davis

855 Turnstone Dr

Sacramento CA 95834

916 862-3204 (cell)

916 359-5843 (home)

padavis@winfirst.com

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Plan Review Team
Land Management

PGEPlanReview@pge.com

6111 Bollinger Canyon Road 3370A
San Ramon, CA 94583

March 5, 2019

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
300 Richard Blvd., 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Ref: Gas and Electric Transmission and Distribution

Dear Mr. Johnson,

Thank you for submitting NAR PUD Project plans for our review. PG&E will review the submitted plans in relationship to any existing Gas and Electric facilities within the project area. If the proposed project is adjacent/or within PG&E owned property and/or easements, we will be working with you to ensure compatible uses and activities near our facilities.

Attached you will find information and requirements as it relates to Gas facilities (Attachment 1) and Electric facilities (Attachment 2). Please review these in detail, as it is critical to ensure your safety and to protect PG&E's facilities and its existing rights.

Below is additional information for your review:

1. This plan review process does not replace the application process for PG&E gas or electric service your project may require. For these requests, please continue to work with PG&E Service Planning: https://www.pge.com/en_US/business/services/building-and-renovation/overview/overview.page.

2. If the project being submitted is part of a larger project, please include the entire scope of your project, and not just a portion of it. PG&E's facilities are to be incorporated within any CEQA document. PG&E needs to verify that the CEQA document will identify any required future PG&E services.

3. An engineering deposit may be required to review plans for a project depending on the size, scope, and location of the project and as it relates to any rearrangement or new installation of PG&E facilities.

Any proposed uses within the PG&E fee strip and/or easement, may include a California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) Section 851 filing. This requires the CPUC to render approval for a conveyance of rights for specific uses on PG&E's fee strip or easement. PG&E will advise if the necessity to incorporate a CPUC Section 851filing is required.

This letter does not constitute PG&E's consent to use any portion of its easement for any purpose not previously conveyed. PG&E will provide a project specific response as required.

Sincerely,

Plan Review Team
Land Management

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Attachment 1 – Gas Facilities

There could be gas transmission pipelines in this area which would be considered critical facilities for PG&E and a high priority subsurface installation under California law. Care must be taken to ensure safety and accessibility. So, please ensure that if PG&E approves work near gas transmission pipelines it is done in adherence with the below stipulations. Additionally, the following link provides additional information regarding legal requirements under California excavation laws: http://usanorth811.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/CA-LAW-English.pdf

1. Standby Inspection: A PG&E Gas Transmission Standby Inspector must be present during any demolition or construction activity that comes within 10 feet of the gas pipeline. This includes all grading, trenching, substructure depth verifications (potholes), asphalt or concrete demolition/removal, removal of trees, signs, light poles, etc. This inspection can be coordinated through the Underground Service Alert (USA) service at 811. A minimum notice of 48 hours is required. Ensure the USA markings and notifications are maintained throughout the duration of your work.

2. Access: At any time, PG&E may need to access, excavate, and perform work on the gas pipeline. Any construction equipment, materials, or spoils may need to be removed upon notice. Any temporary construction fencing installed within PG&E's easement would also need to be capable of being removed at any time upon notice. Any plans to cut temporary slopes exceeding a 1:4 grade within 10 feet of a gas transmission pipeline need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.

3. Wheel Loads: To prevent damage to the buried gas pipeline, there are weight limits that must be enforced whenever any equipment gets within 10 feet of traversing the pipe.

Ensure a list of the axle weights of all equipment being used is available for PG&E's Standby Inspector. To confirm the depth of cover, the pipeline may need to be potholed by hand in a few areas.

Due to the complex variability of tracked equipment, vibratory compaction equipment, and cranes, PG&E must evaluate those items on a case-by-case basis prior to use over the gas pipeline (provide a list of any proposed equipment of this type noting model numbers and specific attachments).

No equipment may be set up over the gas pipeline while operating. Ensure crane outriggers are at least 10 feet from the centerline of the gas pipeline. Transport trucks must not be parked over the gas pipeline while being loaded or unloaded.

4. Grading: PG&E requires a minimum of 36 inches of cover over gas pipelines (or existing grade if less) and a maximum of 7 feet of cover at all locations. The graded surface cannot exceed a cross slope of 1:4.

5. Excavating: Any digging within 2 feet of a gas pipeline must be dug by hand. Note that while the minimum clearance is only 12 inches, any excavation work within 24 inches of the edge of a pipeline must be done with hand tools. So to avoid having to dig a trench entirely with hand tools, the edge of the trench must be over 24 inches away. (Doing the math for a 24 inch wide trench being dug along a 36 inch pipeline, the centerline of the trench would need to be at least 54 inches [24/2 + 24 + 36/2 = 54] away, or be entirely dug by hand.)

Water jetting to assist vacuum excavating must be limited to 1000 psig and directed at a 40° angle to the pipe. All pile driving must be kept a minimum of 3 feet away.

Any plans to expose and support a PG&E gas transmission pipeline across an open excavation need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.

6. Boring/Trenchless Installations: PG&E Pipeline Services must review and approve all plans to bore across or parallel to (within 10 feet) a gas transmission pipeline. There are stringent criteria to pothole the gas transmission facility at regular intervals for all parallel bore installations.

For bore paths that cross gas transmission pipelines perpendicularly, the pipeline must be potholed a minimum of 2 feet in the horizontal direction of the bore path and a minimum of 12 inches in the vertical direction from the bottom of the pipe with minimum clearances measured from the edge of the pipe in both directions. Standby personnel must watch the locator trace (and every ream pass) the path of the bore as it approaches the pipeline and visually monitor the pothole (with the exposed transmission pipe) as the bore traverses the pipeline to ensure adequate clearance with the pipeline. The pothole width must account for the inaccuracy of the locating equipment.

7. Substructures: All utility crossings of a gas pipeline should be made as close to perpendicular as feasible (90° +/- 15°). All utility lines crossing the gas pipeline must have a minimum of 12 inches of separation from the gas pipeline. Parallel utilities, pole bases, water line 'kicker blocks', storm drain inlets, water meters, valves, back pressure devices or other utility substructures are not allowed in the PG&E gas pipeline easement.

If previously retired PG&E facilities are in conflict with proposed substructures, PG&E must verify they are safe prior to removal. This includes verification testing of the contents of the facilities, as well as environmental testing of the coating and internal surfaces. Timelines for PG&E completion of this verification will vary depending on the type and location of facilities in conflict.

8. Structures: No structures are to be built within the PG&E gas pipeline easement. This includes buildings, retaining walls, fences, decks, patios, carports, septic tanks, storage sheds, tanks, loading ramps, or any structure that could limit PG&E's ability to access its facilities.

9. Fencing: Permanent fencing is not allowed within PG&E easements except for perpendicular crossings which must include a 16 foot wide gate for vehicular access. Gates will be secured with PG&E corporation locks.

10. Landscaping: Landscaping must be designed to allow PG&E to access the pipeline for maintenance and not interfere with pipeline coatings or other cathodic protection systems. No trees, shrubs, brush, vines, and other vegetation may be planted within the easement area. Only those plants, ground covers, grasses, flowers, and low-growing plants that grow unsupported to a maximum of four feet (4') in height at maturity may be planted within the easement area.

11. Cathodic Protection: PG&E pipelines are protected from corrosion with an "Impressed Current" cathodic protection system. Any proposed facilities, such as metal conduit, pipes,

service lines, ground rods, anodes, wires, etc. that might affect the pipeline cathodic protection system must be reviewed and approved by PG&E Corrosion Engineering.

12. Pipeline Marker Signs: PG&E needs to maintain pipeline marker signs for gas transmission pipelines in order to ensure public awareness of the presence of the pipelines. With prior written approval from PG&E Pipeline Services, an existing PG&E pipeline marker sign that is in direct conflict with proposed developments may be temporarily relocated to accommodate construction work. The pipeline marker must be moved back once construction is complete.

13. PG&E is also the provider of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E's facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs which may endanger the safe operation of its facilities.

Attachment 2 – Electric Facilities

It is PG&E's policy to permit certain uses on a case by case basis within its electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) provided such uses and manner in which they are exercised, will not interfere with PG&E's rights or endanger its facilities. Some examples/restrictions are as follows:

1. Buildings and Other Structures: No buildings or other structures including the foot print and eave of any buildings, swimming pools, wells or similar structures will be permitted within fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) areas. PG&E's transmission easement shall be designated on subdivision/parcel maps as "**RESTRICTED USE AREA – NO BUILDING."**

2. Grading: Cuts, trenches or excavations may not be made within 25 feet of our towers. Developers must submit grading plans and site development plans (including geotechnical reports if applicable), signed and dated, for PG&E's review. PG&E engineers must review grade changes in the vicinity of our towers. No fills will be allowed which would impair ground-to-conductor clearances. Towers shall not be left on mounds without adequate road access to base of tower or structure.

3. Fences: Walls, fences, and other structures must be installed at locations that do not affect the safe operation of PG&'s facilities. Heavy equipment access to our facilities must be maintained at all times. Metal fences are to be grounded to PG&E specifications. No wall, fence or other like structure is to be installed within 10 feet of tower footings and unrestricted access must be maintained from a tower structure to the nearest street. Walls, fences and other structures proposed along or within the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) will require PG&E review; submit plans to PG&E Centralized Review Team for review and comment.

4. Landscaping: Vegetation may be allowed; subject to review of plans. On overhead electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s), trees and shrubs are limited to those varieties that do not exceed 15 feet in height at maturity. PG&E must have access to its facilities at all times, including access by heavy equipment. No planting is to occur within the footprint of the tower legs. Greenbelts are encouraged.

5. Reservoirs, Sumps, Drainage Basins, and Ponds: Prohibited within PG&E's fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) for electric transmission lines.

6. Automobile Parking: Short term parking of movable passenger vehicles and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) is allowed. The lighting within these parking areas will need to be reviewed by PG&E; approval will be on a case by case basis. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications. Blocked-up vehicles are not allowed. Carports, canopies, or awnings are not allowed.

7. Storage of Flammable, Explosive or Corrosive Materials: There shall be no storage of fuel or combustibles and no fueling of vehicles within PG&E's easement. No trash bins or incinerators are allowed.

8. Streets and Roads: Access to facilities must be maintained at all times. Street lights may be allowed in the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) but in all cases must be reviewed by PG&E for

proper clearance. Roads and utilities should cross the transmission easement as nearly at right angles as possible. Road intersections will not be allowed within the transmission easement.

9. Pipelines: Pipelines may be allowed provided crossings are held to a minimum and to be as nearly perpendicular as possible. Pipelines within 25 feet of PG&E structures require review by PG&E. Sprinklers systems may be allowed; subject to review. Leach fields and septic tanks are not allowed. Construction plans must be submitted to PG&E for review and approval prior to the commencement of any construction.

10. Signs: Signs are not allowed except in rare cases subject to individual review by PG&E.

11. Recreation Areas: Playgrounds, parks, tennis courts, basketball courts, barbecue and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) may be allowed; subject to review of plans. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications.

12. Construction Activity: Since construction activity will take place near PG&E's overhead electric lines, please be advised it is the contractor's responsibility to be aware of, and observe the minimum clearances for both workers and equipment operating near high voltage electric lines set out in the High-Voltage Electrical Safety Orders of the California Division of Industrial Safety (https://www.dir.ca.gov/Title8/sb5g2.html), as well as any other safety regulations. Contractors shall comply with California Public Utilities Commission General Order 95 (http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/gos/GO95/go_95_startup_page.html) and all other safety rules. No construction may occur within 25 feet of PG&E's towers. All excavation activities may only commence after 811 protocols has been followed.

Contractor shall ensure the protection of PG&E's towers and poles from vehicular damage by (installing protective barriers) Plans for protection barriers must be approved by PG&E prior to construction.

13. PG&E is also the owner of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E's facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs that may endanger the safe and reliable operation of its facilities.

From: Home Email
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Reuse proposal for Arco Arena
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 10:33:58 AM

Natomas already has a large number of apartment and condo developments, some of which include required low income housing. There are constant reports in North Natomas of break ins, vehicle theft, vehicular damage and break ins, along with theft of things like deliveries to private homes. These crimes are not committed by hard working homeowners and it is obvious to those of us who own property in North Natomas that the perpetrators of these crimes are often other 'residents' in the area. The idea of even more concentrated apartment housing is quite frightening. We need environmental quality not quantity. Our schools are already suffering from too large class numbers so where would all the children go if such large numbers of apartment housing units were built ?
Natomas needs an environmentally friendly development that would attract visitors to the area, who would then stimulate the local economy by using hotels, restaurants and shops. Many of the empty store buildings and vacant lots would then be occupied. The idea of Sacramento Zoo moving to the Arco Arena lot would bring a feeling of immense pride to the area along with associated employment by virtue of much needed economic stimulation.
Having been homeowners in North Natomas for almost 8 years we recognize that just building more and more dense housing is not the answer to the desire that we all have to improve our environment. There is not the amount of employment here available to sustain the need for concentrated housing.
We hope that comments such as this will be taken seriously and great thought be given to how the Arco Arena land will be used and that serious consideration will be given as to what would benefit this area the most for the future. More housing alone is not the answer. To reiterate.....Natomas needs quality economic stimulation.....not just quantity in terms of quick building.

Homeowners.
Serenata Way, Natomas Park, Sacramento, 95835

From: patricklaumd@yahoo.com
To: Scott Johnson
Cc: wewantazoo@gmail.com
Subject: Natomas Arena Site
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 10:12:44 AM

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident and business owner (www.natomasfamilypractice.com) in North Natomas, and I am writing to voice my support for relocating the Sacramento Zoo to Natomas. There are already enough shopping malls in the area and plenty of vacant lots for further housing construction. What Natomas lacks is more opportunity for family activities. I have 2 young children and I know that they and many others would be thrilled to have the zoo in their neighborhood! I understand that the current zoo has outgrown their location and needs to expand. This seems to be a match made in heaven. The spacious location could provide room for bringing in some larger animals and also habitats for conservationism. The arena site would also provide much easier access to what could become another Sacramento crown jewel.

So I implore those in decision making power to consider transforming the arena site into something special for all Sacramentans to enjoy!

Sincerely,

Patrick Lau MD

From:	Patricia Lee
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	Angelique Ashby
Subject:	No Zoo at Natomas
Date:	Monday, March 25, 2019 9:57:19 PM

Hi Scott,

I'm here to say I am against the zoo at Natomas. Thinking about the noise, the smell, the different disease-carrying insects, the waste water environmental impact and all the lost jobs. As a millennial zoos are inhumane to me.

More importantly here to say that ROMER CRISTOBAL and ED PEREZ do not have full authorization to speak for us. They do not represent all of us at the Hamptons Homeowners Association. I don't recall them taken a consensus with owners and this does not really affect us we are like 7 stop lights north of Arco Arena. These weasels got themselves elected to the board and did a bait and switch on their constituents. Since they been on the board (just this summer 2018) they are trying to make changes to the community with much resistance. For example no parking and/or permits on public streets. Buying an extra house for a community center because of a face saving gesture trying to take false credit for the new "public" Aquatic Center. I know all this sounds like venting and maybe at the wrong forum, and our inherited problem that we have to deal with. Just in case those others that are against the project they should have a voice as well.

Respectfully

Pat Lee

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: No Zoo at Natomas
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:26:33 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:03 AM
To: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: No Zoo at Natomas

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Patricia Lee <pat.lee1401@gmail.com>
> **Date:** March 25, 2019 at 9:57:02 PM PDT
> **To:** SRJohnson@cityofsacramento.org
> **Cc:** aashby@cityofsacramento.org
> **Subject: No Zoo at Natomas**
>
> Hi Scott,
>
> I'm here to say I am against the zoo at Natomas. Thinking about the noise, the smell, the different disease-carrying insects, the waste water environmental impact and all the lost jobs. As a millennial zoos are inhumane to me.
>
> More importantly here to say that ROMER CRISTOBAL and ED PEREZ do not have full authorization to speak for us. They do not represent all of us at the Hamptons Homeowners Association. I don't recall them taken a consensus with owners and this does not really affect us we are like 7 stop lights north of Arco Arena. These weasels got themselves elected to the board and did a bait and switch on their constituents. Since they been on the board (just this summer 2018) they are trying to make changes to the community with much resistance. For example no parking and/or permits on public streets. Buying an extra house for a community center because of a face saving gesture trying to take false credit for the new "public" Aquatic Center. I know all this sounds like venting and maybe at the wrong forum, and our inherited problem that we have to deal with. Just in case those others that are against the project they should have a voice as well.
>
> Respectfully

Pat Lee

From: Palminder
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo in Natomas
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 4:59:08 PM

Dear City of Sacramento,

We are writing with regards to the notice that more homes have been proposed to be built where Sleep Train Arena stands. As a homeowner, taxpayer and resident of Natomas for the last 11 years, my family and I believe that this area does not need more homes. I look at areas like Roseville where there are so many tourist attractions and would wish for leisure areas for our family.

The location of Sleep Train Arena is a central area in Natomas. A community park, zoo or other family themed area would better serve the community. The residents of Natomas need a place for leisure and activity. Additionally, more homes would contribute to more congestion and cars on the streets with an already limited infrastructure.

A zoo would attract tourists and help Natomas' economy and home prices.

Please reconsider the option of more homes in where Sleep Train Arena stands, and put the interest of Natomas residents first.

Sincerely,

Manpreet Brar and Palminder Maheru

From: Priti Merchant
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Plan for Sleep Train Arena
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 11:08:31 PM

Dear City of Sacramento officials:

I'm writing to strongly oppose the current plan in place for the Sleep Train Arena. My family has been a Natomas resident since 2006. Natomas does NOT need additional housing and commercial buildings. Currently, there are too many empty buildings and Natomas does not need more! Additional housing is not needed and schools cannot handle more students. Please understand the views of the community of Natomas and make a decision that will be valuable to the citizens and city.

Thank you for the consideration.

Sincerely,
Priti Merchant
913.485.5552 (cell)

Sent from my iPhone

From: Phil Rosenberg/Deb Heymann
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: PLEASE - WE REALLY DO WANT A ZOO.
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 3:42:37 PM

Since the Kingsedt North Natomas we have been told that it is better to have the old arena site developed prudently rather than quickly. That means nothing if more office space and high density living soace is the result.
You have the perfect opportunity to create a learning trail from the museums in Old Sacramento, to the new science center and to the a new, improved, zoo in Natomas at the old arena, and on to the Natomas Basin Conservancy.
You have this chance to transform this area through thoughtful stewardship, enhanced conservancy and impactful education.

WE WANT A ZOO. Please.

Thank you for your attention.
Phil Rosenberg
Pebblewood Dr
So Natomas

From: Pat Sandlin
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:02:48 PM

I support moving the Zoo to the Arco Arena Land. Please make this a priority!

Thank you, Pat Sandlin
Natomas resident since 1979

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Patricia Szostak
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Comments on Sacramento Kings Proposal
Date:	Tuesday, April 2, 2019 10:14:25 PM

Hello,

I would like to comment on the what to do with the arena land. We absolutely do not need any more housing, The zoo would be awesome. This area is in need of family friendly activities and of things for teens to do. A skating rink or bowling lanes, swimming pool or water slides, fun restaurants, anything but more apartments or houses that no one can afford. Housing is a lazy idea.

Make Natomas a fun place where people want to come and spend their money.

Thank you.

Patricia Szostak
3075 Stanhope Way
Sacramento, CA 95833

From: Pat Thompson
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena Master Plan
Date: Sunday, March 17, 2019 9:17:06 PM

North Natomas is filled with high density housing and more going up all around us. The Zoo Proposal is a good alternative and would give us all living north I-8 someplace close by to enjoy other than big box shopping and fast food joints!! Sounds like the Kings see fast cash if they get re-zoned to allow more high density housing. Sell off quickly. This area will be more congested than Roseville at I-8 in no time otherwise. A big mess. Don't do it!

Put in that light rail extension to the airport along Commerce Ave. with a stop at the new zoo, the convention center and Golden 1. Make Sacramento a First Class City. You have a good start with revamping Old Sac at the River. Keep it going with a quality project here, not just ho hum, more of the same jammed in housing.

2000 more cookie cutter high density units up here in addition to what is already on the books is just too much. Save it for the Rail Yards. Natomas needs a high quality family amenity like the Zoo. And now that I think of it, put high density at the old Zoo where folks can walk out into Land Park. Bet those neighbors would really like that!

Pat Thompson
North Natomas Resident

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Paula Willhite/CEO
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	Freddiemac Acct 2017
Subject:	Old Arco Arena Site
Date:	Sunday, March 24, 2019 9:15:54 PM

I am writing as a Natomas Park resident. I would love to put in my vote for the Sacramento Zoo!!! We need something in this area with so many families. We need more kid friendly things out here and my kids are all grown up! LOL I still would love to see a Zoo in this neighborhood with real animals!! More than birds and a monkey!

Paula Willhite
Natomas Park resident

--

Paula Willhite & Associates Real Estate Team Inc.
Paula Willhite/CEO
916.202.1594 cell
916.473-6444 off
PWAoffers@gmail.com
www.**PWArealestate**.com

From: Rachelle Ahmad
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Old Arena Site
Date: Sunday, March 17, 2019 7:25:42 PM

Good evening,

I am writing to express my concern over the Kings plans to rezone for retail and housing at the old arena site. I am DO NOT want this growth in my neighborhood. We all ready have so much housing growth and retail/restaurants that are not able to sustain business.

The Sacramento Zoo plans should be strongly considered. This is what myself and my neighbors want and would benefit our beloved zoo and their animal occupants. This would fill a much needed entertainment gap in our area while supporting the city's need for zoo improvements.

Thank you for your time,

Rachelle Ahmad
Natomas Resident

From: Rai Arts
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo for Natomas
Date: Sunday, March 31, 2019 4:24:37 PM

To whom it may concern
Dear sir/madam
We people in Natomas are really not happy being the step children of the city. We need opportunities for our children and families. We don't need more housing, rather we need amenities. A zoo will be ideal at the sleep train arena location.
Our families vote is for the zoo!
Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

From: Ruthie Bowers
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: WWAZ
Date: Monday, March 18, 2019 7:06:08 AM

What a terrific way to bring more tourism to our city! We need this zoo! Please vote for relocation!
Thank you,
Ruthie Bowers

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From: eronebox c/o Romer Cristobal
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: No More High Density Housing in North Natomas
Date: Sunday, March 31, 2019 6:37:17 AM

Hello Mr. Johnson,

I am writing this letter to voice my strong support for the relocation of the Sacramento Zoo to the former Sleep Train Arena in North Natomas. Thumbs down to more high density housing units, that idea is being opposed by the community. I cannot find one single resident that supports the King's idea.

The relocation of Sacramento Zoo to Natomas will bring economic growth to Sacramento because of tourists from all over the world. Tourists will be great for businesses and will create jobs. Sacramento Zoo in Natomas will be one of the largest zoos in the nation and California; Sacramento will become a destination!

Again, YES to the Sacramento Zoo relocation to Natomas and a big NO to more high density housing in North Natomas.

ROMER CRISTOBAL
President
The Hamptons Homeowners Association

From: Ruma Costello
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco Arena Plans
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 2:43:26 PM

Mr. Johnson,

I have been following the Facebook campaign organized by the "We Want A Zoo" group, as well as the news releases stating that the Kings would prefer to use the old Arco Arena site for retail stores and housing development. I decided to do some research to find out what the King's core values are, and found the following to be their mission statement: "Our **mission** at the **Sacramento Kings** has always been to unite our community and use our platform to create positive change, so we continue to stand with our players, and all people, who use their platform to raise awareness and make **Sacramento** and our country proud."

So, it seems the Kings believe in creating positive change and their mission is to unite their community. Their present plan to building a shopping center and housing development does not meet that criteria!

Sacramento is currently entertaining innovative ideas to reinvent the waterfront. With Natomas near downtown and the waterfront, I feel that a new and creative vision is being developed for our city. I would think the Kings would be proud to use their land for something just as new and exciting to unite our city, just as their mottos says. Therefore, I urge the Kings to live up to their mission statement and approve the plan to build a new safari zoo at Arco!

Ruma Costello
Legal Secretary
COSTELLO LAW CORPORATION
2267 Lava Ridge Court, Suite 210
Roseville, CA 95661
www.sacramentopatentattorney.com
Phone: (916) 441-2234
Email: ruma@costellolawcorp.com

From: 4ruthiegarcia
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco Arena
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 8:34:01 AM

PLEASE NO MORE HOUSING!!!
We want a Zoo or hospital or college... Not housing.
We Need our voices heard!
J. Ruth Garcia
A Natomas resident
3652 Trefethen Way
Sacramento California 95834

From: rochelle harvey
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena Space
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 10:45:40 AM

Hello,
I have been a Natomas homeowner for almost 12 years and a teacher in Natomas for 15 years. As this development would greatly impact my neighborhood,
I would LOVE to see the arena area turned into a new zoo. It would benefit families and students all over Sacramento. It would benefit the Sacramento Zoo as well, making expansion possible and drawing in more visitors. More homes would make traffic/commuting horrible and is not a good option for Natomas.
Thank you for taking the time to read my suggestion.
Sincerely,
Rochelle Harvey

From: Renee Henry
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Tower 301 Comment Submittal
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 10:29:03 AM

To whom it may concern,

Sacramento is the capital of California and we should have a zoo that reflects that. Our current zoo is very disappointing compared to other cities. The city needs more attractions to attract more money, jobs, and people. There is currently a lot of housing already being built in North Natomas, we don't need anymore housing. Businesses and attractions, like a state of the art zoo will only make our beautiful city even more beautiful! Another suggestion would be a hospital or mall.

Thank you

Sent from my iPhone

From: Rachelle Kohnen
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Comments re: What should Sleep Train Arena become?
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 5:14:27 PM

Hello: Councilmember Angelique Ashby suggested that we send our comments to you in regards to the vacant Sleep Train Arena. I have lived in North Natomas since 2001, when I moved into a development that was just barely finished at that time. I've watched the area grow with plenty of retail, shopping, and restaurants. I would really love to see Sleep Train be converted, or torn down and rebuilt as a hospital, preferably not Kaiser. Maybe UC Davis, Sutter or Mercy. We are at least 30 minutes from an emergency room, and with traffic, it could be more like 45 minutes. Thankfully, I have not needed emergency services. But when and if the time comes, I would love to have a hospital with an emergency room much closer. I believe a hospital would offer the kind of employment opportunities (at varying pay grades) that Natomas would be lucky to attract and retain. Also, you can't ask for a better location, right off of I-5 or I-80. Natomas is HUGE now; a city within itself. It is deserving of a large medical facility; something more than an urgent care center.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thanks,
Rachelle Kohnen
1 Rockmont Circle, Sacramento, CA 95835

From: Renato A Pascual Jr
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: SleepTrain/ARCO Arena use
Date: Sunday, March 31, 2019 7:32:36 AM

Dear Sir.

My wife, children and I would also like to add our support to the idea of moving Sacramento Zoo to the Sleep Train / ARCO arena area.

I understand that the Sacramento Kings are requesting to change the current zoning for the area from entertainment to residential. So it appears to me that after “gifting” them with 100 acres, they want us, the tax payers to “gift” them again with a new zoning tag so they can make more money? I see no logic in that except that the Kings just want more money from the tax payers.

In the meantime, we are the state capital of one of the largest economy in the world and we have a 15 acre zoo! So small that I hear it might actually lose accreditation if it does not move.

Natomas is halfway between downtown and the airport and right off major freeways. It is about 180 acres that the proposed parking lot alone is bigger than the current zoo.

Sacramento badly needs a place where people from outside the city and the state would consider coming to. No one will go vacation in sacramento for a high density housing...or a mall.

Please consider the zoo proposal.

Renato, Mary Jane, Johannes and Justine Pascual
waikoloa2005@yahoo.com

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Erica Castillo
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	FW: Old ARCO Arena
Date:	Friday, March 29, 2019 1:22:04 PM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 1:21 PM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Old ARCO Arena

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** rramirez.2009@gmail.com
> **Date:** March 29, 2019 at 10:50:38 AM PDT
> **To:** aashby@cityofsacramento.org
> **Subject: Old ARCO Arena**
>
> The opportunity to have the zoo relocate to North Natomas would be a real plus not just for Natomas, but the entire City. As a Natomas resident, I would even be willing to be taxed for the benefit of having the Zoo here; maybe for free admission twice a year.
>
> I also realize the deal has to pencil, and a mixed use develpment, although taking away from the size of the zoo, may need to be part of the equation.
>
> Finally, freeing up the acreage in Land Park with the zoo's relocation will allow 100's of Section 8 units and a homeless shelter being built in Land Park
>
> Anyway, good luck with the effort...
>
> Sent from my iPhone

From:	Ron Richardson
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	Ron Richardson; Dauer, Petra
Subject:	Tower 301 Comment Submittal
Date:	Sunday, March 17, 2019 8:34:37 AM

Hello Mr Johnson,

I read on Nextdoor that this is where we can submit comments on the proposed rezoning of Sleep Train arena. If this is incorrect please redirect me accordingly.

I feel it would be horrible to have the property rezoned to include high density housing. The traffic in North Natomas is extremely congested with the current residents who live in the area. What is lacking in our community is retail shopping, gas stations, coffee shops and commercial uses like a movie theater, office buildings, etc. The zoo option would also bring a community gathering place to residents. Something like DOCO around the new downtown arena would bring a fresh feel to our area and create a vibrant gathering location. We just don't need more housing especially high density.

Sincerely,
Ron and Petra Richardson
3362 Mas Amilos Way
Sacramento - Natomas 95835

From: robert simonson
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: reuse of Sleep Train Arena in Natomas.
Date: Thursday, March 21, 2019 2:05:18 AM

I am in favor of the ZOO. I believe that would be a great addition for Natomas. We have enough new homes and businesses being developed.

Robert Simonson

From: ruby
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena reuse
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 7:38:58 PM

Rather have a zoo. Too much housing. Need something for people to do in the area. A zoo would bring in dollars from other areas.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From:	Renee van Zuydam
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Sleep Train Arena
Date:	Tuesday, March 26, 2019 11:03:43 AM

Good afternoon,

I am writing you today regarding the development of the Sleep Train Arena property.

There are so many high density houses being built in the area and the traffic is getting ridiculous. Please don't build any more houses!

We need something in the Natomas area that makes it a destination. A zoo would be great to have in our area. There is plenty of space and lots of room to add roads.

We already have many hotels and stores and medical offices, etc.
A zoo would be a wonderful addition!

Thank you,

Renee van Zuydam

April 2, 2019 9:00 a.m.

Scott Johnson, Senior Planner

City of Sacramento Community Development Department

300 Richards Blvd., Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811

srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse Project (P18-077) EIR Scoping

Thank you for this opportunity to provide input on the subject EIR. Please include the following concerns in the EIR scope of analysis:

Concern 1:

The Project proposes to change the zone designation of the Arena property to C-2 General Commercial.[1] **The proposed zone designation is thoroughly inconsistent with the original use intended for that property; as such it represents a significant divergence from the hard-fought community design that is the North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP).** The Arena property is currently zoned SPX Sports Complex.[2] Given that the property is no longer the home of the Kings (moved downtown) or the Monarchs (defunct), and there are no other sports teams seeking to make it their home, "accommodating the design requirements of professional and amateur sports"[2] is no longer a priority and is not a realistic pursuit. However, **the intended use of that land was and still is to "provide for the education, information, recreation, culture, or entertainment of Sacramento area residents and visitors."** The General Plan and Community Plans are official policy statements of the City Council, and by extension, the citizens they represent. The Project's proposed C-2 Zone designation demonstrates a callous disregard for the vision imagined by those stakeholders.

Concern 2:

With the Project's proposed addition of up to approximately 2,000 residential units, none of which were anticipated in the North Natomas Community Plan, **please demonstrate how the City will meet goal NN PHS 1.2, specifically "a police protection standard of 1.60 police officers per 1,000 residents and 1.0 non-sworn personnel for every 1.60 police officers** (2035 General Plan/NNCP, NN PHS 1.2).

Concern 3:

Regarding "...the geographic area bounded by the East Drain, I-5, Del Paso Road, and Arena Boulevard (this area comprises about 340 acres and includes several PUDs)…." (2035 General Plan/NNCP, NN.LU 1.19). For any development to remain consistent with policy NN.LU 1.19, several findings must be made. Two of those findings are particularly relevant in the context of the proposed Project:

- "The proposed increase in residential use will not result in an over-concentration of multi-family projects in the area"
- "The total amount of acreage devoted to residential use(s) within this geographic area does not exceed 25 percent"

Quick math tells us that 25% of 340 is 85 (acres). Some of the 85 acres are already devoted to residential use(s), reducing the availability of eligible acreage to something less than 85.

Of the 340 acres referenced in NN.LU 1.19, how many acres are already devoted to residential use(s)? What percentage (of the 340 acres) do those devoted acres represent? How many acres are still eligible for residential use(s)? Is it feasible to build ~2,000 residential units on the remaining eligible acreage, and not result in an "over-concentration of multi-family projects"?

Furthermore, NN.LU 1.14 of the 2035 General Plan/NNCP states "The City shall ensure the maximum size of an apartment complex is 200 units and 8 acres…." **Please demonstrate how or if the Project could comply with policy NN.LU 1.14.**

Other concerns:

Air Quality: The Project proposes to add up to 2,000 residential units in the plan area. Presumably, many of these new households would own one or more automobiles each, resulting in a permanent, long-term increase in vehicular emissions. The Sacramento region is already a non-attainment area with regard to air quality.

Biological Resources: Please evaluate the pond/potential wetland/riparian zone in the north part of the Project area. Also evaluate the Project's potential impact on the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Same as Air Quality...permanent, long-term increase in vehicular emissions.

Population and Housing: I am concerned that the Project would induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area. The Arena property was not planned/intended to be developed for intensive residential use(s).

Public Services: The Project would trigger a need for a suite of new public services, including one or more new elementary and junior high schools, and necessitating expansion of one or more of the existing high schools. The Project's proposed "bolt-on" growth was not a part of the original design of the North Natomas Community Plan. The fire, police and parks departments will all need to expand to meet the new, unplanned demand triggered by the proposed Project.

Traffic and Transportation: I am very concerned about the Project's impact on local traffic and transportation, by adding significant daily traffic to the system. Of particular concern are the freeway on- and off-ramps during morning and afternoon commute times, and traffic on I-5 itself, especially the segment between Del Paso Road and downtown Sacramento (LOS D&F at peak times, daily). Also, I believe this Project will contribute a significant amount of traffic to the Arena Boulevard and Del Paso Road overpasses; such traffic is an annoyance when it impedes commuters, but is a threat to public safety when it impedes emergency responders or citizens fleeing flood waters. The Snowy Egret and Natomas Crossing overpasses (currently unbuilt) should be considered as possible mitigation to traffic impacts on the existing overpasses.

Insufficient Details: The Project would substantially influence the character of the Natomas community, but the Project plan is incredibly vague. (Compare to the Panhandle NOP.)

Suggested Alternatives to consider in the EIR:

- **Alternative 1: Rezone the entire property to A-OS Agricultural-Open Space.[3] A-OS is far more consistent with the intent of the current SPX zone designation.** (For reference, the North Natomas Regional Park is designated A-OS.) **The Sacramento Zoo is currently seeking to relocate and expand, and has identified the Arena property as a suitable and desirable location. While not a sports team, a relocated Sacramento Zoo would fulfill the original NNCP vision for an amenity that provides for the education, information, recreation, culture, or entertainment of Sacramento area residents and visitors.**
- **Alternative 2: Rezone ~120 acres to A-OS, and rezone the remainder to EC Employment Center.[4] EC would permit the same uses as C-2, but is better suited to the vision of the North Natomas Community Plan.**

Respectfully,

Robert Wurgler

2414 Serenata Court, Sacramento, CA 95835

rwurgler@gmail.com

Footnotes:

[1] C-2 General Commercial "The purpose of the C-2 zone is to provide for the sale of goods; the performance of services, including repair facilities; office uses; dwellings; small wholesale stores or distributors; and limited processing and packaging."

[2] SPX Sports Complex "The purpose of the SPX zone is to ensure the proper development and use of land and improvements to achieve a sports complex that, at a minimum, accommodates the design

requirements of professional and amateur sports; and accommodates events, exhibitions, and performances that provide for the education, information, recreation, culture, or entertainment of Sacramento area residents and visitors, in accordance with the specific land use policies of the city general plan, community plans, and the planned unit development (PUD) guidelines. A conditional use permit is required for each use in this zone."

[3] A-OS Agricultural-Open Space "The purpose of the A-OS zone is to ensure the long-term preservation of agricultural and open space land. This zone is intended to prevent the premature development of land to urban uses."

[4] EC Employment Center "The purpose of the EC zone is to provide a flexible zone for employment-generating uses in a pedestrian-friendly setting with ample open space. The EC zone also provides for a variety of supporting uses, including retail, residential, and light industrial. The close proximity of supporting uses allows for pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and rideshare-connection opportunities, which collectively help reduce dependence on the automobile. Consequently, parking needs are reduced and shared parking opportunities increase. The EC zone was developed specifically for North Natomas, but may be applicable to other areas of the city if the site is appropriate for a flexible, mixed–use, employment-generating complex."

cc: ecastillo@cityofsacramento.org

From:	CGS Webmaster
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	Erica Castillo
Subject:	Natomas Arena Reuse Project (P18-077) EIR Scoping
Date:	Tuesday, April 2, 2019 9:25:18 AM
Attachments:	Natomas Arena Reuse Project (P18-077) EIR Scoping.pdf

---

April 2, 2019 9:00 a.m.

Scott Johnson, Senior Planner
City of Sacramento Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd., Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811
srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse Project (P18-077) EIR Scoping

Thank you for this opportunity to provide input on the subject EIR.
Please include the following concerns in the EIR scope of analysis:

Concern 1:

The Project proposes to change the zone designation of the Arena property to C-2 General Commercial.1 The proposed zone designation is thoroughly inconsistent with the original use intended for that property; as such it represents a significant divergence from the hard-fought community design that is the North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP). The Arena property is currently zoned SPX Sports Complex.2 Given that the property is no longer the home of the Kings (moved downtown) or the Monarchs (defunct), and there are no other sports teams seeking to make it their home, "accommodating the design requirements of professional and amateur sports"2 is no longer a priority and is not a realistic pursuit. However, the intended use of that land was and still is to "provide for the education, information, recreation, culture, or entertainment of Sacramento area residents and visitors." The General Plan and Community Plans are official policy statements of the City Council, and by extension, the citizens they represent. The Project's proposed C-2 Zone designation demonstrates a callous disregard for the vision imagined by those stakeholders.

Concern 2:

With the Project's proposed addition of up to approximately 2,000 residential units, none of which were anticipated in the North Natomas Community Plan, please demonstrate how the City will meet goal NN PHS 1.2, specifically “a police protection standard of 1.60 police officers per 1,000 residents and 1.0 non-sworn personnel for every 1.60 police officers (2035 General Plan/NNCP, NN PHS 1.2).

Concern 3:

Regarding "...the geographic area bounded by the East Drain, I 5, Del Paso Road, and Arena Boulevard (this area comprises about 340 acres and includes several PUDs)…." (2035 General Plan/NNCP, NN.LU 1.19). For any development to remain consistent with policy NN.LU 1.19, several findings must be made. Two of those findings are particularly

relevant in the context of the proposed Project:

- "The proposed increase in residential use will not result in an over-concentration of multi-family projects in the area"
- "The total amount of acreage devoted to residential use(s) within this geographic area does not exceed 25 percent"

Quick math tells us that 25% of 340 is 85 (acres). Some of the 85 acres are already devoted to residential use(s), reducing the availability of eligible acreage to something less than 85.

Of the 340 acres referenced in NN.LU 1.19, how many acres are already devoted to residential use(s)? What percentage (of the 340 acres) do those devoted acres represent? How many acres are still eligible for residential use(s)? Is it feasible to build ~2,000 residential units on the remaining eligible acreage, and not result in an "over-concentration of multi-family projects"?

Furthermore, NN.LU 1.14 of the 2035 General Plan/NNCP states "The City shall ensure the maximum size of an apartment complex is 200 units and 8 acres…." Please demonstrate how or if the Project could comply with policy NN.LU 1.14.

Other concerns:

Air Quality: The Project proposes to add up to 2,000 residential units in the plan area. Presumably, many of these new households would own one or more automobiles each, resulting in a permanent, long-term increase in vehicular emissions. The Sacramento region is already a non-attainment area with regard to air quality.

Biological Resources: Please evaluate the pond/potential wetland/riparian zone in the north part of the Project area. Also evaluate the Project's potential impact on the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Same as Air Quality...permanent, long-term increase in vehicular emissions.

Population and Housing: I am concerned that the Project would induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area. The Arena property was not planned/intended to be developed for intensive residential use(s).

Public Services: The Project would trigger a need for a suite of new public services, including one or more new elementary and junior high schools, and necessitating expansion of one or more of the existing high schools. The Project's proposed "bolt-on" growth was not a part of the original design of the North Natomas Community Plan. The fire, police and parks departments will all need to expand to meet the new, unplanned demand triggered by the proposed Project.

Traffic and Transportation: I am very concerned about the Project's impact on local traffic and transportation, by adding significant daily traffic to the system. Of particular concern are the freeway on- and off-ramps during morning and afternoon commute times, and traffic on I-5 itself, especially the segment between Del Paso Road and

downtown Sacramento (LOS D&F at peak times, daily). Also, I believe this Project will contribute a significant amount of traffic to the Arena Boulevard and Del Paso Road overpasses; such traffic is an annoyance when it impedes commuters, but is a threat to public safety when it impedes emergency responders or citizens fleeing flood waters. The Snowy Egret and Natomas Crossing overpasses (currently unbuilt) should be considered as possible mitigation to traffic impacts on the existing overpasses.

Insufficient Details: The Project would substantially influence the character of the Natomas community, but the Project plan is incredibly vague. (Compare to the Panhandle NOP.)

Suggested Alternatives to consider in the EIR:

- Alternative 1: Rezone the entire property to A-OS Agricultural-Open Space.3 A-OS is far more consistent with the intent of the current SPX zone designation. (For reference, the North Natomas Regional Park is designated A-OS.) The Sacramento Zoo is currently seeking to relocate and expand, and has identified the Arena property as a suitable and desirable location. While not a sports team, a relocated Sacramento Zoo would fulfill the original NNCP vision for an amenity that provides for the education, information, recreation, culture, or entertainment of Sacramento area residents and visitors.
- Alternative 2: Rezone ~120 acres to A-OS, and rezone the remainder to EC Employment Center.4 EC would permit the same uses as C-2, but is better suited to the vision of the North Natomas Community Plan.

Respectfully,
Robert Wurgler
2414 Serenata Court, Sacramento, CA 95835
rwurgler@gmail.com

Footnotes:

1 C-2 General Commercial "The purpose of the C-2 zone is to provide for the sale of goods; the performance of services, including repair facilities; office uses; dwellings; small wholesale stores or distributors; and limited processing and packaging."

2 SPX Sports Complex "The purpose of the SPX zone is to ensure the proper development and use of land and improvements to achieve a sports complex that, at a minimum, accommodates the design requirements of professional and amateur sports; and accommodates events, exhibitions, and performances that provide for the education, information, recreation, culture, or entertainment of Sacramento area residents and visitors, in accordance with the specific land use policies of the city general plan, community plans, and the planned unit development (PUD) guidelines. A conditional use permit is required for each use in this zone."

3 A-OS Agricultural-Open Space "The purpose of the A-OS zone is to ensure the long-term preservation of agricultural and open space land. This zone is intended to prevent the premature development of land to urban uses."

4 EC Employment Center "The purpose of the EC zone is to provide a

flexible zone for employment-generating uses in a pedestrian-friendly setting with ample open space. The EC zone also provides for a variety of supporting uses, including retail, residential, and light industrial. The close proximity of supporting uses allows for pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and rideshare-connection opportunities, which collectively help reduce dependence on the automobile. Consequently, parking needs are reduced and shared parking opportunities increase. The EC zone was developed specifically for North Natomas, but may be applicable to other areas of the city if the site is appropriate for a flexible, mixed–use, employment-generating complex."

cc: ecastillo@cityofsacramento.org
Attached: Natomas Arena Reuse Project (P18-077) EIR Scoping.pdf

Department of Transportation
Ron E. Vicari, Director

Divisions
Administration
Engineering & Planning
Maintenance & Operations

County of Sacramento

March 1, 2019

Mr. Scott Johnson
Senior Planner
City of Sacramento, Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR THE NATOMAS ARENA REUSE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (P18-077)

Dear Mr. Johnson:

The Sacramento County Department of Transportation (SACDOT) has had a chance to review the NOP for this project. Thank you for the opportunity to review. We have the following comment:

- Please include analysis of impacted Sacramento County Roadway facilities in the traffic analysis that will be prepared for the EIR. Traffic from this development will use portions of Del Paso Road, North Market Boulevard, Northgate Boulevard, and even El Centro Road. Please identify any impacts and mitigation measures as appropriate for these facilities.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (916) 874-7052.

Sincerely,

Matthew G. Darrow, PE, TE, PTOE
Senior Transportation Engineer
Department of Transportation.

MGD

c: Dan Shoeman - DOT
Rick Carter – DOT

From: steven alfaro
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas proposal at sleeptrain arena
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 2:48:46 PM

My name is Steve and I live in Natomas. I vote or propose to have a zoo or hospital in that area rather than apartments. As it is there are already so many apartments in Natomas vacant.

Anyways, that's my opinion, vote, whatever you'd like to call it.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sarah Allen
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: We want a zoo!
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 3:55:26 PM

Hello,

I would really love to see a zoo in natomas for the land use of the old Kings arena.

From: Steve Dennison
To: Scott Johnson; Angelique Ashby
Subject: Sleeptrain Arena
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 9:19:12 PM

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to express my deepest opposition the the Sacramento Kings proposed re-use of the old arena site. A proposal to add over 2,000 medium to high density housing units and over 1 million sf of commercial space makes no sense.
What the area needs is development that will either bring in high paying jobs (like Centene) or attract tourists. All one needs to do is look to the example that Roseville set some 30 years ago with the development of the Douglas corridor. This area grew into one of the premier locations for financial institutions in the region, which attracted high paying jobs. From this, retail, housing, restaurants and hotels have all flourished. But it all started with a unified plan to develop the area into a Class A office space alternative to downtown Sacramento. And it worked. So now instead of all that revenue going to Sacramento, it flows to Roseville.
The tourist option that is very attractive and gaining momentum, is moving the zoo to Natomas. To me, this is also a fantastic idea. With the swim center being built in Natomas that will attract visitors from all over the region, they will have down time and a visit to the zoo could be an excellent way to spend an afternoon. Plus, with our close proximity to UC Davis, one of the premier veterinary schools in the country, the new zoo could work in partnership to expand educational opportunities. Not just at the college level, but the zoo could attract school children of all ages with families that would dine at our restaurants and stay in our hotels. It would be an excellent addition to the community that would serve the entire region.
But neither of these options is an either/or. With the sheer size of the land available, there is no reason we could not have both.
All it takes is vision and leadership. And for that, the citizens of Natomas are relying on you. Please don't let this golden opportunity go to waste. Bring high paying jobs AND a world-class zoo, not more cheap housing and vacant commercial space.

Resptfully,

Steve Dennison

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Sleeptrain Arena
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:29:23 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:17 AM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Sleeptrain Arena

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Steve Dennison <stevemdennison@yahoo.com>
> **Date:** March 19, 2019 at 9:18:49 PM PDT
> **To:** srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org, aashby@cityofsacramento.org
> **Subject: Sleeptrain Arena**
>
> Dear City Council Members,
>
> I am writing to express my deepest opposition the the Sacramento Kings proposed re-use of the old arena site. A proposal to add over 2,000 medium to high density housing units and over 1 million sf of commercial space makes no sense.
> What the area needs is development that will either bring in high paying jobs (like Centene) or attract tourists. All one needs to do is look to the example that Roseville set some 30 years ago with the development of the Douglas corridor. This area grew into one of the premier locations for financial institutions in the region, which attracted high paying jobs. From this, retail, housing, restaurants and hotels have all flourished. But it all started with a unified plan to develop the area into a Class A office space alternative to downtown Sacramento. And it worked. So now instead of all that revenue going to Sacramento, it flows to Roseville.
> The tourist option that is very attractive and gaining momentum, is moving the zoo to Natomas. To me, this is also a fantastic idea. With the swim center being built in Natomas that will attract visitors from all over the region, they will have down time and a visit to the zoo could be an excellent way to spend an afternoon. Plus, with our close proximity to UC Davis, one of the premier veterinary schools in the country, the new zoo could work in partnership to expand educational opportunities. Not just at the college level, but the zoo could attract school children of all ages with families that would dine at our restaurants and stay in our hotels. It would be an excellent addition to the community that would serve the entire region.

But neither of these options is an either/or. With the sheer size of the land available, there is no reason we could not have both.
All it takes is vision and leadership. And for that, the citizens of Natomas are relying on you.
Please don't let this golden opportunity go to waste. Bring high paying jobs AND a world-class zoo, not more cheap housing and vacant commercial space.

Resptfully,

Steve Dennison

From: Stephanie Edwards
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sacramento Zoo Relocation
Date: Saturday, March 23, 2019 9:38:45 PM

Hi Mr. Johnson,

I am writing to voice my support for relocating the Sacramento Zoo to the Sleep Train Arena property. As a Natomas resident, I would like to see a fun, interesting, family friendly place, like the Zoo, built in the currently vacant Sleep Train Arena area. I do not think Natomas needs any more homes, restaurants, or retail stores. Plenty of those already exist or are currently under construction in Natomas. Something unique and different, like the Zoo, would be more beneficial to the Natomas community.

Thank you for taking public comments about the Sleep Train Arena property.

Thanks,
Stephanie Edwards

From: HANCOCK SHERRYL
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco Arena
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 8:46:52 AM

The last thing we need in Natomas is MORE housing! We would absolutely like to see the Zoo there, or even a hospital which Natomas is sorely lacking. With losing Arco Arena as an entertainment venue, we've lost a valuable resource for local businesses. More housing will only increase track, noise and pollution. Please consider this situation wisely!

From: speaks.shannon@gmail.com
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena space
Date: Saturday, March 16, 2019 8:33:06 PM

> I vote zoo!
>
> Shannon Speaks
> 541 Alcantar Circle
>
>
> Sent from my iPhone

From:	Erica Castillo
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	FW: I support moving the Sacramento Zoo to Natomas
Date:	Friday, March 29, 2019 10:28:43 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 10:14 AM
To: Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>; Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: I support moving the Sacramento Zoo to Natomas

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Sara Hanson <shanson@broadwaysacramento.com>
> **Date:** March 22, 2019 at 11:09:33 AM PDT
> **To:** "aashby@cityofsacramento.org" <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: I support moving the Sacramento Zoo to Natomas**
>
> Hello, Councilmember Angelique Ashby,
>
> My name is Sara Hanson and I have been a resident of Natomas since 1997. I love how much our community has grown in that time but, as you know as a fellow resident, the housing crisis in the mid-2000's and the building moratorium hurt our area quite a bit. With the recent exit of the Sacramento Kings, the area continues to be in a stalemate as there has not yet been a replacement that can equal the revenue loss to our local businesses.. The Centene project is very promising. However, we do not need more commercial business properties developed as there are already numerous large Buzz Oates properties sitting vacant.
>
> Recently, information came out that the Sacramento Zoo is seeking land to relocate and expand the zoo. Natomas was mentioned as the destination. While I have my own issues with zoos in general, I have always felt that the Sacramento Zoo leadership and staff have created and maintained a healthy environment for the animals. I believe that the approval for the Zoo's relocation to Natomas would benefit all parties. I think it would bring tourism to our area and that the restaurants, gas stations, retail stores would all benefit from the increased traffic and that the expansion plans would greatly benefit the animals and provide even more employment opportunities through the Zoo. And I think it would be so much fun to hear the animals at night and in the early mornings. On my daily walks (AM/PM) with my black lab, Stella, I can only imagine what she will thinks. ☺

I am interested in joining committees to improve our district. I am hoping that there is an opportunity to get more involved.

Thank you,
Sara Hanson

Sara Hanson
Associate Director of Marketing and Public Relations
Broadway Sacramento | Broadway At Music Circus & Broadway On Tour
1510 J Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814 | P: 916-446-5880 x128 | C: 916-801-5319 |
broadwaysacramento.com
Formerly California Musical Theatre

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Natomas Arena Reuse Comment/Request
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 9:49:14 AM

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Sunday, March 31, 2019 10:33 PM
To: Darrell Steinberg <DSteinberg@cityofsacramento.org>
Cc: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Natomas Arena Reuse Comment/Request

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** <suzzij@sbcglobal.net>
> **Date:** March 30, 2019 at 4:30:38 PM PDT
> **To:** <aashby@cityofsacramento.org>
> **Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse Comment/Request**
>
> Dear Councilmember Ashby,
>
> I am in your district, and would like to share a comment/request with you. Please consider an expanded Sacramento Zoo in the Natomas Sleep Train Arena site. It would benefit the entire community, including families, businesses, property values, and the zoo animals.
>
> The deal that was part of the new Golden 1 Arena included a promise to do something creative and substantial for the Natomas community on the prior arena site. Your comments from that time are well recorded, which identified that additional housing and apartments does not meet the bar for that deal. There is plenty of housing and apartments available in Natomas. The infrastructure can barely handle it now, between busy roads that are falling apart (Del Paso Rd) or wavy (Truxel), over-crowded schools, and crime growing at a concerning pace with limited number of police in the area - over-worked so many crimes do not meet the necessary priority to even receive a response (rampant bike theft at the high schools, shop-lifting, car and home vandalism, etc.).
>
> Please take this opportunity to do something great for Natomas, Sacramento, and the Sacramento Zoo. An expanded state-of-the-art zoo just north of the terrific downtown expansion can be another draw for

visitors and the entire surrounding areas. It would add a whole new positive dimension to Natomas and Sacramento, that more houses and apartments will not provide.

Thank you for your consideration.

Suzzi Judson
5017 Alterra Way
Sacramento, CA 95835

P.S. – May I ask your office to please forward this email to Mayor Steinberg. I would have sent it to both of you, however his email address may not be available to the public. Thank you.

From: suzzij@sbcglobal.net
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse Comment/Request
Date: Saturday, March 30, 2019 3:36:09 PM

Scott Johnson, Senior Planner
City of Sacramento Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd., Third Floor,
Sacramento, CA 95811
Tele: (916) 808-5842
E-mail:
srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

3/30/2019

Dear Mr. Johnson,

Please consider an expanded Sacramento Zoo in the Natomas Sleep Train Arena site. It would benefit the entire community, including families, businesses, property values, and the zoo animals.

The deal that was part of the new Golden 1 Arena included a promise to do something substantial for the Natomas community on the prior arena site. The mayor and Councilwoman Ashby's comments from that time are well recorded. Additional housing and apartments does not meet the terms of that deal. There is plenty of housing and apartments available in Natomas. The infrastructure can barely handle it now, between roads that are falling apart (Del Paso Rd), or wavy (Truxel), over-crowded schools, and crime growing at a concerning pace with limited number of police in the area - over-worked so most crimes do not meet the "priority" to even receive a response and are ignored (shop-lifting is ignored completely, bike theft at the high schools is rampant and ignored, car and home vandalism is ignored, etc.).

Please take this opportunity to do something great for Natomas, Sacramento, and the Sacramento Zoo. An expanded world-class zoo just north of the downtown expansion can be another draw for visitors and the entire surrounding areas. It would add a whole new positive dimension to Natomas and Sacramento, that more houses and apartments will not provide.

Thank you for your consideration.

Suzzi Judson
5017 Alterra Way
Sacramento, CA 95835

From: Sionainn Karlssen
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 2:27:55 PM

I think a zoo is needed in North Natomas!

The current zoo needs room to expand and North Natomas is the perfect location

“Think of all the beauty still left around you and be happy”.
-Anne Frank

From: Shannon Kiehn
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena land use
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 7:18:21 AM

I spent 15 years living in north Natomas. I love the community, the diversity, the convienent location but there are already far too many developments with high density housing and commercial space. Anchor stores sit vacant for years. When we looked at commercial space for our business we found places that had never had tenants many years after they were built. The only housing development where you can get a decent yard is Natomas park which was build almost 20 years ago. We have owned multiple houses there because it's the only place I would consider buying and if you ask any real estate agent they will tell you it's the place everyone wants.

Why can't we have another master planned community like Natomas park, a new larger zoo and a much smaller scale commercial area? That is what the community needs. This proposed development is not in the best interest of Natomas. It is only in the best interest of the owners. They promised Natomas something that would be great for the community in that space. This is not keeping that promise. This is more traffic and more empty buildings and no open space. We do not need more streets so narrow that cars can't travel with others parked to the sides. It's not realistic to put high density housing and no place to park because people will park anyway and while public transportation should surely be a part of any development, most residents are not going to use light rail because they don't feel safe outside of commute times. There is a need for housing in Sacramento. There is a need for anchor attractions to bring tourism. This could be both. This is a chance to shine, don't accept something this mediocre. Natomas deserves better.

Thank you
Shannon Kiehn
--
Shannon Kiehn | Director of Operations | Appency
o: 877-875-1882
e: shannon@appency.com
t: @Appency

From: Sara Kempf
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena to Zoo
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 2:42:54 PM

Hi,

We want the zoo please.

Thank you,
Sara Ponce

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From: Steve Korvink
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Concerns with NATOMAS ARENA REUSE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
Date: Sunday, March 31, 2019 10:30:58 AM

Good morning Scott,

I attended the City's Scoping Meeting regarding the 'NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND SCOPING MEETING FOR THE NATOMAS ARENA REUSE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT', and after talking with neighbors and reading through the documents, have some concerns as a Natomas resident. I have significant concerns regarding the planned development project as it relates to the environmental impact it places on City residents.

Specifically re-zoning the 180+ acre project area - to arguably one of the most flexible land-use zones available - could have unmitigated and unforeseen impacts beyond what an EIR can produce. Without specific plans for the land area, which I believe were not provided by the applicant, it would be nearly impossible for a comprehensive EIR to be drafted that could provide adequate information to City Leaders and constituents on potential impacts. The applicant should be requested to provide a specific land use for the area in order for a comprehensive EIR to be drafted. Without a specific land use/project plan in place, and considering the zoning flexibility requested by the applicant could convert largely all the land area residential space, into my concerns extend to the following:

- Fire/Safety: It was only a few years ago that Natomas and City residents had rolling brown-outs of fire stations and like-services. Tax measures have been approved to help keep City services in place. What is the Fire/Safety impact to residents residing in the immediate, surrounding and regional area? Response times are critical, and I am concerned significant development in the land area will strain City services and make the area less safe.
- Quiet Enjoyment: Currently thousands of Natomas residents enjoy quiet enjoyment of the surrounding area. Decades of homeowners purchased their property knowing that the land area was open, not significantly used on a daily basis, and is part of the larger use plan. I suspect that the the impact of the current use, to most, has been minimal. Re-zoning the land area to allow potentially thousands of homes and more commercial space, would have a direct negative impact on the quiet enjoyment of the area. This is something that can only be mitigated by purchasing an equal-size property, in the same part of the city, with close proximity to the existing area, and provides the same level of use. The Mayor and City Leadership have supported programs that support the health of citizens, and I believe the mental health of residents would be negatively impacted with the re-zoning and potential development of the land area.
- Public Education: With potentially thousands of homes and an equal number of youth (birth-young adult) moving into the area, the impact could be significant. On average it takes a few months to build a home, yet it can take years to find land and build a school for K-12 students. Where are those students going to go until their facility can be built? Do we ask students to move into portables or other temporary solutions with only a promise of a 21st century campus to support their needs? Based on public records, with the most recent bond issuance, the Natomas Unified School District is near it's debt capacity. Where is the money proposed to come from to find land and build facilities? Significant development of the land area will impact not only new student-residents, but most certainly will impact current student-residents who attend over-crowded schools. Outside of K-12 public education further stresses

will be placed on pre-K and post-12 education services. My hope is that the EIR considers the academic, social-emotional and long-term impact on education as well.

I am also generally concerned with the following, and hope the EIR will review the impact of:
- Air, dust and noise pollution;
- The heat index more residential/commercial space will bring to the area;
- Infrastructure including residential, arterial, freeway and similar access, including traffic and commute times for residents;
- Public school funding if the re-zoning brings in residential development that reduces the Unduplicated Pupil Percentage (UPP) of the Natomas Unified School District below certain funding benchmarks; and
- Medical support services for the region.

There are an overwhelming amount of negative environmental impacts with this reuse project, a handful of which are near-impossible to completely mitigate. Instead I would propose the City consider alternative proposals for the land area, and in particular, projects that continue the uphold the promise on the land areas minimal overall impact, quite enjoyment and use.

Cheers,
Steve Korvink

From: Staci
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 6:55:41 PM

Hello,

I wanted to provide my input on what I would like to see in place of the Sleep Train Arena. I would like Costco, Winco, Trader Joe's, and Dutch Bros.

Thanks!

Staci Kowallis

Sent from my iPhone

From: Skye Lao
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Turn Sleep Train Arena into a zoo
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 12:37:17 PM

To whom it may concern:

My name is Skye Lao. I am a long time resident of Sacramento and moved to the Natomas area 10 years ago when I bought my first home. I love my community and am happily raising my children here. I would like to put my voice and vote towards the Sleep Train Arena being turned into a zoo. I feel that as a 30+ year resident of Sacramento, we do not have anything worthwhile that makes us a destination city that can attract visitors. My family and I have traveled all over and the reason we choose to go elsewhere to vacation, spend our time and money is due to the many attractions we find in other cities such as San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, and New York City. These cities have world-class museums, family attractions, zoos, etc. Sacramento as the capital of California, we must do more to put our city on the map. By re-locating our local zoo to the much larger space at Sleep Train Arena, we will be able to expand not only facilities for the animals already in the current zoo's care, but also expand educational, conservation and retail opportunities connected to the zoo. Please include my name and contact information on any list that is for turning the Sleep Train Arena into a zoo.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Warmest regards,

Skye Lao
5421 Duck Walk Way
Sacramento, CA 95835
(916) 217-7156

From: Susan Lopez
To: Scott Johnson
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 8:27:55 PM

Please bring a zoo or something fun for our children to do to the Arco Arena. We dnt need more houses we need something our kids can do here in Natomas.

Sent from my Sprint Samsung Galaxy S7.

From: sheryl.luoma@yahoo.com
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena repurposing
Date: Saturday, March 16, 2019 11:52:46 PM

Hello.

Please consider the Sacramento Zoo for the use of this property. Natomas already has so much housing and retail area. It does not need more. The zoo would add so much in the way of benefits for Natomas - Give it a more family friendly and focused vibe, help property values for home/property owners, boost the economy for retail and restaurants in the area, etc

I firmly believe the zoo coming to Natomas would be a positive thing for Sacramento.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Sheryl Luoma

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From:	sanjay mani
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	What should Sleep Train Arena become?
Date:	Tuesday, March 26, 2019 3:36:52 PM

Hello,

This is Sanjay Mani from Natomas, Sacramento. I would suggest for a Science or Musical Museum and an Aquarium to be converted in place of Sleep Train Arena.

Thanks

Sanjay Mani
Natomas Resident

From: Shawn-Michael Mathies
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Fwd: Zoo in Natomas is preferred
Date: Monday, March 18, 2019 1:58:23 PM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Shawn-Michael Mathies <sm.mathies@gmail.com>
> **Date:** March 16, 2019 at 4:27:59 PM PDT
> **To:** srjohnson@cityofsacramento.com
> **Subject: Zoo in Natomas is preferred**
>
> Natomas resident here... I prefer a zoo in the old Arco Arena property not more housing developments and we can't even fill retail spots that are already built now. They've been siting vacant for over a decade... Put Natomas on the map for something as a destination and help save Sacramento's zoo.
>
> Best regards,
>
> Shawn-Michael Mathies
> 50 Regency Park Cir Unit 8109
> Sacramento, CA 95835
> (415) 420-8899
>
> Sent from my iPhone

From: Sharon N
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sacramento Kings proposal
Date: Monday, April 1, 2019 7:23:35 PM

When Sacramento made the deal with the new Kings owners, Natomas residents were promised the site would be used for project that brought high level jobs and revenue to the area and not more residential housing. I don't believe that this proposal fulfills that promise, particularly with the inclusion of additional residential units.

As for the commercial development, there is not enough detail in the current proposal to know what types of businesses will be brought in if the zoning change is approved. Natomas still has empty office and retail spaces available.

As to residential development, considerable new housing, both single family and multi-family, is currently be built or has approval to be built in close proximity to the old arena site.

Sacramento currently does not have enough police presence to fully patrol the area, and has not had enough in the last ten years. Given the current issues, number of vacancies, and time it takes to recruiting and training police officers, I feel that this will be an even larger issue if this plan moves forward.

The area surrounding the arena was approved to be built with light rail use in mind. Although progress may have been made on a plan for extending light rail to the airport, it could be another 10 or more years before it is even started. The current residential areas surrounding the old arena were built with narrow streets and limited parking designed for an area that would have accessible light rail accessible. This has not happened and any increased housing will greatly exacerbate the parking and traffic issues in the area.

I am not in favor of this proposal.

Sharon Neilson

Sent from my iPad

From: sean ohri
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas arena reuse
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 10:25:47 AM

Dear sir,

I am a multi unit restaurant owner in north Natomas . Ever since the arena left we have seen a sharp decline in sales . We use to count on game nights and other events , especially on weekends , even used to do lots of catering with the team itself. We need something to draw People in and help businesses like a zoo especially with the cost of doing business increasing so much. The addition of so much retail would only give us more competition and hurt us even more .

Please consider a zoo , a family friendly destination that draws people in from all areas to generate sales for our community not to just increase competition amongst businesses with more retail.

Sean Ohri
530-682-6172

Sent from my iPhone

From:	sheila snyder
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Tower 301 Comment Submittal
Date:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 1:21:01 PM

We do not need another area for housing on the Arena site. Concerned citizens want to consider other uses than residential, e.g. a Zoo. Natomas is becoming a wall to wall housing development and alternatives should be considered that contribute to conservation, biodiversity and civic pride.

Sheila Snyder
317 Suez Canal Lane.

From: susan sterling
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arena property
Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 3:30:33 PM

I would like to beautify Natomas with a huge park with a lot of trees and a lake.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Schuyler Wood
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Zoo at Sleep Train arena
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 10:48:45 PM

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in favor of putting a zoo at the former sleep train arena. The surrounding land is currently being developed densely with housing, traffic flows will already be adversely effected by the currently planned and in-progress works.

The Zoo would be a well-worth-it addition to the community, and any additional traffic would be primarily weekends or non-rush hour times.

Please consider this humble request to help improve my community with enrichment activities.

Sincerely,

Schuyler Wood, MD

From: Travis Burke
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Future
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 6:49:35 AM

Good Morning,

I am writing to provide input on submitted projects for the future development of Sleep Train Arena. This arena was the center of this community at one time, and brought visitors and provided a place of recreation. I would like to see the land used in a way that brings in tourism, defines our community, and provides recreation for locals. The Sacramento Zoo is the project that I am most enthusiastic about. As an educator, it would be incredible to have a zoo in close proximity for student visits, collaboration with experts in the field of zoology and conservation, and service learning projects. Our proximity to the airport makes this a more logical move financially for the city, as visitors could provide an influx of money for our local businesses and make Natomas more of a destination.

I hope you take my input into consideration,.

Thank you,

--
Travis Burke
Natomas Unified School District

From: Theresa Campbell
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Development
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 3:15:01 PM

Hi, I'd like to propose that the Sleep Train Arena is redeveloped for the Sacramento Zoo. I've been a homeowner in North Natomas for 17 years and I've seen a significant economic decline in the area because of the building moratorium and loss of the sports/entertainment arena.

The surrounding infrastructure and location are ideal for a Zoo, close to the airport and downtown, easily accessible, and plenty of space to build a world-class facility to fulfill the Zoo's mission in conservation and animal welfare.

Natomas does not need more housing or retail stores in the area, we need a destination that will attract tourists and families and generate revenue to support the struggling businesses in the Natomas area.

Relocating the Zoo to Sleep Train Arena area will create a positive impact for both Natomas and the greater Sacramento Valley area.

Thank you for taking into consideration the thoughts and proposals from the Natomas residents and community.

Best Regards,

Theresa Campbell

From:	Tracy Chatters
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Public comment on Kings" Proposal for Sleep Train Arena site
Date:	Saturday, March 30, 2019 3:53:28 PM

Mr. Johnson:
Thank you for considering my voice along with others in the Natomas area regarding the planned redevelopment of the Sleep Train Arena site. I have been a Sacramento resident most of my life and a resident, home owner and taxpayer of North Natomas since 2000. Through that time, I've seen many promises come and go for the development of the arena site, along with the promise of filling in retail that has sat empty for years and years. I'm confident that the one thing Natomas does NOT need is another housing/commercial plot to slowly be developed and sit empty.

Years ago, in order to keep the Kings in Sacramento, the city gave the Kings a beautiful gift of 100 acres of land. Allowing for rezoning and sale of that property at a higher value than it currently is, is another gift of public funds that Sacramento should not offer up. The Kings have committed over and over to do right by Natomas, but yet again, we're staring down another giant empty space crawling through development and another money grab by the organization. It's time the City Council says "That's enough" to the Kings' proposal and consider options that actually serve the community of Natomas and the city as a whole.

We've been promised a lot in Natomas and we're ready to more forward now. Thank you for your time,

Tracy Chatters
5142 Isador Ln.
Sacramento, CA 95835

From: Trina Drotar
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco/Sleep Train Arena
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 7:55:34 AM

Dear SR Johnson,

As a long-time Natomas resident and Sacramento area resident, I'm writing regarding my concerns about Arco/Sleep Train Arena and the plans for additional housing and businesses.

As you may know (I hope you do), Natomas is a HUGE community, yet there are no entertainment/destination places in the area. There are no bowling alleys, miniature golf, live theatre (there is a small one on Del Paso, but that's not technically Natomas), no museum, no history center or science center or any number of other family-friendly destination places that could be enjoyed by Natomas residents and others in the greater Sacramento area.

The fact that the Kings became the owners of this property made it a bigger problem since I believe that there was a clause in the whole situation of building the new arena that said that no sports (I guess that leaves out billiards, swimming, miniature golf, and bowling) or performance (I suppose that leaves out dance, music, and other performance events that could rival Folsom Lake College and other venues that are not as large as the downtown arena).

We have a lot of houses and apartments here. North of I-80 has a lot of vacant businesses, mostly retail shops, and we have more restaurants than we probably need.

I don't have any particular idea for the location other than to say that it should be a destination cultural/entertainment/sports something complex and not simply more housing and businesses.

The roads were created to handle people traveling from I-5 and I-80 to attend events at that location. The roads were not created for a hundred thousand people driving to and from on a daily commute.

As it is, the growth is greater than most of the roads can bear, and more housing and businesses will impact Natomas in a negative way.

I hope you'll consider this and make the right choices.

Sincerely,

Trina L. Drotar

Trina L. Drotar
Instructor, Writer, Editor, Artist
Reporter, Messenger Publishing Group
trinaldrotar.blogspot.com
Follow me on Facebook
Sign up for monthly Art News

Save the Dates -

September - Blackwork Embroidery ICC
October - Travel Junk Journal Workshop
October - Book Binding ICC
November - Book Binding - Beginning
December - Movable Cards
December - Haiku in the Rose Garden
2018 TBA - Book Release
January - Beginning Crochet
January - Paste Paper
February - Egg Tempera

From: Tre Everett
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Reuse Plan
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 5:55:36 PM

Greetings,

As a concerned citizen of Sacramento and a resident of the Natomas area, I respectfully would like to submit a suggestion on the reuse of the land that Sleep Train Arena currently sits. I moved to Natomas one year ago and during this first year, I've learned much about my new community and its great potential. The Sleep Train arena property sits at the heart of that potential.

I understand that initial proposals were to relocate the Sacramento Zoo to the arena property; a proposal that I am adamantly against. What the area needs, and what Sacramento as a whole needs, is for its citizens to be economically empowered by the developments in their community. A zoo does nothing to improve the lives of the people within the community. My neighbors do not need more minimum wage jobs; what they need is opportunities is live, work, and do business in their community.

I suggest the arena property be converted into a mixed-use area which includes retail, restaurants, and entertainment; the majority of which to be owned by Natomas residents. I'm sure local banks where we house our money would be willing to partner with the Natomas Chamber of Commerce and the City to create a business ownership program/academy for willing residents.

Another portion of the property should be allotted for large corporations willing to bring 500 or more jobs that pay above the cost of living. To ensure economic empowerment for local residents, 85% of the job openings should be filled by candidates living within the Natomas communities. Not only would this have a positive economic impact on local residents; it would also reduce carbon emissions and traffic congestion because more people would be within walking or biking distance to work.

My final suggestion would be to assign an area to developing young minds through a recreational and learning center unlike any other. With partnerships from each business and corporation on the property, programs can be developed to teach youth everything from financial literacy and business development to skilled trades such as real estate investing, coding, construction, and much more.

I look forward to your response and the decision on the reuse of such a vital piece of Natomas.

--
Speaking Life,

Tré Everett
Lead Pastor
Life Words Church

From: Erica Castillo
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: FW: Sacramento Zoo Relocation
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 9:48:55 AM

More coming your way today

From: Angelique Ashby <AAshby@cityofsacramento.org>
Sent: Sunday, March 31, 2019 10:31 PM
To: Erica Castillo <ECastillo@cityofsacramento.org>; Karina Talamantes <KTalamantes@cityofsacramento.org>
Subject: Fwd: Sacramento Zoo Relocation

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Tristan Godt <tristangodt@gmail.com>
> **Date:** March 31, 2019 at 4:13:37 PM PDT
> **To:** dsteinberg@cityofsacramento.org
> **Cc:** aashby@cityofsacramento.org
> **Subject: Sacramento Zoo Relocation**
>
> Dear Mayor Steinberg and Councilmember Ashby,
>
> As a 30 year resident of Sacramento (431 Eastbrook Way, 95835), my family and I are excited at the prospect of expanding and relocating the Sacramento Zoo, specifically to North Natomas. We Want A Zoo!
>
> Our local zoo has been enjoyed by our family of four children and two adults for nearly 20 years. Where else can we see and smell (up close and personal) wildlife in their "natural" habitat? What better way to learn how essential this circle of life is to our ecosystem? These experiences provide us the tangible connections needed to understand the importance of conservation and the threat of species extinction.
>
> We may all be a bit older, but age has not lessened our desire to learn from and experience all that these incredible zoo creatures have to offer. While traveling on vacation, we have enjoyed the opportunity to visit the zoo's in Hawaii, San Francisco, San Diego and Utah. However, the cage size and living conditions of the current Sacramento Zoo, leaves much to be desired, both for the animals themselves and the overall guest experience. Relocation, with the opportunity for expansion, will enhance animal care and visitor experiences, continue the AZA accreditation and increase revenue.

A project of this magnitude is perfect for the now abandoned Sleep Train Arena site in North Natomas. While the Kings have presented a proposal for high density housing, commercial development and retail, as a 17 year Natomas resident, I'm confident that this is NOT the solution for our community.

After many years in a building moratorium, residential building has resumed (Natomas Meadows, housing between I-5/Truxel near Arena Blvd) with the proposed Greenbriar and Panhandle communities not far behind. More housing will only increase traffic congestion, pollution and blood pressure, while creating a shortage of classroom space for our children. New retailers have already recently moved in (Big Five Sporting Goods, TJ Maxx) as well as several new eateries. We Want A Zoo!

With our proximity to the airport and recent growth of hotel rooms in Natomas, relocation of the zoo here is ideal for drawing tourism to the area, without overtaxing current downtown traffic. It would create a significant impact on the local and regional economy through jobs, overnight hotel stays, and dining out. Visitors would have the opportunity to explore the various parts of Sacramento (New Sacramento Zoo, Swabbies on the River, well maintained parks, Old Sacramento, Golden One Arena) while inexpensively staying in North Natomas hotels and dining nearby. This could lead them to discover our affordable housing and employment opportunities (Centene Corp), planting the "relocation seed" in their minds.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our love for the Sacramento zoo, our desire to expand/relocate it, and the reasons why it should move to the Sleep Train Arena site. #WWAZ!

Tristan Godt
North Natomas resident
916-248-6022

From: Tristan Godt
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena re-use
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 5:28:51 PM

As a 30 year resident of Sacramento (431 Eastbrook Way, 95835), my family and I are excited at the prospect of expanding and relocating the Sacramento Zoo, specifically to North Natomas. We Want A Zoo!

Our local zoo has been enjoyed by our family of four children and two adults for nearly 20 years. Where else can we see and smell (up close and personal) wildlife in their "natural" habitat? What better way to learn how essential this circle of life is to our ecosystem? These experiences provide us the tangible connections needed to understand the importance of conservation and the threat of species extinction.

We may all be a bit older, but age has not lessened our desire to learn from and experience all that these incredible zoo creatures have to offer. While traveling on vacation, we have enjoyed the opportunity to visit the zoo's in Hawaii, San Francisco, San Diego and Utah. However, the cage size and living conditions of the current Sacramento Zoo, leaves much to be desired, both for the animals themselves and the overall guest experience. Relocation, with the opportunity for expansion, will enhance animal care and visitor experiences, continue the AZA accreditation and increase revenue.

A project of this magnitude is perfect for the now abandoned Sleep Train Arena site in North Natomas. While the Kings have presented a proposal for high density housing, commercial development and retail, as a 17 year Natomas resident, I'm confident that this is NOT the solution for our community.

After many years in a building moratorium, residential building has resumed (Natomas Meadows, housing between I-5/Truxel near Arena Blvd) with the proposed Greenbriar and Panhandle communities not far behind. More housing will only increase traffic congestion, pollution and blood pressure, while creating a shortage of classroom space for our children. New retailers have already recently moved in (Big Five Sporting Goods, TJ Maxx) as well as several new eateries. We Want A Zoo!

With our proximity to the airport and recent growth of hotel rooms in Natomas, relocation of the zoo here is ideal for drawing tourism to the area, without overtaxing current

downtown traffic. It would create a significant impact on the local and regional economy through jobs, overnight hotel stays, and dining out. Visitors would have the opportunity to explore the various parts of Sacramento (New Sacramento Zoo, Swabbies on the River, well maintained parks, Old Sacramento, Golden One Arena) while inexpensively staying in North Natomas hotels and dining nearby. This could lead them to discover our affordable housing and employment opportunities (Centene Corp), planting the “relocation seed” in their minds.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our love for the Sacramento zoo, our desire to expand/relocate it, and the reasons why it should move to the Sleep Train Arena site. #WWAZ!

Tristan Godt
North Natomas resident
916-248-6022

From: Teri Ira
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse Project
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 4:05:37 PM

Hello,

As a Natomas resident since 2009, I was very disappointed to hear the Kings proposal for the arena site. More homes would require more schools but where is the plan for that?

Natomas currently has homes and commercial space. What it doesn't have is something to draw commerce from non-residents to the area. I strongly feel that the relocation and expansion of our Sacramento Zoo would draw visitors from all over northern California to Natomas. I am putting my support behind the We Want A Zoo movement because I feel as a resident and mother that is a better option for the Natomas Community.

Thank you,
Teri Ira

From:	Tirzah H.
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Arco Arena Replacement
Date:	Saturday, March 23, 2019 8:48:50 AM

Hello,

I just want to weigh in on this discussion.Natomas does not need more housing.

What we could use instead is:
1. A non-Kaiser hospital.
2. A zoo
3. An amusement park
4. Botanical garden/museum
5. Childrens, discovery and play area (open on the weekend).

Nearly every weekend we try to find someplace to take our grandchildren while it's raining and all the kid play places are closed on Saturday and Sunday. We are stuck going to the mall with everyone else in a tiny play area.

Thanks for listening,
Have a great day!

Tirzah

From: Ted Pham
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Reuse of Sleep Train Arena comments
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 11:50:25 AM

Hello,

As a Natomas resident and lifelong Sacramentan, I would love to see that area turned into a place of attraction. We need something fun and exciting that will bring people to the area. I've seen a lot of interest and real plans to have the Sacramento Zoo relocate to Natomas. That enormous area would be an amazing animal sanctuary. Sacramento could be a new leader in wildlife conservation and environmental science education!

With current events such as climate change, extreme weather patterns, wildlife habitat destruction and extinction, we Sacramentans - even Californians - need to support initiatives that will further the education and awareness in these major issues.

That is why I am emailing you to show my support in moving the Sacramento Zoo to Natomas. We need an attraction that will draw people from all over the world to our special city. We have an enormous opportunity to do so with a world class zoo.

Please, no more residential or retail centers. We have so many plazas that are still vacant with more being built on Arena and Truxel... And more homes being built everyday.

Let's do something special that will impact our community and the world in a positive and meaningful way.

Thank you,
Ted Pham

From:	Tiffany Ruvalcaba
To:	Scott Johnson
Subject:	Natomas Arena Reuse Planned Unit Development Project
Date:	Wednesday, March 20, 2019 3:54:57 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png
Importance:	High

Good afternoon,

I'm writing to strongly oppose the proposed Arena reuse plan as submitted by the Sacramento Kings. This plan does not take into account the unique opportunity that Sacramento has before it. So rare is the opportunity to make something special for our city in an are so close to downtown. We (as a city) have already swung and missed on the railyards, it would be a shame to miss another opportunity to make this area a statement destination for our city. The Sacramento Zoo has made it clear in recent months that it needs a new location in order to transform itself into the world-class location it longs to be. As a resident of Natomas for over 19 years, I would welcome a neighbor such as the Sacramento Zoo in this location. The Natomas area has been subjected to so many unfulfilled promises during its short existence, and the Zoo would be a refreshing change to the empty shopping centers and unfilled warehouse locations. I strongly urge you to consider alternative proposals to the one suggested by the Sacramento Kings for the Arena site.

Best,

Tiffany Ruvalcaba
Associate Director of e-Learning
California Primary Care Association
1231 I Street, #400
Sacramento, CA 95814
Ph: (916) 440-8170

BEYOND these walls
VIDEO CONTEST 2019

California Primary Care ASSOCIATION | 25th ANNIVERSARY

From: tsaenz11@gmail.com
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena Site
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 4:24:44 PM

I've lived in Natomas since 1960. I have moved from the house I grew up in but my parents still live there. I have grand children now and we all have purchased and live in various areas on Natomas. What we lack, big time, are things for our kids to do. Yes, parks are nice. But for party events, or general family get togethers, we often have to leave our natomas areas. With that said, we need areas for children activities (I.e., bowling, jumping places, miniature golfing, arcades, etc). My entire family also SUPPORTS THE ZOO IN NATOMAS!!!PLEASE!!!!!

Thank you.
Teresa L Saenz

Sent from my iPhone

From: tonette wilkerson
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:41:33 PM

I am a North Natomas resident and am concerned about more housing coming in. What we desperately need are retail stores and nice restaurants. Another great idea is bringing the zoo here as this will bring families here. Maybe a weekend trip to the zoo, Old Sac and The Capital. Look at the revenue this would bring to the city.

From: Vanessa Fontana
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Tower 301 Comment Submittal
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 1:41:37 PM

I live on the south side of Arena Blvd at East commerce. There are entirely too many homes in the Natomas area currently. The usual 7-8 minute commute,takes up to 25 minutes during commute hours and it is just getting worse!!
Until something is done in the area to be able to ease the congestion of streets and the freeway, more housing is a huge mistake!

Please do not destroy the already overpopulated area.

Vanessa M. Fontana
2551 Judith Resnik Ave
Sacramento, CA 95834

From: Valerie.Hanson
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Stop Apartment Building in Natomas!
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 12:22:38 PM

Dear Scott,
I just read the proposal for the Arco Arena plot of land. I am a home owner in North Natomas and strongly urge you to deny the proposal of building low income housing. We have so many apartment buildings in the area already, and I believe this will bring down the value of homes, increase crime, and make North Natomas an undesirable place to live. The crime rate is increasing. I no longer feel safe in my neighborhood. Please encourage the building of homes, medical offices (Kaiser, Sutter, etc.), large shopping mall comparable to Roseville, restaurants, etc. We need to welcome high income jobs as well so that we bring in more money to the area. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to prevent more apartments from being built. The proposal has over 2,000 residential spots. This would be a mistake.

Thank You,

Valerie

Valerie Hanson, MA
Resource Specialist
Allison Elementary
4315 Don Julio Blvd.
North Highlands, CA 95660
(916) 566-1810 #20121

"The way we talk to our children becomes their inner voice." Peggy O'Mara

From: Valerie.Hanson
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Land Suggestion
Date: Thursday, March 28, 2019 2:34:54 PM

To Whom It May Concern,
I am writing in regards to the space of the former Sleep Train Arena in Natomas. I am a home owner at 10 Michelson Court, Sacramento, CA 95835. I strongly urge you do not build any apartment homes. The area is saturated with apartments. The apartments seem to bring with them more drugs, violence, and crime. In order to make Natomas a desirable place to live, I strongly urge the city to zone for a zoo, a large medical building, or a large shopping mall like Roseville has.

Thank You,

Valerie

Valerie Hanson, MA
Resource Specialist
Allison Elementary
4315 Don Julio Blvd.
North Highlands, CA 95660
(916) 566-1810 #20121

"The way we talk to our children becomes their inner voice." Peggy O'Mara

From: Wendy
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Development Plans for Natomas Sleeptrain Arena
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 3:01:30 PM

To Whom it may concern,

I have lived in the Natomas region for 8 years and have a good feel for the community and the resources that it has available. I am concerned with the proposed plan (P18-077) to reuse the SleepTrain Arena site in Natomas and how it will effect the community.

The housing situation in Natomas is getting overcrowded. Homes are so crowded together that there isn't decent space between houses. Our neighbors bathroom window opens up into our "back yard" which really is just a patio. While using the BBQ, I can look into the same neighbors' kitchen window. There is no fence between the houses. The neighbors house is the "fence." Decent privacy and space just doesn't exist (this was also an issue when previous neighbors lived there and their constant smoking effected my family and our access to this outside space). There is also a lack of single story homes (not including the Senior Communities). My husband has back issues which has forced us to evaluate the possibility of moving to a 1-story, and there are limited options as most of these are so highly sought after that chances of getting one are slim. We have had friends leave the Natomas region so that they could have just slightly larger spaces in Roseville and Rocklin. I like the idea of upgrading to a new house and staying in the community that we love, but at the same time, family homes with even just small yard spaces are nearly non-existent.

We have seen so many retail spaces open and close and open again, and close again. I don't feel confident that Natomas could support a large addition of basic retail businesses. There has been what feels like increased crime especially at the Safeway on Del Paso, and many cars get broken into at various parking lots around Natomas as it is. I am concerned that additional high density residential housing and retail will add to this growing problem.

I think that if possible, relocating the Sacramento Zoo to this location would make a wonderful alternative. It would definitely bring more income to the area from all of the visitors. It is along the path of the proposed Light Rail track allowing for ease of public access. It is also near the freeway which makes it easy for tourists to access while driving from the Sacramento airport into town, and for the Zoo's access to the airport as well. As a resident of Natomas, the thought of having a large attraction in Natomas that I can take my family to regularly is an exciting thought, and the Sacramento Zoo can live up to those expectations for the whole community.

I appreciate you taking my concerns into account. Thank you so much for your time.

Wendy Benedetto
Sacramento, CA 95835

From: Wood Kimley Filacier
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: We want a Zoo!
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 12:56:36 PM

Hello,

Just emailing you to tell you that everyone I've talked to about what they would like to see be built there is for a Zoo. If it can't be a zoo then something else engaging for our community but not more housing and stores. If it has to be stores, then please put a
Trader Joe's.

Thank you for reading my opinion.

From:	Wendy Rae Hill
To:	Scott Johnson
Cc:	Erica Castillo
Subject:	Natomas Arena Reuse Project (P18-077) EIR Scoping
Date:	Tuesday, April 2, 2019 3:21:50 PM

Scott Johnson, Senior Planner
City of Sacramento Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd., Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811
srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse Project (P18-077) EIR Scoping

Thank you for this opportunity to provide input on the subject EIR. Please include the following concerns in the EIR scope of analysis:

Concern 1:

The Project proposes to change the zone designation of the Arena property to General Commercial. The proposed zone designation is thoroughly inconsistent with the original use intended for that property; as such it represents a significant divergence from the hard-fought community design that is the North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP). The Arena property is currently zoned SPX Sports Complex. Given that the property is no longer the home of the Kings (moved downtown) or the Monarchs (defunct), and there are no other sports teams seeking to make it their home, "accommodating the design requirements of professional and amateur sports" is no longer a priority and is not a realistic pursuit. However, the intended use of that land was and still is to "provide for the education, information, recreation, culture, or entertainment of Sacramento area residents and visitors." The General Plan and Community Plans are official policy statements of the City Council, and by extension, the citizens they represent. The Project's proposed C-2 Zone designation demonstrates a callous disregard for the vision imagined by those stakeholders.

Concern 2:

With the Project's proposed addition of up to approximately 2,000 residential units, none of which were anticipated in the North Natomas Community Plan, please demonstrate how the City will meet goal NN PHS 1.2, specifically “a police protection standard of 1.60 police officers per 1,000 residents and 1.0 non-sworn personnel for every 1.60 police officers (2035 General Plan/NNCP, NN PHS 1.2).

Additionally, where will these children go to school? Our classrooms are already overcrowded and under resourced.

Concern 3:

Their are already a multiple high-density housing facilities being built in the North Natomas area. What is needed is lower income and homeless housing, but not a high end project as proposed to potential developers.

Other concerns:

Every shopping center in North Natomas has vacancies. We don’t need more commercial space. What we do need is more family and child based activities. If you take the tax revenue generated for all the Natomas families that have had to leave Natomas for birthday parties in West Sacramento, Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, Roseville, Rocklin and Folsom we would be able to fund a lot of new services.

The King’s used our community for years and then dumped it for their new home downtown. There was a promise that was made to North Natomas to replace with something that adds to our community. Giving the Kings a commercial zone on a silver platter just raises the cost of the land for the City should the City decide to keep its promise to the north Natomas residents.

Suggested Alternatives to consider in the EIR:

• Alternative 1: Rezone the entire property to A-OS Agricultural-Open Space.3 A-OS is far more consistent with the intent of the current SPX zone designation. (For reference, the North Natomas Regional Park is designated A-OS.) The Sacramento Zoo is currently seeking to relocate and expand, and has identified the Arena property as a suitable and desirable location. While not a sports team, a relocated Sacramento Zoo would fulfill the original NNCP vision for an amenity that provides for the education, information, recreation, culture, or entertainment of Sacramento area residents and visitors.
• Alternative 2: Rezone ~120 acres to A-OS, and rezone the remainder to EC Employment Center.4 EC would permit the same uses as C-2, but is better suited to the vision of the North Natomas Community Plan.

Respectfully,
Wendy Rae Hill
7 Rosebriar Court
Sacramento, CA 95835
(916) 202-9700
WendyRaeHill@gmail.com

From: Y Campbell
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Sleep Train Arena Usage ideas
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 1:50:46 PM

Good afternoon,

I would be interested in seeing the Zoo relocate to Natomas. Since I have young children, I am interesting in seeing that space be used in a way that would allow families the ability to have fun and be safe. While I like the Regional Park and the many city parks, it would be great to see a regional theater or outdoor concert hall for daytime summer events or something walk-able/bikeable with families. I don't want more constant traffic or high congestion in the area. If there is more housing, it would be great if it was mixed use so we can see some restaurants or other businesses (like Art Beast, Petroglyphs, or sports clubs) in the area. Another idea is for Kaiser or another hospital to be located there and then consolidate the medical businesses (dental, optometry, etc). Another idea is a community center that could give our teenagers something safe and fun to do during the day with scheduled activities (or even our area seniors!). There seems to be a gap of free safe activities for teenagers and seniors in North Natomas (other than the library, which is GREAT!). Nothing loud or traffic-ridden would be appreciated!

Yating Campbell

From: ychoong@surewest.net
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Public Comment - Proposed Use of "Sleep Train Arena" Property
Date: Friday, March 29, 2019 8:45:16 AM

To whom it may concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment on the proposed use of the "Sleep Train Arena" property located at the intersection of Truxel Rd and Arena Blvd in Natomas.

As the City Council considers the best use for this property, I urge the members to consider how the property can best be used to meet the needs of current and future residents of the city. As such, I propose that the current owners and the city consider developing the property as a campus of community based health services such as facilities for crisis mental health, skilled nursing, rehabilitation, assisted living and nursing homes. In addition, the property could house vocational and education programs to meet the growing demand for a well-trained health care workforce to serve this population.

As California's population ages, there is expected to be a significantly increased demand for nursing homes and assisted living facilities. Currently, residents caring for family members have difficulty finding facilities that meet their needs that are located nearby. Locating these types of facilities in Natomas would allow residents to age in the community and with the support of their families nearby. Co-location of vocational educational training centers with these facilities would provide the opportunity for hands-on education in high-demand fields for the city's residents.

With the construction of the new medical campus at the Railyards location, this type of supportive medical service would complement other planned health services.

I hope the city council and the current owners will consider this request.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Choong

3031 Rockford Way

From: yuliana hernandez
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Fwd: We want a zoo
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 1:41:41 PM

>
> We want a zoo! Not anymore retail and commercial lots there's plenty around that are empty and many apartments with availability! Why bring more? So more people can move in? A zoo! Will bring more tourism because it gives them something new to experience let's be honest out zoo at the moment isn't that great and we still go every week or two! It will still create jobs at the zoo and for building and it will give the kids of Sacramento a new learning experience. Sacramento is the capital of California and what do we have that makes us stand out? Only old sac and the capital building! Give us more!
>
> Sincerely, Yuliana Hernández

From: Zach Paul
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco Arena land use
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 11:21:47 AM

The Kings proposal is an idea that will hurt the city of Sacramento forever. We have an opportunity to make a big change starting with this land. Sacramento Needs some tourist attractions. If this city is ever gonna be a destination we need more for people to do not stores. Whether it be a zoo or something else, we will always be a boring cow town if we settle for houses and retail. Look at San Diego for example. Take out their beach and they still have so many awesome tourist attractions which brings more revenue and therefore more attractions and city upkeep. If we build housing and retail on this land it will hurt the city of Sacramento from prospering into the city it can become. I am a so-cal native now living in Sacramento. I just want the best for this city.

From: Zackery J Sommer
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Natomas Arena Reuse
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 11:13:02 AM

Good afternoon,

I oppose the proposed reuse of the arena as outlined in the EIR.
North Natomas already has far too many vacant retail spaces that have created feelings of uneasiness and fear for the future of this community.
Regarding the residential aspect of the proposal, high density housing is out of control. There are far too many developments with patio-sized lots or 0 lot lines. If new homes are to be built in that area, the homes should be single family and have 6000+ sq. ft. lots minimum. Streets should be the width of four-five cars, allowing parking on each side and bi-directional traffic.
Driving down the poorly-planned Natalino Circle is unsafe due to the narrow streets and high-density housing. It sounds like the proposed reuse of the arena will be even tighter.
Please don't allow this plan to go any further. There are too many apartment buildings in North Natomas. Let's create a true feeling of community with back-yard barbecues, single family homes and neighbors who know each other's names!

Thank you,

Zackery Sommer
650 Regency Park Circle
Sacramento, CA 95835
916-201-0843

From: Zack Wood
To: Scott Johnson
Subject: Arco Arena Natomas, CA
Date: Monday, March 18, 2019 12:55:52 PM

Good afternoon,

I would like to add my voice to the idea that the old Arco Arena site in Natomas be developed into something other than commercial space and high density housing. As a family of 5, we would love to see the Sacramento Zoo added to this space - it would be wonderful for all the families of Sacramento.

Natomas does not need more apartments or housing developments. The schools are overcrowded and the district is stalling plans to build the one and neighborhood elementary school in the Westlake/Westshore area although thousands of new homes have been built.

Natomas is close to downtown, has great freeway access, lots of local restaurants and other businesses - it would be a perfect location for all of Sacramentans to enjoy the zoo.

Please consider these issues as the city moves to approve plans for that area.

City of SACRAMENTO
Community Development

NATOMAS ARENA REUSE PROJECT (P18-077)
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) SCOPING

COMMENT FORM

Please provide the following information if you wish to receive Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR and to document the author of comments received. Thank you.

Name: Kerri Price

Email: Sackerri@gmail.com

Address (if no email): \

Organization: We Want A Zoo

Please provide us with your written comments on the scope of analysis in the draft EIR by **April 2, 2019**. Comments may be sent to:

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Email: srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

You may attach additional pages to this form and/or you may submit your written comments separately. Written comments on the scope of the Draft EIR will help guide the analysis.

March 21, 2019

To Members of the Sacramento City Council:

My name is Kerri Price and I have been a Natomas Resident for 19 years, 17 years in South Natomas and 2 years in North Natomas.

I remember when I first moved to Natomas, I would stop by Perry's "Garden Highway" produce stand on West El Camino. Then the land was sold for development, and I watched on the day that the Perry family house and the produce stand were demolished. Now I'm watching as Beazer builds its 2nd phase of high-density homes in that spot, with the 1st phase directly across Interstate 80 from phase 2.

When Beazer's 1st phase of high-density housing was complete (between I-80 and San Juan Road), I drove through the neighborhood out of curiosity. I immediately felt claustrophobic! Two-story houses piled one on top of each other, with narrow streets and lack of public spaces. The development gave a whole new meaning to "reach out and touch a neighbor", as there was barely room to walk between homes.

Beazer is just one of the companies that received approval to put in housing developments like this all over Natomas. Except for the Natomas Marketplace, the stretch of land between I-5 to the west, Truxel to the east, Arena to the North, and San Juan to the south is currently being built out with high-density housing.

There is a large area of high-density housing on the west side of El Centro, as part of the West Parke neighborhood. There is high-density housing at the north end of El Centro, as part of the Westlake Community. There is high-density housing from H.Allen Hight Middle School all the way out to Macon Drive. There are apartments to still be built along the I-5 freeway between San Juan and Arena.

In addition, there is now the proposed development by the County of the land in the "Y" section where Highway 99 and I-5 split, which was supposed to be reserved as open-air space for the airport. There is also proposed development of the last remaining open farmland along El Centro.

Development is inevitable. And some housing that is more affordable than the standard single-family home is needed too. I believe Natomas residents agree on that. But I also believe that Natomas needs smart, thought-out growth. Homes are being completed at an alarming rate, with no accountability for additional schools, additional roads, public transportation (where's that Light Rail?), and all the other factors that play into large-scale development. I've heard SO many people say, "we don't want Natomas to turn into Elk Grove!"

Natomas does not need another large-scale, high-density housing project. What we do need is a reason for the rest of the greater Sacramento area (and beyond) to visit Natomas. And that reason should be a new, beautiful, large zoo. Sacramento's zoo has served the community well for many, many years. But the need for larger, better facilities is more than long-overdue. The drawings for the new zoo are amazing; benefitting the animals, the hard-working staff, and are in keeping with the Mayor's vision for a "world-class city".
I understand that there are people out there that think zoos are "bad". And unfortunately, that is true in some cases. But the Sacramento Zoo is one of the great ones, and has the potential to be so much more with a move and expansion. Our Zoo believes in and teaches conservation. Our Zoo protects animals that may be near extinction in the wild, preserving that those animals will be around for future generations. Our Zoo teaches children and adults through classes, camps, tours and school visits.

The Zoo currently offers classes all year long, but one of it's biggest draws are the summer camps. Zoo camps are wildly popular, but due to space restrictions, only about 1/3 of the kids that want to attend are able to be accepted to the camps. Waitlists are lengthy. A new Zoo in Natomas has the potential to offer more classes, involve more children, hire more people. And to continue the ongoing efforts of the Zoo to protect animals, promote conservation, and teach the public.

Arco Arena benefitted Natomas for a long time. And the new Golden One Arena is wonderful. Natomas already has great residents, great schools, and now it needs a new, great destination. The residents of Natomas DESERVE to be a destination of choice again.

Sincerely,

Kerri Price

Kerri Fritz Price
5553 Kalispell Way
Sacramento 95835
916-717-8762

City of
SACRAMENTO
Community Development

NATOMAS ARENA REUSE PROJECT (P18-077)
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) SCOPING

COMMENT FORM

Please provide the following information if you wish to receive Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR and to document the author of comments received. Thank you.

Name: Myrna Rudman

Email: mlrudman@att.net

Address (if no email):

Organization: homeowner in Natomas

Please provide us with your written comments on the scope of analysis in the draft EIR by **April 2, 2019**. Comments may be sent to:

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Email: srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

You may attach additional pages to this form and/or you may submit your written comments separately. Written comments on the scope of the Draft EIR will help guide the analysis.

There is a need for a hospital presence in Natomas esp in the north side. Hard for elderly to get places when they don't drive. Would prefer a shared hospital - UCD, Mercy & Sutter. They could each have a floor or two, but ancillary support - X Ray - lab etc could be cost shared.

There is no skilled nursing home in this area. Transportation (lack of) and traffic (too much of) impact elders & others getting around.

Also a botanic garden!

City of
SACRAMENTO
Community Development

NATOMAS ARENA REUSE PROJECT (P18-077)
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) SCOPING

COMMENT FORM

Please provide the following information if you wish to receive Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR and to document the author of comments received. Thank you.

Name: Lalanya Rothenberger

Email: lrothenberger@natomasusd.org

Address (if no email):

Organization: NUSD

Please provide us with your written comments on the scope of analysis in the draft EIR by **April 2, 2019**. Comments may be sent to:

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Email: srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

You may attach additional pages to this form and/or you may submit your written comments separately. Written comments on the scope of the Draft EIR will help guide the analysis.

NUSD needs a new school in this area if the project moves forward. NUSD formally requests to be active partners in all elements in planning for schools.

City of
SACRAMENTO
Community Development

NATOMAS ARENA REUSE PROJECT (P18-077)
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) SCOPING

COMMENT FORM

Please provide the following information if you wish to receive Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR and to document the author of comments received. Thank you.

Name: GARY ZIEGENFUSS

Email: GZIEGENFUSS@ME.COM

Address (if no email): 5771 PALMERA LANE, SACRAMENTO 95835

Organization: SELF- ~~RESI~~ RETIRED CITY EMPLOYEE (PLANNING, NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES)

Please provide us with your written comments on the scope of analysis in the draft EIR by **April 2, 2019**. Comments may be sent to:

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Email: srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

You may attach additional pages to this form and/or you may submit your written comments separately. Written comments on the scope of the Draft EIR will help guide the analysis.

GIVEN ITS LOCATION AND GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION I WOULD LIKE TO SEE:

- COMPATIBLE MIXED USES
- ~~HOSPITAL~~ HOSPITAL SERVICES
- ~~HEALTH SERVICES~~
- OTHER OFFICES
- OPEN SPACE

WE NEED TO HAVE FLEXABILITY

City of
SACRAMENTO
Community Development

NATOMAS ARENA REUSE PROJECT (P18-077)
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) SCOPING

COMMENT FORM

Please provide the following information if you wish to receive Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR and to document the author of comments received. Thank you.

Name: We Wanta Zoo – Brandy Boyd

Email: wewanta200@gmail.com

Address (if no email): _____

Organization: WWAZ

Please provide us with your written comments on the scope of analysis in the draft EIR by **April 2, 2019**. Comments may be sent to:

Scott Johnson
City of Sacramento
Community Development Department
300 Richards Blvd, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Email: srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

You may attach additional pages to this form and/or you may submit your written comments separately. Written comments on the scope of the Draft EIR will help guide the analysis.

We Want A Zoo in Natomas

By signing this petition, you are showing your support for a proposal to relocate the Sacramento Zoo to the old arena site in Natomas and NOT a plan by the Sacramento Kings to redevelop the location to include more than 2,000 high-density residential units and 1.18 million square feet of commercial development.

First Name	Last Name	What is your zip code?
Vanessa	Acevedo	95835
Joe	Adams	95843
Lisa	Adams Savard	95834
Hamza	Afzal	95834
Timothy	Aguirre	95833
Zeny	Agullana	95835
Rachelle	Ahmad	95835
Jennifer	Akins	95659
Hillary	Albers	95825
Yanira	Alfaro	95833
Avon	Alfaro	95835
Yoana	Alfaro	95834
Rosalien	Ali	95833
Anwar	Ali	95835
Megan	Allen	95834
Adrian	Alvarez	95835
Steffanie	Amador	95835
Stephanie	Amey	95834
Rommel	Amian	95835
Jessica	Anaya	95834
david	andersen	95834
Shawna	Anderson	95680
Kimberley	Andrews	95835
Rebecca	Angeles	95833
Christine	Anjo	95835
Sabrina	Aragon	95660
Jessica	Arcuri	95765
Tina	Arroyo	95834
Janelle	Arsich	95835
Jeremy	Arsich	95835
Raymond	Asuncion	95835
Amy	Atwal	95834
Joy	Ault	95833
Casey	Avalos	95835
Dawn	B	95835
Roland	Babiera	95838
Kristina	Babiera	95838
Olga	Bachilo	95834
Alexys	Bajet	95835
Harwinder	Bal	95834
Tiffany	Ballard	95835
Grace	Ballesteros	95834

TINA	Balsley	95835
Kimberly	Baral	95835
Mary	Barker	95835
Jonathan	Barnato	95835
Kenneth	Barrow	95834
Karen	Bartells	95835
Dawn	Basciano	95835
Bobby	Bates	95834
Tierney	Bates	95834
Marsha	Bateson	95835
Shelly	Bath	95835
Alinda	Batten	95834
Thom	Bayne	95820
Karessa	Belben	95825
Gina	Bell	95835
Wendy	Benedetto	95835
Jill	Benemelis	95835
Mary	Bennick	95819
Jennifer	Berdugo	95835
Brian	Berger	95835
Laura	Bettencourt	95834
Lilly	Bettencourt	95834
Gurnoor	Bhullar	95835
Mercedita	Bibay	95834
Larry	Bibayoff	95835
Joshua	Biggs	95831
Stephanie	Binford	95838
Amy	Bingham	95833
Richelle	Bingham	95833
Kathleen	Bissell	95834
Nathan	Black	95834
Paula	Black	95835
Brandon	Black	95834
Tammy	Black	95835
Steven	Blaine	95835
Marcia	Blanke	95817
Samuel	Bledsoe	95838
Gina	Blighton	95206
Jessica	Block	95834
Daniel	Bluford	95834
Tisha	Bogan	95835
Michelle	Bombarda	95835
Taylor	Bombarda	95835

Alan	Bombarda	95835
Sabrina	Bordon	95835
Christopher	Borsh	95835
David	Bott	95670
Brian	Bouknight	95747
Yves	Bouyssounouse	95835
Paula	Bouyssounouse	95835
Ruthie	Bowers	95835
Chad	Bowman	95628
Brandy	Boyd	95835
Shanie	Bradley	95835
TERESA	BRADLEY	95833
Navkirat	Brah	95835
Elizabeth	Brann	95835
Shanna	Bredeson	95835
Joseph	Brescia	95834
Lorabeth	Brink	95835
Andrea	Broadnax	95834
Eboni	Bronson	95823
Tyler	Brown	95835
Deb	Brown	95834
Linda	Brown	95833
Linda	Brown	95835
Linda	Brown	95834
Elizabeth	Brushwyler	95835
Rosalyn	Bryant	95835
Tyler	Buckley	95835
Erin	Bucknell	95621
Melanie	Bull	95747
Travis	Burke	95834
Molly	Burke	95678
Martin	Burnett	95835
Kate	Burns	95835
Maniza	Butt	95833
Vicki	Byrd	95834
Debbie	Byrne	95626
Sam	C	95833
Joy	Cabatic	95835
Ashley	Cajigas	95835
Tony	Caldron	95747
Lucy	Camacho	95835
Janelle	Cameron	95835
Robert	Campaz	95838

Victoria	Campbell	95834
Carina	Campos	95833
Siu-Henh	Canimo	95835
Evelyn	Cano	95835
Matthew	Carey	94591
Mariag	Carlile	95835
Maria	Carrillo	95835
Peggy	Carter	95833
Tanya	Carter	95835
Denise	Casey	95833
Erica	Castillo	95814
Rochelle	Castro	95823
Tausha	Catlett	95833
Melissa	Cavazos	95835
Teodoro	Celeste	95835
Malena	Centella	95833
Judy	Chalmers	95835
Jacquie	Chamberlin	95833
David	Chang	95835
Richard	Chang	95834
Ranmeet	Chatha	95835
Tracy	Chatters	95835
Jake	Chatters	95835-2063
Socheath	Chhim	95835
Kari	Chism	95835
Susan	Christiano	95626
Rachelle	Christy	95834
Jo Ann	Clark	95835
Nicole	Clark	95835
Aideen	Clark	95833
Racquel	Clark	95841
Shannon	Clarke	95630
Carolyn	Clarke	95833
Aaron	Claxton	95835
Jaclyn	Clemens	95660
Stacey	Clements	95833
Sadie	Close	95834
Sarah	Clough	95833
Dawn	Clover	95835
Jason	Coldiron	95833
Caitlin	Cole	95747
Arlescia	Collins	95834
Lydia	Cook	95991

Brian	Cook	95991
Ariel	Cook	95608
Julie	Cook	95835
Richele	Cooley	95834
Eddie	Corns	95835
Miguel	Corona	95824
Stephen	Coronado	95673
TIA	CORONADO	95834
S	Coronek	95833
María	Coronel	95834
Maria	Coronel	95835
Lisa	Corr	95835
Rocco	Cosato	95835
Ruma	Costello	95835
Sarah	Coulter	95835
Yvette	Couvson	95835
Samantha	Cox	95833
Diana	Craig	95835
Alec	Craig	95835
Courtney	Crisler	95835
Wilfred	Cristobal	95835
Romer	Cristobal	95835
Felicia	Crutcher	95820
Victoria	Cruz	95835
Courtney	Cucchi	95834
Andrew	Cummins	95833
Debbie	Cun	95835
Blake	Cunningham	95864
Thea	Curiel	95835
Christina	Damian	95833
Laura	Daniells	95835
Laurie	Daniels	95833
Abigail	Dasilva	95747
Scott	Daugherty	95624
Matt	Davey	95835
Margaret	Davis	95833
Cheryl	Davis	95838
Marcella	Davis	95678
Rachelle	Davis	95835
Jordan	Davis	95835
Geraldine	Dawson	95821
Tinamarie	De Teresa	95833
Deborah	Dear	95833

Christopher	Dela Cruz	95835
Michelle	DeLeon	95835
Jhermaine	DeMayo	95845
Terrie	Denis	95834
Steve	Dennison	95835
Corina	Dennison	95835
melanie	dent	95626
Jean	Desilets	89460-6524
Kristina	Desor	95588
Matt	Dessel	94585
Julie	Deter	95835
Melissa	Dhanis	95834
Claudia	Diaz	95695
Pamela	Dickey	95835
Jennifer	Diez	95833
GEORGE	DORAN	95835
Amber	Dray	95834
Crystal	Drouin	95835
Maria	Duenas	95834
Robert	Duncan	95835
Megan	Dunn	95834
Nick	Dunn	95831
Katrina	Duvale	95835
Sue	Dwyer-Voss	95833
Ron	Dwyer-Voss	95833
Sasha	E	95835
Bonnie	Early	95834
Dacia	Eastin	95834
Sara	Edmonds	95835
Jennifer	Eickmann	95757
Cher	Ekasala	95691
Michelle	Ellis	95835
Scott	Erwin	95693
Sharon	Escobar	95843
Shawna	Fadden	95834
Lavada	Fallon	95835
Susanna	Farina	95834
Amir	Farooq	95825
John	Fenes	95835
Matthew	Ferguson	95834
Krista	Ferns	95835-1509
Sharon	Field	95626
Alicia	Filice	95835

Greg	Fisher	95835
Alisa	Fisher	95835
Shaun	Fitzgerald	95835
Christina	Fitzhugh	95835
Nancy	Flagg	95835
Jackie	Fleck	95833
Molly	Fling	95833
Eloísa	Flores	95834
Matt	Floro	95835
Danielle	Floro	95835
Laura	Flournoy	95835
Ashley	Fobbs	95834
Jinnelle	Fong	95835
Eric	Fong	95835
JOYCE	FORD	95835
Mercedes	Fountain	95833
Cat	Franklin	95835
Valerie	Frederickson	95835
Rachel	Frey	95835
Kaitlyn	Friskel	95835
Rose	Froling	95835
Audrey	Fu	95835
Donna	Fujioka	95835
Sam	Galvez	95835
Yousuf	Gamal	95835
Lavern	Ganz	95834
Eric	Ganz	95835
Monica	Garcia	95835
Veronica	Garcia	95835
Gary	Gaspar	95835
Ana	Gatdula	95835
Hope	Gawlick	95835
Alexis	Gerardo	95835
Gina	Gerbi-marcione	95835
Lakhvir	Ghuman	95835
Jermaine	Gibson	95758
Phillip	Gifford	95628
Nate	Gillen	95835
Amber	Gillespie	95835
Brian	Gillespie	95835
Haley	Gilmore	95835
Adia	Gipson	95833
Cheryl	Glance	95835

Jerry	Glance	95835
Tiffany	Glasser	95835
Carlex	Gnanamani	95835
Nydia	Godoy	95835
Tristan	Godt	95835
Julie	Gomez	95834
MICHAEL	GONZALES	95673
Mario	Gonzalez	95835
Janeen	Gordon	95833
Kendra	Gorski	95835
Jessica	Grace	95833
Anthony	Grace	95835
Jacqueline	Grace	95835
Samantha	Grant	95834
Jennifer	Gravvat	95831
Carolyn	Gray	95835
Stephanie	Gray	95823
Natalie	Green	95835
Michelle	Green	95833
Annisa	Green	95833
Courtney	Greener	95835
Brian	Greener	95835
Rachel	Greenwood	95835
Dina	Greenwood	95834
Melissa	Gruenholz	95835
Melanie	Guenette	95835
Christopher	Guillen	95815
Michelle	Guina	95834
Jonathan	Guina	95834
Joseph	Gutierrez	95834
Robert	Gutierrez	95833
Brenda	Gutiérrez	95833
Vina	Guzman	95835
Jen	Guzman	95835
Joseph	Guzman	95833
Megan	Hafenstein	95835
Penny	Hagenbuch	95648
Kelsey	Haig	95834
Chelsea	Haller	95834
Kathy	Hallett	95835-2141
Sherryl	Hancock	95834
Briana	Hanes	95835
Shari	Hansen	95833

Jude	Hansen	95833
Heather	Harcia	95835
Julie	Harmon	95820
Danae	Harris	95834
Kristin	Harrisberger	95834
Kim	Harrison	95835
Mike	Harrison	95835
CHELSEA	HART-CONNOR	95835
Nancy	Hasdovic	95835
John	Hasler	95838
Julie	Haywood	95838
Jessica	Hazen	95835
Marilee	Hazen	95835
Alexandra	Hazen	95835
Mackenzie	Hazen	95835
James	Hazen	95835
Angela	Hearring	95834
Janice	Heasley	95833
Mandy	Heilner	95835
Dan	Heimann	95834
Kathryn	Heimann	95834
Holly	Hein	95835
Paul	Hein	95835
Sara	Henderson	95835
The	Hendersons	95835
Christine	Henning	95835
Jeff	Henrich	95834
Chanda	Henry	95834
Elizabeth	Henson	95835
Brandon	Her	95835
Eliseo	Heredia	95834
Andrea	Hernandez	95838
Emily	Hernandez	95833
Derrick	Hernandez	95835
Cristina	Hernandez	95835
Yuliana	Hernandez	95838
Amelina	Hernandez	95842
Janae	Herren	95835
Sierra	Hersek	95835
Walt	Hess	95757
Sharon	Hess	95757
Emily	Hester	95835
Robert	Hester	95835

Deb	Heymann	95833
Yvette	Hibbitts	95844
Mary	Hicks	95834
Portia	High	95835
Marnie	Hill	95835
Joseph	Hindo	95834
Marilyn	Hinds	95831
Akwai	Hinman	95835
Chris	Hirschmann	95835
Erika	Ho	95835
Kimberly	Hoffman	95835
Kurt	Hoffman	95834
Donna	Homan	95835
Eric	Homan	95835
Calvin	Hong	95835
Melanie	Honrada	95835
Rhonda	Hopkins	95835
Megan	Hoppe	95835
jordonna	hornstein	95835
Cory	Horrillo	95835
Shannon	Horrillo	95836
Lisa	Howell	95835
Diane	Howell	95835
Catherine	Howland	95835
Deborah	Hozempa	95835-1209
Matthew	Hubbard	95757
Donald	Hubbard	95835
Amber	Huber	95835
David	Hufford	95660
Angela	Hughes	95834
Jenna	Hughes	95677
Amber	Hustead	95835
Aaron	Hustead	95835
Michael	Hutchings	95834
David	Hylton	95838
Mindy	Hylton	95838
Stan	Ichiho	95835
Carmen	Igano	95835
tess	ilardi	95819
Jaime	Imus	95835
Razia	Iqbal	95835
Teri	Ira	95835
LaTasha	Jackson	95833

Tina	Jamerson	95670
Mei-Ling	Jameson	95453
Shannon	Jameson	95835
Michelle	Jett	95835
Michelle	Jimenez	95835
Serina	Jimenez	95834
Maribel	Jiménez	95835
Latoya	Johnsk	95842
Lisa	Johnson	95835
Will	Johnson	95835
Miranda	Johnston	95835
Yvonne	Jones	95835
Amy	Jordan	95833
David	Jordan	95833
Karla	Joseph	95835
Lindsey	Joyner	95833
Michele	Juarez	95835
Lorena	Juarez	95835
Suzzi	Judson	95835
Lee	Kahle	95833
Barbara	Kampmeinert	95835
Christine	Kataoka	95621
Sionainn	Katlssen	95835
Rachel	Kattan	95835
Monika	Katyal	95835
Adrienne	Kaufmann	95834
Elizabeth	Keene	95833
Jennifer	Keller	95838
Angela	Kellogg	95834
CHRIS	KENNEDY	95834
Tamara	Kennedy	95834
Rachel	Kennedy	95961
Patricia	Kent	95835
Cara	Kenyon	95834
Richard	Khuu	95835
Lorraine	King	95838
Cassandra	King	95841
Hami	Kitsuda	95835
Deborah	Klacik	95835
Karen	Klein	95833
Tiffany	Klopfer	95835
Joanna	Knieriem	95610
Gary	Knight	95835

Nancy	Kong-Vasquez	95834
Angela	Kopchak	95835
Steve	Korvink	95835
Stephen	Kraatz	95835
Darlene	Kramer	95834
Maggie	Kuang	95834
Minh	La	95835
Kevin	La	95742
Jimmy	Lake	95838
Kuldeep	Lally	95834
Sam	Lane	95973
Kim	Lang	95834
David	Lardizabal	95833
Morgan	Lardizabal	95833
DJ	Latcham	95835
Brittany	Latcham	95835
Teri	Latsko	95835
Patrick	Lau	95835
Eric	Law	95835
Richelle	Lawas	95833
Jill	Lawler	95835
Robyn	Le	95835
Esmeralda	LeDoux	95838
Jeannie	Lee	95835
Linda	Lee	95835
Sandra	Lee	95835
Ka	Lee	95833
Julian	Leesha	95833
Payton	Leesha	95833
Teresa	Lehane	95833-1015
Alexix	Leija	95355
Moulay	Lemrini	95835
Lynn	Lenzi	95835
quitall	lester	95670
Lawrence	Levy	95833-1015
Kristopher	Lewis	95835
Stephen	Lewis	95835
Devon	Lewis	95835
Lynnette	Lewis	95834
Candy	Li	95835
Steve	Libertini	95834
Chris	Libertini	95834
Shannon	Libertini	95834

Jamie	Lindner	95835
Sarah	Lipton	95835
Alicia	Lockwood	95835
Erica	Looney	95835
Becky	Lopes	95833
Barbara	Lopez	95834
Robert	Lopez	95838
Alyssa	Lozano	95835
Brittany	Ludemann	95834
Kim	Ly	95835
Kristine	Ly	95835
Joyce	Lyons	95835
Dinielle	Lysak	95835
Robert	Mackinnon	95835
Trusha	Magwood	95834
Melissa	Maly	95834
Sonya	Mangabay	95833
Todd	Marcione	95835
Linda	Marcum	95673
Jeff	Marques	95835
Michelle	Marquez	95826
David	Marquez	95835
Danielle	Marshall	95835
Mark	Marshall	95821
Alisha	Martel	95835
Joe	Martinez	95835
DOUGLAS	MARTINEZ	95835
DEVID	Matteucci	95835
Samantha	Maxwell	95662
Richard	May	95835
Maria	Mayorga	95835
Angelica	McCaw	95834
Sarah	McCleary	95835
Jamie	Mcdole	95835
Donald	McFarland	95834
Andriena	McGovern	95835
Christopher	McGreal	95833
Iori	mclain	95833
Jane	McMahon	95825
Becky	McMannis	95673
Jennifer	McMartin	95834
Victor	Medina	95838
Kayla	Medina	95834

Sumiti	Mehta	95834
Corina	Melchor	95673
Allison	Melott	95835
Maria	Mendoza	95833
Sheila	Mendoza	95835
Frances	Mercado	95835
Gen	Mercado	95834
Priti	Merchant	95835
Michael	Meyer	95834
Terri	Meyer	95835
Lisa	Meylor	95835
Tihane	Meza	95834
Michael	Micciche	95835
Alex	Migit	95678
Jason	Miller	95818
Nichole	Miller	95835
Eddie	Miller	95835
Carrie	Mills	95833
Patricia	Milner	95833
Shawn	Milner	95833
Phil	Milton	95835
John	Miramontes	95842-3454
Joan	Mock	95834
Peter	Mock	95834
Jessica	Mock	95834
Mihir	Modi	95835
Geri	Mohler	68632
Juliana	Mohr	95815
Cristina	Montano	95834
Rebecca	Montes	95834
Sheila	Montgomery	95628
Michelle	Montilla	95833
Jayne	Moore	95833
Denise	Moore	95835
Daniel	Moorhouse	95825
Eli	Morales	95776
Jamie	Moreland	95961
Mary	Moren Favrat	95835
Lindsay	Moreno	95660
Aaron	Morgan	95833
Nichole	Morgan	95834
Angela	Morgan	95835
Aaron	Morgan	95833

David	Morris	95673
Dillon	Morrison	95370
Garrett	Mort	95835
Nancy	Munoz	95834
Meghan	Murphy	95621
nay	murr	95853
Dylan	Musgrove	95672
Sunshine	Nacar	95835
Dexter	Nacar	95835
Shalini	Nand	95834
Sunny	NANUA	95835
Miguel	Navarro	95835
Shanna	Naylor	95835
Kayleigh	Nealon	95835
Sherry	Nealon	95835
Sean	Nealon	95835
Eric	Neuhauser	95835
Jessica	Newcomer	95834
Julie	Newton	95835
Andrew	Nguyen	95835
Amy	nguyen	95833
Mike	Nguyen	95835
Jeremy	Nied	95834
Dora	Noegel	95835
Karen	O'Haire	95835
Theresa	OBrien	95835
Ed	Ochoa	95695
Jessica	Ocock	95833
Barbara	Ocock	95833
Amy	Oden	95835
Patrick	Oden	95835
Sean	Ohri	95835
Dawn	Okinaka	95835
Janine	Olsen	95835
Stephanie	Oneill	95624
Ann	Oparowski	95835
Haley	Orr	95691
Ray	Ortega	95835
Markcurtis	Otani	95835
Shalonda	Ousley	95834
Elizabeth	Outman	95834
Bertha	Padilla	94834
Monica	Palacios	95835

Joseph	Palomo	95835
Katie	Park	95683
Tony	Park	95835
Elizabeth	Parker	95833
Christina	Parker	95835
Caroline	Pascua	95835-2118
Renato	Pascual	95835
Mary Jane	Pascual	95835
Pinky	Patel	95835
Ronak	Patel	95834
Diana	Patterson	95835
Kristy	Patterson	95835
Zach	Paul	95835
Curtis	Paullins	95835
Jenifer	Pearsall	95834-2708
Sarah	Pecota	95834
Anne	Peggins	95835
Sophia	Pena	95838
Joshua	Percy	95835
Victor	Perez	95835
ED	PEREZ	95835916-259-3516
Elizabeth	Perez	95834
Cherie	Perez	95835
Librado	Perez	95835
Jessica	Perigny	95835
Robbert	Perrine	95822
Nicole	Perry	95326
Anthony	Peters	95831
Chris	Peterson	95827
Michael	Pettigrew	95835
Ted	Pham	95834
Caitlin	Phomsopha	95835
Isabella	Phomsopha	95834
Marcus	Pickett	95826
Angelique	Piliotis	95833
Danielle	Pimentel	95833
Karen	Pollard	95835
Michelle	Pomicpic	95835
Sara	Ponce	95833
Jason	Pope	95835
Denise	Pope-Wieder	95834
Aaron	Powe	95673
Elisabeth	Pray	95835

Cassy	Preheim	95835
Kerri	Price	95835
Anna Marie	Price	95838
Deirdre	Price	95833
Alycia	Price	95835
Elizabeth	Quezada	95835
Luis	Quezada	95835
Michael	Quinn	95835
Valorie	Quinn	95835
Carmen	Quintero	95835
Jorge	R.	95834
Jinh	Racpan	95835
Meaghan	Radican	95833
Kathy	Radican	95833
Kaci	Rai	95835
Kellie	Ramirez	95835
Mary	Ramírez	95834
Amanda	Ramos	95833
Liliana	Ramos	95834
Sean	Randall	95835
michelle	randolph	95626
Joe	Rangel	95833
Roberta	Raper	95833
Deanna	Read	95673
Pamela	Reber	95838
Sharalin	Redding	95835
Spencer	Rees	95834
J	Reeves	95835
David	Reeves	95833
Kristina	Reich	95835
Brandee	Reimers	95835
Vernon	Renwanz	95835
Stacy	Rhodes	95833
Jayme	Richards	95835
Ardith	Richardson	95835
David	Richardson	95835
Lois	Richardson	95673
Lori	Richter	95835
Stacy	Ridgeway	95660
Raven	Ridgeway	95660
Tricia	Riehl	95819
Allison	Risas	95835
Jacqueline	Robbins	95838

Samantha	Robbins	95835
Nicole	Robinson	95835
Randi	Robinson-Snaer	95835
Patrina	Rodan	95835
Cristi	Rodda	95834
Sergio	Rodriguez	95835
Dana	Roebuck	95628
Joseph	Rojas	95833
Robin	Rolles	95835
Tiffany	Rollins	95835
Lisa	Romero	95674
Cynthia	Romero	95835
Jamie	Ron	95835
Javier	Ron	95835
Shannon	Rosa	95747
Diana	Rosales	95835
Robynne	Rose	95835
Brian	Rose	95833
Becky	Roseman	95834
Phil	Rosenberg	95833
Sherly	Rosilela	95835
Susan	Ross	95835
Jay	Ross	95835
Stacey	Roth	95835
Patrick	Roughton	95825
Amber	Roumiguiere	95835
Brandi	Rowan	95835
Justin	Rubio	95835
Rosemarie	Ruggieri	95835
Lawrence	Ruiz	95835
Dawn	Rumore	95834
Siek	Run	95835
John	Runion	95616
Mary	Runion	95616
Arnaldi	Rustandi	95835
Tiffany	Ruvalcaba	95833
James	Ryan	95835
Alicia	Ryan	95835
Jody	Saad	95835
See	Saeo	95834
Kulwant	Sahota	95835
Gurmit	Sahota	95835
Jeaven	Sahota	95835

Marja	Sainio	95834
Mark	Salcedo	95841
David	Salyer	95834
Angela	Samayoa	95834
Jocelyn	San nicolas	95835
John	Sanborn	95834
Amanda	Sanborn	95834
Arlene	Sanchez	95835
Timothy	Sanchez	95835
Donald	Sanders	95835
Amritpal	Sandhu	95834
Rajina	Sandhu	95834
Richard	Sang	95838
Stephanie	Santich	95831
Pamela	Santich	95831
John	Santich	95831
Linda	Santo Domingo	95835
Matthew	Santos	95835
Ona	Saras	9583t
Julie	Saturnio	95835
Candi	Saul	95835
Casey	Saumure	95835
Vikki	Savee	95833
Diana	Saxton	95833
Karen	Schechter	95835
Diane	Schellbach	95834
Mary	Schertzer	95629
Devonne	Schmolke	95833
Selah	Schoech	95835
Ali	Schofield	95835
Peter	Schofield	95835
Kerri	Schofield	95834
Andrew	Schwarz	95626
Elizabeth	Schwarz	95626
Shelly	Scott	95833
Jessica	Scott	95835
Rachel	Scott	95838
Jennifer	Scott	95834
Marc	Seely	95835
William	Segraves	95834
Tejpal	Sekhon	95993
Courtney	Selby	95821
Elizabeth	Seredich	95747

Robin	Sewell	95835
Nitin	Sharma	95835
Ruby	Shepherd	95673
Amy	Shettlesworth	95834
David	Shettlesworth	95834
Jenny	Shoemaker	95835
Jimmy	Short	95835
Chitra	Shrestha	95835
Susan	Sibbring	95835
Andrea	Silva	95835
Jessica	Silverbrand	95835
Alexandra	Simien	95835
Briawna	Sims	95824
Daljit	Singh	95835
Swati	Singh	95835
Andy	Singh	95834
Iness	Singh	95834
Seiha	Sky	95834
Julie	Slobodnik	95842
Nicole	Smith	95834
Erica	Smith	95835
Crystal	Smith	95834
Michael	Smith	95835
Genna	Snedden	95825
Joanna	Snyder	95833
Uzyar	Sohail	95835
Becky	Solie	95833
Sophia	Soria	95835
Elena	Soto	95833
Joshua	Speaks	95834
Shannon	Speaks	95834
Staci	Spencer	95835
Kathleen	Spisak	95833
Nancy	Spradling	95835
Donna	Springman	92555
Tal	Srab	95835
Andrea	St. Clair	95834
Michelle	Stafford	95834
Mary	Stafford	95932
Sue	Stafford	95932
Nickea	Stalter	95835
Dimitri	Stanich	95834
Sammie	Star	95834

Mike	Starkey	95834
Sarah	Stebbins	95834
Gary	Stephens	95823
Joshua	Stinson	95834
Stephanie	Stoll	95835
Kendra	Stoll	95836
Mary	Stone	95835
Paul	Streuli	95835
Nancy	Strickland	28115
Tracey	Strong	95834
Truly	Sughrue	95835
Neel	Suthar	95835
Linda	Ta	95835
Marvin	Talso	95470-0350
Michele	Tamplin	95833
Jannsen	Tan	95834
Joseph	Tande	95824
David	Tanguay	95835
Brenna	Taylor	95835
Ben	Taylor	95834
Heather	Taylor	95835
Tom	Taylor	95835
Katherine	Taylor	95835
NANCY	TAYLOR	95833
Jennifer	Taylor	95833
Janet	Taylor	95626
Carrie	Tedrick	95835
Jimmy	Thai	95828
Stacy	Thomas	95835
Sonya	Thomas	95833
Karen	Thomas	95835
Todd	Thompson	95834
Scott	Thompson	95835
Kyle	Thompson	95747
Carrie	Thomsen	95835
Nicole	Thorpe	95823
Stacy	Throop	95834
CarolLynn	Tice	95834
Charles	Tieszen	95835
DeMaria	Tiger	95833
Kai	Tjalsma	95835
Rosa	Tonga	95833
Brad	Torbeck	95835

Kristene	Torbeck	95835
Rachel	Torres	95833
Natalie	Townes	95835
Heather	Tran	95835
Anthony	Trujillo	95835
Tara	Trujillo	95835
Kim	Truong	95691
Allen	Tsao	95835
Shannon	Turner	95833
Mike	Turner	95835
Susanne	Turner	95834
Mike	Turner	95834
Jessica	Turner	95835
Tiffany	Turner	95835
Sheree	Turner	95835
Michelle	Tyler	95834
Jasdeep	Uppal	95826
Joel	V	95833
Renee	van Zuydam	95835
Simona	Vanecek	95833
Tina	Vankesteren	us, 95833
Steve	Varner	95835
David	Vasquez	95834
Armand	Vattuone	95818
Camila	Velez	95834
Allison	Vickrey	95835
Janice	Villanueva	95691
Brian	Viray	95835
Kellie	Vitaich	95835
Minh	Vo	95834
Keran	Vraitch	95835
Michael	Vukas	95834
Terry	Wade	95835
Angela	Wahl	95834
Bernadette	Wallace	95835
Marquita	Ward-white	95835
Katerra	Warren	95835
Aaron	Watkins	95835
Jennyfer	Watson	95834
Denise	Weatherly	95610
Aimee	Wells	95834
Gary	Weston	95835
Katherine	Weston	95835

Judy	Weston	73099
Thelma	Whidden	95834
Julie	White	95835
Tonette	Wilkerson	95835
Jamie	Williams	95835
JD	Williams	95835
Shelley	Williams	95835
stephanie	wills	95668
Shilo	Wilson	95835
Albert	Witt	95829
Veronica	Wogec	95835
Katie	Wollman	95834
Michelle	Wong	95835
christopher	wong	95835
Jennifer	Woo	95691
Kavisa	Wood	95834
Joe	Wood	95835
Liz	WOOD	95834
Zack	WOOD	95834
Aimee	Woodward	95838
Corina	Workman	95835
Deb	Wurgler	95835
Owen	Wurgler	95835
Robert	Wurgler	95835
Audrey	Wyatt	95835
Amanda	Wymer	95835
Dave	Wynn	95834
Elaine	Yang	95838
Ruben	Ybarra	95835
Melinda	Yee	95835
Tina	Yee	95834
Lisa	Young	95833
Shawna	Young	95835
Ray	Yund	95843
Grace	Zamora	95833
Carlos	Zaragoza	95833
Vontina	Zavala	95833
Celine	Zehnder	95835
Katarzyna	Zembrzuski-Couture	95834
Liz	Zimbelman	95835
Joan	Zimmermann	95833
Greg	Zumstein	95835
Kristina	Zumstein	95835

eligio	zuniga	95835
Allison	Zuvela	95835