

# CALIFORNIA INDIAN HERITAGE CENTER GENERAL PLAN

## SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS RECEIVED IN WRITING

*The following comments were received in writing in response to the NOP and on comment cards distributed at the public meeting on January 26, 2010. Questions and answers from the scoping meeting have been summarized in a separate document.*

Date Received Name	Comments
January 20, 2010 Central Valley Flood Protection Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project is within the Central Valley Flood Protection Board’s jurisdiction</li> <li>• Comment letter lists requirements for Board permit</li> </ul>
January 31, 2010 Greg Potnik	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no academic consensus that defines European settlers’ actions towards the California Native American people and culture as genocide; this language is divisive and does not belong in the CIHC document, plan, or project</li> <li>• West Sacramento Planning Commission is not shown on the timeline for EIR review and should be added</li> <li>• There is a fatal flaw in the formation and approval of CEQA documents for this project, which should be corrected to avoid potential legal challenge</li> </ul>
January 26, 2010 John Powderly, Comment Card	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of CIHC project on West Sacramento’s flood protection system should be addressed in the General Plan, EIR, and all other appropriate documents</li> <li>• Flood protection system should be addressed in relation to public river access, recreation, and species’ habitats</li> </ul>
January 26, 2010 Rob Himes and Myriam Frausto, Comment Card	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project site needs 24-hour security that is guaranteed into the future</li> <li>• No overnight camping should be allowed</li> <li>• Buses and cars on top of the levee will be a visual impact</li> <li>• Concerned with parking structure and other off-site business</li> <li>• Traffic from visitors will require improvements to I Street bridge, C Street, and 5<sup>th</sup> Street</li> <li>• Way-finding signs will be needed</li> <li>• Levee improvements must be preformed before site improvements</li> <li>• Connection to riverfront is important</li> <li>• Hours of operation</li> <li>• Future State budget could force CIHC to close, and homeless could take over project site</li> </ul>
February 02, 2010 Greg Potnick (please note – a copy of the same comments were	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visitor Population Assumptions:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Projected visitor population must be quantified</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Traffic Circulation, Parking Impacts and Mitigations:</li> </ul>

Date Received Name	Comments
also provided by Steve Yee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project will have significant and permanent effects on the project site, surrounding neighborhoods, and the City of West Sacramento</li> <li>○ Current and projected Levels of Service to/from the site, infrastructure improvements, access/egress, public transit, off-site parking and transportation to the project, and overall traffic patterns need to be studied, analyzed, and mitigated</li> <li>○ A Traffic Management Plan and Capital Improvement Plan are required</li> <li>○ Funding sources and cost apportionment must be identified</li> <li>● Public Safety Impacts to Fire and Police: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project will have significant and permanent effects on public safety of the community and the project</li> <li>○ A Police and Fire Public Safety Master Plan is required</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Air Quality Degradation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project will contribute significantly to the degradation of community and regional air quality</li> <li>○ Mitigation of project impacts must be included in the project</li> <li>○ An Air Quality Plan is required</li> </ul> </li> <li>● AB 32 Scoping Plan and Impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Impact analysis and mitigation related to AB 32 is required</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Alternative Building Site Locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Currently proposed project site may be unsuitable to intense pedestrian, traffic, and urban use</li> <li>○ Relocating the project to the West Sacramento Central Business District or adjacent to Raley Field mitigates many issues associated with the currently proposed project site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Allows better public access, density for economic and community growth, and centralized infrastructure improvements</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Separating the building from the passive park should be considered as an alternative</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Proposed Building Programmatic and Schematic Alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Including warehouse space in the project adds to the environmental footprint of the building</li> <li>○ Possibility for locating the Tribal Treasures Archives offsite should be analyzed</li> <li>○ Using off-site warehouse space would reduce traffic and mitigate numerous environmental issues</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Flood Plan/Levee Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project will have significant impact on the flood plain and levees</li> <li>○ Project must provide a comprehensive analysis of flood issues, mitigations, and infrastructure requirements, including funding sources and operational maintenance</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Economic Impact Study:</li> </ul>

Date Received Name	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An Economic Impact Study is required to determine the economic viability of the project, its impact on community jobs, and economic sustainability</li> <li>○ Jobs/housing balance study and project pro forma are required to determine economic impact on the community</li> <li>● Archaeological/Historical Site Analysis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Analysis of project site needs to be more in-depth to include potential archaeological sites, historical context, and recent community traditions and use</li> <li>○ All archaeological/historical sites need to be identified and preserved</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Hazardous/Toxic Chemical and Substances Study and Remediation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A Hazardous/Toxic Chemical and Substances Study and Remediation Plan must be developed</li> <li>○ All known and potential hazardous sites must be identified, assessed, and mitigated</li> <li>○ All analysis and mitigation must be Proposition 65 compliant</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Construction Management Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A Construction Management Plan is required to mitigate effects of site development and construction</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Lighting Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project will result in ambient and direct light projected onto the site, surrounding community, and river/riverfront areas</li> <li>○ Project must implement a plan to design and monitor light from the site</li> <li>○ Lighting must be addressed to not disturb wildlife, residents, neighborhoods, cross-river facilities, and river and highway traffic</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Aesthetic/Design Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An Architectural/Design Review Committee must be composed of community and project stakeholders, as well as design experts</li> <li>○ Conflicts with existing community must be resolved</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Neighborhood Impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project will impact adjacent neighborhood social structures, dynamics, and interactions in the area</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Sedimentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A Sedimentation Plan must be designed to prevent and/or mitigate any project effects</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Public Access to Riverfront, Existing and Developed Pathways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project must ensure continued public activities on the project site are guaranteed</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Hydrology Analysis and Remediation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Hydrology Identification and Remediation Plan must be completed before project implementation</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Site Security Relative to Local/State/Federal Stakeholders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Emergency Action Plan must be developed by all affected agencies and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Date Received Name	Comments
	<p>implemented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Memorandums of Understanding and Mutual Aid Agreements need to be formalized</li> <li>● Specific Analysis of Park Ranger Resource Sufficiency: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Analysis of State Parks’ ability to implement and maintain necessary law enforcement for the project is required</li> <li>○ Sufficiency of Peace Officer staff within the Capital District to patrol additional 60 acres of project development must be quantified</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Gentrification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project has potential to result in gentrification of surrounding neighborhoods</li> <li>○ Gentrification is a long-standing issue in Washington/Broderick and Bryte neighborhoods, and needs to be addressed in the EIR and General Plan</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Impact on Wildlife/Fauna/Migratory Birds and Aquatic Life: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project must coordinate with stakeholder agencies regarding impacts on riverfront, forested terrain</li> </ul> </li> <li>● CalTrans Scoping Meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ State highway projects, facilities, and capacity must be addressed in the EIR and General Plan</li> <li>○ CalTrans Scoping Meetings must be part of public input process</li> <li>○ West Sacramento and its residents must not bear infrastructure costs for development above site’s existing use</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Department of Fish and Game (DFG) Scoping Meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Analysis and remediation of all DFG issues must be resolved</li> <li>○ West Sacramento and its residents must not bear related mitigation costs resulting from site development</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Noise Impact Analysis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Noise Reduction/Remediation/Elimination Plan must be developed to address infrastructure requirements, funding sources, and ongoing operational needs for noise remediation</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Economic Sustainability Analysis and Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Economic Sustainability Analysis Plan is required to identify revenue sources to guarantee ongoing project funding</li> <li>○ Project EIR and General Plan must identify funding sources to ensure continued operations and maintenance</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Regional Land Use Planning and Coordination with SACOG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project must coordinate with SACOG regarding future regional growth, infrastructure</li> <li>○ Intergovernmental agreements need to be defined/agreed to by respective agencies and governmental entities</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Consistency with West Sacramento General Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project must be evaluated in context of West Sacramento General Plan</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Date Received Name	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ General Plan Update is underway</li> <li>○ Project EIR and General Plan must evaluate the impacts on the proposed project of recently completed projects and projects that have been approved or are pending approval</li> <li>● Land Subsidence and Uplift: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All historic, current, and future surface and groundwater gathering facilities must be analyzed for potential impacts on the site</li> <li>○ Department of Interior has identified the Sacramento Valley as groundwater pumping and land subsidence area</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Earthquake Soil Liquefaction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project will be developed in a flood plain on sandy soil, infill debris, loose sands, and silts</li> <li>○ Updated analysis, mitigation, and costs are required before the site is developed</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Loss of Identified Existing Pond/Wetland: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Further analysis of the pond/wetland identified in the Master Agreement is required to identify potential species that may be affected by the project</li> <li>○ Analysis, mitigation, and costs are required before the site is developed</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project requires an ADA plan to meet needs of individuals with disabilities or limitations in accessing the site</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
February 08, 2010 Mark Campbell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Traffic/Parking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Traffic flow proposed in Concept Master Plan cannot be supported by existing roadways</li> <li>○ Proposed parking will not accommodate projected daily visitors, forcing museum parking onto local streets</li> <li>○ Traffic Management Plan and Capital Improvement Plan are required to identify necessary infrastructure improvements and mitigation measures; funding should be identified</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Public Safety: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Police and Fire Public Safety Master Plan required to mitigate project impacts on local service and identify funding for increased public safety infrastructure/service officers</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Adjacent Properties: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proposed uses for adjacent properties that may be incorporated into the project site should be identified and analyzed in the EIR; uses may include parking, museum storage and restoration, and retail/commercial uses</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Lighting/Noise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lighting and noise should be addressed so the project does not disturb wildlife, residents, neighborhoods, cross-river facilities, and river/highway traffic</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Date Received Name	Comments
February 11, 2010 Bill Roehr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking/traffic should not impact the surrounding community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Public transit, river access, off-site parking with shuttle service would help alleviate problems</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Park security should patrol between Broderick Boat Ramp and River North to ensure project does not infringe on security of surrounding neighborhood</li> <li>• Surrounding residents' expectations for the use or non-use of adjacent parcels to the project site should continue to be considered during the design and planning phase</li> </ul>
February 11, 2010 Alyssa Begley, Caltrans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A traffic impact study (TIS) which contains appropriate mitigation should be provided for the project following Caltrans guidance (website provided);</li> <li>• A traffic management plan (TMP) for the project should be prepared and submitted for Caltrans review to minimize impacts to SHS during construction. Plan should discuss expected dates, duration, and traffic mitigation measures; contact for assistance is provided.</li> </ul>
February 12, 2010 Jim Brewer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic and transit to, from, and within the project site should use 'green technology' with small environmental footprints</li> <li>• Security should patrol the project site and adjacent parcels from the Broderick Boat Ramp north along the river to ensure safe public access</li> <li>• Public parking should be located off-site and outside of surrounding neighborhoods</li> </ul>
February 16, 2010 Russ Liebig	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification is needed regarding the location of the drive isle proposed near the Rivers' community entrance; its location is represented differently on various diagrams</li> <li>• Building massing diagrams do not appear to show buildings at correct elevation of 35 feet</li> <li>• Building massing diagrams only show one building even though two will be visible to the community (i.e., entry forum and tribal treasures/library)</li> </ul>