



City of Sacramento Project Prosper Executive Summary of Public Meetings


On Feb. 21, Feb. 22 and March 3, 2018, the City of Sacramento held three identical public meetings for Project Prosper. Meeting times and locations were in diverse geographic areas of the City in an effort to maximize opportunities for attendance from a wide range of demographics. Meetings were held in the evening at the Fruitridge Community Collaborative and Bartley Cavanaugh Golf Course, and on a Saturday at the KVIE Community Room.

Mayor Darrell Steinberg and Howard Chan actively participated in each of the meetings, and several City Council Members participated in meetings in their districts. Additionally, numerous City staff from Economic Development, Neighborhood Services, the City Manager's office and the Mayor's office attended each meeting along with consultants Darrene Hackler, Wendy Hoyt, and Tammy Teurn.

The public meetings were promoted in a variety of ways including emailed invitations to approximately 15,000 people in the City's database, extensive use of the City's social media, individual group presentations, etc. As a result of these efforts, approximately 300 community members attended the meetings (including a Jan. 22 meeting of invited stakeholders). Approximately 1/3 of the attendees indicated that they had either never attended a City public meeting or had not done so in more than a year. Attendees indicated they heard about the meeting as follows: 38% email, 26% Nextdoor.com, 25% personal contact by a friend, City employee, neighborhood or Planning|Design Commission meeting, and 11% social media.

Attendees indicated which Council District (CD) they lived in:

- | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| A. CD 1 – Ashby | E. CD 5 – Schenirer | I. I do not live in |
| B. CD 2 – Warren | F. CD 6 – Guerra | Sacramento (N/A) |
| C. CD 3 – Harris | G. CD 7 – Jennings | |
| D. CD 4 – Hansen | H. CD 8 – Carr | |



The purpose of the public meetings was to obtain feedback from the public on a broad range of topics that will improve the community's economic prosperity and empower residents to nurture healthier and more vibrant neighborhoods throughout the City. Residents were given an opportunity to share their ideas through engaging facilitated discussions, group exercises, voting opportunities with immediate vote tallies, and written prioritizations and comment forms.



Map Exercise:

At each of the meetings, 15 to 25 large colored maps of the City were placed on walls throughout the room. The maps were divided into three different segments of the City focusing on the North, South and Central areas. Attendees were asked to draw and write on the maps to illustrate and comment on what they felt was positive (working well) and negative (needing attention or improvement) in their local neighborhood.




After the map exercise, comments from a facilitated brief discussion were written on large easel notepads. These comments have been categorized and placed in no particular order below.

POSITIVES	NEGATIVES
Central Area (Feb. 21, 2018)	
• Citywide Impact Team • Library system, parks, and 311 • Colonial Heights community • Collaborative meetings and discussions • Police attending and sharing information • Mack Road community, positive energy • Fruitridge Manor is very multicultural • City Council and staff attending meetings • Neighborhood for Justice Program • Brentwood South Neighborhood Association is happy with Police	• Extend public transit lines and hours • Interaction with nearby/other cities • Stockton Boulevard (Colonial Heights): homelessness, prostitution and lack of businesses • Access to safe, affordable housing • Lack of housing for homeless • Crime near Martin Luther King Library and William Charlie Park

South Area (Feb. 22, 2018)	
• Safe, parks, comfortable • Diversity and unity in community • Stunning libraries • Accessibility to airport and downtown • New Delta Shores development • Neighborhood associations, Mack Road Partnership, and police collaboration	• Bike trail not extended through Pocket area • Political issues resolved • Later bus service (Broadway to S. Land Park and Pocket area) • Subway/light rail to airport (extended rail) • Accessible and affordable childcare in urban core/downtown, not just in suburbs • Vacant storefronts
North Area (March 3, 2018)	
• Historic resources to increase businesses, tourism, etc. • (D7) Biking, safe community • Diverse community and longevity • Great neighbors and neighborhood watch (River Oaks Community)	• Pocket area is isolated (hence the name) • Lack of public transit and community gathering places • (D2) Needs a library • (D3) Fireworks sounds like a warzone during New Year's Eve and 4th of July; please ban fireworks. A show of hands illustrated this was a big concern for several of the attendees



Following the map exercise, a presentation was given on economic growth capacities to increase and diversify growth. The three capacities included People, Business, and Place. Attendees were given an opportunity to vote on their priority for each capacity by choosing from a multiple choice menu of options. The following pages are poll results including comments from a facilitated brief discussion of pros/cons and additional capacities.



Which option would most improve the capacity of people to secure jobs in your neighborhood?

- A. High school graduation rates
- B. Post-high school certificates or degrees
- C. Digital skills
- D. Free community college tuition and fees
- E. Internships, apprenticeships, and career pathways
- F. Train for skills that match our business needs



First Option	Second Option	Top Choice Comments (First Option)																								
Central Area (Feb. 21, 2018)																										
<table><tr><td>A.</td><td>B.</td><td>C.</td><td>D.</td><td>E.</td><td>F.</td></tr><tr><td>16%</td><td>2%</td><td>6%</td><td>31%</td><td>23%</td><td>22%</td></tr></table>	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.	16%	2%	6%	31%	23%	22%	<table><tr><td>A.</td><td>B.</td><td>C.</td><td>D.</td><td>E.</td><td>F.</td></tr><tr><td>19%</td><td>5%</td><td>10%</td><td>20%</td><td>33%</td><td>14%</td></tr></table>	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.	19%	5%	10%	20%	33%	14%	D: Free community college - Includes everyone (free Community College) - Education critical for better jobs
A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.																					
16%	2%	6%	31%	23%	22%																					
A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.																					
19%	5%	10%	20%	33%	14%																					
South Area (Feb. 22, 2018)																										
<table><tr><td>A.</td><td>B.</td><td>C.</td><td>D.</td><td>E.</td><td>F.</td></tr><tr><td>13%</td><td>7%</td><td>11%</td><td>27%</td><td>22%</td><td>20%</td></tr></table>	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.	13%	7%	11%	27%	22%	20%	<table><tr><td>A.</td><td>B.</td><td>C.</td><td>D.</td><td>E.</td><td>F.</td></tr><tr><td>2%</td><td>20%</td><td>5%</td><td>12%</td><td>27%</td><td>34%</td></tr></table>	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.	2%	20%	5%	12%	27%	34%	D: Free community college - Distribution of wealth; youth can't afford college - Kids to form own opinions - Guaranteed jobs
A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.																					
13%	7%	11%	27%	22%	20%																					
A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.																					
2%	20%	5%	12%	27%	34%																					
North Area (March 3, 2018)																										
<table><tr><td>A.</td><td>B.</td><td>C.</td><td>D.</td><td>E.</td><td>F.</td></tr><tr><td>10%</td><td>11%</td><td>4%</td><td>30%</td><td>25%</td><td>20%</td></tr></table>	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.	10%	11%	4%	30%	25%	20%	<table><tr><td>A.</td><td>B.</td><td>C.</td><td>D.</td><td>E.</td><td>F.</td></tr><tr><td>5%</td><td>10%</td><td>8%</td><td>30%</td><td>31%</td><td>16%</td></tr></table>	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.	5%	10%	8%	30%	31%	16%	D: Free community college - Motivator to graduate high school - Single parents need incentive for kids to go to college
A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.																					
10%	11%	4%	30%	25%	20%																					
A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.																					
5%	10%	8%	30%	31%	16%																					

Which option would most improve the capacity of business to grow better and more jobs in your neighborhood?

- A. Stimulate new local entrepreneurs
- B. Technical assistance to grow local small business
- C. Grow business that import wealth (export goods and services to others)
- D. Attract business with middle income jobs to move or expand in Sacramento
- E. Innovation District




First Option	Second Option	Top Choice Comments (First Option)																								
Central Area (Feb. 21, 2018)																										
<table><tr><th>Option</th><th>Percentage</th></tr><tr><td>A.</td><td>19%</td></tr><tr><td>B.</td><td>32%</td></tr><tr><td>C.</td><td>13%</td></tr><tr><td>D.</td><td>18%</td></tr><tr><td>E.</td><td>18%</td></tr></table>	Option	Percentage	A.	19%	B.	32%	C.	13%	D.	18%	E.	18%	<table><tr><th>Option</th><th>Percentage</th></tr><tr><td>A.</td><td>25%</td></tr><tr><td>B.</td><td>22%</td></tr><tr><td>C.</td><td>12%</td></tr><tr><td>D.</td><td>21%</td></tr><tr><td>E.</td><td>20%</td></tr></table>	Option	Percentage	A.	25%	B.	22%	C.	12%	D.	21%	E.	20%	B: Technical assistance Everything electronic (digital skills critical when applying for any job)
Option	Percentage																									
A.	19%																									
B.	32%																									
C.	13%																									
D.	18%																									
E.	18%																									
Option	Percentage																									
A.	25%																									
B.	22%																									
C.	12%																									
D.	21%																									
E.	20%																									
South Area (Feb. 22, 2018)																										
<table><tr><th>Option</th><th>Percentage</th></tr><tr><td>A.</td><td>21%</td></tr><tr><td>B.</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>C.</td><td>7%</td></tr><tr><td>D.</td><td>19%</td></tr><tr><td>E.</td><td>23%</td></tr></table>	Option	Percentage	A.	21%	B.	20%	C.	7%	D.	19%	E.	23%	<table><tr><th>Option</th><th>Percentage</th></tr><tr><td>A.</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>B.</td><td>39%</td></tr><tr><td>C.</td><td>2%</td></tr><tr><td>D.</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>E.</td><td>20%</td></tr></table>	Option	Percentage	A.	20%	B.	39%	C.	2%	D.	20%	E.	20%	E: Innovation district - Model not just for youth folks, but those in transition - Digital skills in high school
Option	Percentage																									
A.	21%																									
B.	20%																									
C.	7%																									
D.	19%																									
E.	23%																									
Option	Percentage																									
A.	20%																									
B.	39%																									
C.	2%																									
D.	20%																									
E.	20%																									
North Area (March 3, 2018)																										
<table><tr><th>Option</th><th>Percentage</th></tr><tr><td>A.</td><td>25%</td></tr><tr><td>B.</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>C.</td><td>9%</td></tr><tr><td>D.</td><td>22%</td></tr><tr><td>E.</td><td>25%</td></tr></table> (Tie between A & E)	Option	Percentage	A.	25%	B.	20%	C.	9%	D.	22%	E.	25%	<table><tr><th>Option</th><th>Percentage</th></tr><tr><td>A.</td><td>24%</td></tr><tr><td>B.</td><td>16%</td></tr><tr><td>C.</td><td>7%</td></tr><tr><td>D.</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>E.</td><td>34%</td></tr></table>	Option	Percentage	A.	24%	B.	16%	C.	7%	D.	20%	E.	34%	A: Stimulate new local entrepreneurs - Skillsets to success; entrepreneurial resources - Streamline and make it easier to do business; City involvement makes things harder - Seed money for businesses E: Innovation District - Talent to create partnerships and grow businesses - Capitalize on ethnic diversity as an economic driver 18 hour city - Accelerators in underserved areas (outside downtown)
Option	Percentage																									
A.	25%																									
B.	20%																									
C.	9%																									
D.	22%																									
E.	25%																									
Option	Percentage																									
A.	24%																									
B.	16%																									
C.	7%																									
D.	20%																									
E.	34%																									

Which option would most improve your neighborhood's capacity as a place?

- A. Middle income, low income, and homeless housing options
- B. Walking, biking, transit facilities
- C. Community safety and cleanliness services
- D. Shopping, eating, and entertainment options
- E. Public places to learn and play



First Option	Second Option	Top Choice Comments (First Option)																				
Central Area (Feb. 21, 2018)																						
<table><tr><td>A.</td><td>B.</td><td>C.</td><td>D.</td><td>E.</td></tr><tr><td>46%</td><td>10%</td><td>18%</td><td>16%</td><td>11%</td></tr></table>	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	46%	10%	18%	16%	11%	<table><tr><td>A.</td><td>B.</td><td>C.</td><td>D.</td><td>E.</td></tr><tr><td>27%</td><td>28%</td><td>27%</td><td>11%</td><td>8%</td></tr></table>	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	27%	28%	27%	11%	8%	A: Housing options Poor/poverty – folks left out of society prevalent in Oak Park
A.	B.	C.	D.	E.																		
46%	10%	18%	16%	11%																		
A.	B.	C.	D.	E.																		
27%	28%	27%	11%	8%																		
South Area (Feb. 22, 2018)																						
<table><tr><td>A.</td><td>B.</td><td>C.</td><td>D.</td><td>E.</td></tr><tr><td>52%</td><td>14%</td><td>18%</td><td>9%</td><td>7%</td></tr></table>	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	52%	14%	18%	9%	7%	<table><tr><td>A.</td><td>B.</td><td>C.</td><td>D.</td><td>E.</td></tr><tr><td>27%</td><td>30%</td><td>27%</td><td>7%</td><td>9%</td></tr></table>	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	27%	30%	27%	7%	9%	A: Housing options Helps students stay in district
A.	B.	C.	D.	E.																		
52%	14%	18%	9%	7%																		
A.	B.	C.	D.	E.																		
27%	30%	27%	7%	9%																		
North Area (March 3, 2018)																						
<table><tr><td>A.</td><td>B.</td><td>C.</td><td>D.</td><td>E.</td></tr><tr><td>43%</td><td>22%</td><td>16%</td><td>6%</td><td>13%</td></tr></table>	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	43%	22%	16%	6%	13%	<table><tr><td>A.</td><td>B.</td><td>C.</td><td>D.</td><td>E.</td></tr><tr><td>24%</td><td>26%</td><td>21%</td><td>17%</td><td>12%</td></tr></table>	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	24%	26%	21%	17%	12%	A: Housing options - Incentivize lower cost housing in City and urban core - Lack of affordable housing pushing seniors to homelessness in CD2 - Students can’t attend college without affordable housing (no roof, no school) as there are a number of students who sleep in their car
A.	B.	C.	D.	E.																		
43%	22%	16%	6%	13%																		
A.	B.	C.	D.	E.																		
24%	26%	21%	17%	12%																		



Childcare and Early Childhood Education

Although not a “Capacity” option provided in the multiple choice “poll,” the issue of affordable childcare, early education and daycare came up over and over again in all three public meetings. In a straw poll suggested by one of the Councilmembers at the North Area meeting, by a show of hands 31 attendees would have chosen this as their first priority had it been an option. Attendees stressed the need for subsidized or affordable childcare in the urban core (not just in the suburbs), and childcare for parents who are working, going to school, or in training apprenticeship programs.

The following are pros/cons of multiple choice capacities, additional capacities and general feedback written on large easel notepads at the public meetings. These comments have been categorized and placed in no particular order below.

Pros/Cons, Additional Capacities and General Feedback		
Central Area (Feb. 21, 2018)	South Area (Feb. 22, 2018)	North Area (March 3, 2018)
• How can those not fluent in English participate? • More health and family/youth education • Good non-profits don't have space to work such as those who foster youth, etc. • Ordinance – investors rent houses; halfway houses create cycle of crime, 500 sex offenders within three-mile in Oak Park • Program/intervention with	• Non-profits, services to community • Connection to diversity factor, access to Capitol • Show ratio in local dollars • More housing and density = richer environment • Attract safe, clean businesses • Arts • Better access to rivers	• Affordable daycare and childcare. By a show of hands 31 attendees would have chosen this as their priority if an option • Community outreach, education about resources • Higher minimum wage • Voting model doesn't distinguish attendees' neighborhood • Most of Sacramento largely suburban; isn't 20 min.

troubled kids • Free/low cost childcare • Code issues • City of Stockton model – stipend for poor folks to stay in their homes • Webpage for folks to see organizations available		walking/biking distance • Trained workforce; children to go to college; public transportation • Flooding risks; lower greenhouse gas emissions; global warming; address storm water control
---	--	---

Key Take-a-Ways

Through the voting prioritization and discussion process, much information was obtained from the public reflecting their strong desires for affordable housing for middle income, low income and the homeless; support and technical assistance for small businesses; and the need for free community college. These topics are addressed elsewhere in this meeting summary.

Additionally, the following are general observations or themes that became apparent over the course of the three public meetings:

What you love about our City...

- Throughout the City, residents identified strongly with their neighborhoods. Even those voicing frustrations and wanting improvements feel a positive sense of neighborhood/community and a passionate City pride
- Residents love their library(s). They also love their parks, bike trails, trees and open spaces
- Those that have Community Centers greatly appreciate them and encourage even more programing
- Many residents appreciate the local businesses and restaurants in their neighborhood; others wish they had more local businesses
- Murals and live art were often noted as positive community attributes

What you want for your City....

- Affordable or free childcare for those that are employed, in training or in school
- Greater City financial investment into low income neighborhoods (two examples: suggestion for innovation hubs located outside of the urban core in the poorer neighborhoods; and staff at all police stations so reports can be filed in person)
- Help for small businesses, micro businesses, startup businesses, and nonprofits
- Less cannabis dispensaries with greater geographic disbursement
- Repurpose vacant buildings. Transform vacant, blighted infill lots
- Increased public transit service, more routes and evening service

This Executive Summary of Public Meetings was compiled by The Hoyt Company and City Outreach Staff with data analysis provided by Darrene Hackler. A 50+ page Consolidated Meeting Summary of all comments provided both verbally and in writing has also been prepared by the same team and found on

<http://www.cityofsacramento.org/projectprosper>.