Meeting Summary

On Friday, June 9th the City of Sacramento held the second set of stakeholder focus group meeting for the Sacramento Valley Station Master Plan. The meeting took place from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. at the Stanford Gallery, located at 111 I Street in Sacramento.

The following project team members attended the stakeholder meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greg Taylor</td>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McDonald</td>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geeti Silwal</td>
<td>Perkins + Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luca Giaramidaro</td>
<td>Perkins + Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ahmadzai</td>
<td>Perkins + Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Tung</td>
<td>Grimshaw Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suhee Oh</td>
<td>Grimshaw Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Bruzzone</td>
<td>ARUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meghan Weir</td>
<td>Nelson Nygaard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Zhender</td>
<td>Economic and Planning Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Cornell</td>
<td>AIM Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Porter</td>
<td>AIM Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador Ramirez</td>
<td>AIM Consulting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representatives from the following organizations attended the meeting including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alkali and Mansion Flats Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California High Speed Rail Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Railroad Museum Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority (CCJPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Advisory Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown / Riverfront Streetcar Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Railyards Ventures, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Council of the Sacramento (ECOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyhound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwind Commercial, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Sacramento Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club of Midtown Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Hispanic Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento International Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Regional Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Superior Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Transportation Management Association (Sac TMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The River District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis Facilities Development &amp; Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagabond Inn Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Investments LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County Transportation District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-eight representatives attended the third Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting for the Sacramento Valley Station Master Plan. Below is a discussion summary.

The meeting objectives included:
- Review the goals and objectives of the Sacramento Valley Station Master Plan and the City’s vision
- Present two draft preliminary concepts for the master plan
- Discuss and gather input on the four key elements of each draft concept: street network, open space opportunities, transit network, and built development.

**Project Overview**
The goal of the Sacramento Valley Station Master Plan is to develop design concepts for a new regional transportation hub as well as integrate transit-oriented development for the 17-acre planning area that will catalyze a sustainable downtown Sacramento community.

At the conclusion of this initial phase of the master planning process, the conceptual alternatives will be included in a “development plan” with implementation components and phases.

**Preliminary Concepts**
The project team developed two draft preliminary concepts for the master plan, Option 1 and Option 2.
Common Elements of Option 1 and Option 2

Both Option 1 and Option 2 share some common elements including their street network, transit network, and open space framework.

Street Network

In regards to site connectivity, the master plan will bring the existing Downtown Sacramento street grid onto the station site.

- H Street will run through the station and connect pedestrians to 3rd Street.
- Bicycle paths on F Street will connect through the station to Old Sacramento and the waterfront.
- Both options will provide pedestrian access from the drop off and pickup areas across the rail alignment to the Sacramento Railyards.
Transit Network
Both options:

- Incorporate the planned alignments for light rail and the proposed streetcar.
- Provide access for buses from 3rd Street and F Street with a bus terminal aligned to the north.
**Open Space Framework**

The project team is proposing open spaces that will be highly walkable and provide easy access for pedestrians to reach their destination or mode of transportation. A mix of diverse types of open space will be included such as:

- **A historic plaza** will present the existing historic depot and historic heritage of the site. New development will frame this plaza to provide a sense of scale and activate it for visitors to enjoy restaurants, cafes, and pop up events.

- **A transit plaza** will provide easy access to all modes of transportation and deliver a great sense of arrival. Visitors will immediately recognize this plaza as their destination. Both the transit plaza and historic plaza will be visible from one another.

- **A Neighborhood courtyard** provides a different, more intimate experience intended to serve people who live and work at the site. This open space is off the beaten path of pedestrians who need to access the station for transportation purposes.

- **A new River Park** will leverage the removal of Jiboom Street and welcome visitors to the waterfront. The park will be underneath Interstate 5, west of 3rd Street. New programming from the California State Railroad Museum will assist in activating this park.

*All images pertaining to open space framework are precedent imagery.*
Open Space Framework (continued)
Below is a map of where each proposed open space will be located.
Unique Elements

Option 1

Option 1 proposes a concourse that is in a north-south configuration. It engages the historic depot and addresses the existing barrier of the rail alignment by providing access through the concourse to the Sacramento Railyards.
Street Sections (Option 1)

H Street is an important connection for Option 1. In this option, H Street will include two lanes for private vehicles, two dedicated drop off lanes and curbs – one in each direction, and a separated bicycle lane in each direction. Streetcars and light rail will also run through H Street, and a stop sign will be in place in front of the station. Upon arrival at the station on H Street, visitors will travel upstairs to access the concourse. H Street will provide access to the office and residential spaces built around the historic station. Passengers will be dropped off and picked up on H Street and at the Railyards.
Station Concourse Alignment (Option 1)

An elevated concourse will provide access to all modes of transportation, including light rail, streetcar, the bus terminal, and the train. A passenger concourse will provide a way for pedestrians to access the Railyards and the historic station. The location of the concourse in this option connects the station to the Railyards in a more elongated configuration. The tunnel that visitors walk through today will be repurposed for baggage handling.
Built Form Program (Option 1)

Option 1 creates an urban campus west of the concourse. Residential units will be along 5th Street, and a tower adjacent to the concourse will serve as a landmark for the site. Commercial and job-oriented developments will frame the historic plaza and activate the site.
Option 2
Option 2 proposes a concourse that is in an east-west configuration. It is more compact and oriented to the north of the planning area on 5th Street. This option allows for more flexibility and greater opportunities to develop the site.
Street Sections (Option 2)
The street sections for Option 2 are similar to Option 1, except that drop off and pickup will take place on 5th Street. H Street will include two driving lanes, bike lanes, and parking lanes in each direction. Streetcars and light rail will continue to run through H Street.
Station Concourse Alignment (Option 2)

Access to the concourse will be provided through 5th Street at a higher elevation. Pick up and drop off will take place at 5th street at this higher elevation, and the station itself will be elevated to provide views of the surroundings.
Built Form (Option 2)
Option 2 places residential development more to the west of the site, in a section that is more intimate. H Street becomes the address road for the new development around the historic depot. Commercial development is provided at the intersection of H Street and 5th Street.
Group Exercise
After the presentation, stakeholder representatives separated into four table groups for a group exercise. The groups discussed the four key elements for each option for the master plan: street network, open space / public realm opportunities, transit network, and built form. Discussion topics included:

- **Street network ideas**: designs for each of the street cross sections, how the grid is being configured for the planning site, and the street character (e.g. bike lanes, wider sidewalks, drop-off areas).
- **Open space / public realm elements**: potential arrival locations at the station, connections to the riverfront, opportunities behind and in front of the existing transit depot, active use vs. passive use, and softscape vs. hardscape.
- **Transit network planning**: the configuration of the concourse (north / south vs. east / west), the designated spaces for buses, and the proposed drop-off and arrival zones.
- **Built form ideas**: placement of remaining development parcels by height.

The following is a summary of all the input gathered during the breakout table discussion.

**Street Network:**

**Option 1**

- The existing station needs a better connection to the river.
- Option 1 has good neighborhood connectivity between downtown, the Historic station, H Street, and the Railyards development as it creates a new corridor along the new station mass. The connectivity with this option works better than Option 2.
- I want separated bike access to the train. A bike parking program should be looked at and centralized in the site, but allow for some spread to be going along with the open space framework.
- Keep bikes and pedestrians on the I Street Bridge.
- Bikes on the north side of F Street along the rail right-of-way is better so cyclists can pass through uninterrupted and will be protected – but offer an entrance into the station on the east side of the concourse building.
- The bike track on F Street should be wider; 12’ is the minimum and 14’ or more is preferred.
- Include bike sharing in the plan.
- Include bike parking – for example: to the north of the site in Railyards area, where G Street hits the site.
Right now, F Street is the main bicycle track to get across the city.

Bikes will go south and east (of this site) to get to jobs.

The station should use the historic components better, and visually link the history of the site from the 1850s, 60s, 70s, and 80s all along I Street.

The way to come up with the best design is to troubleshoot the problems each option brings. One problem we can troubleshoot is that I Street is not intended to have as much traffic as it has. I am disabled and even just getting to this meeting from the Sacramento Valley Station to the Stanford Gallery was difficult with the lack of pedestrian access. There needs to be specific access points with better signal visibility to promote wayfinding and I don’t see that with Option 1.

Emphasize a wide range of options for mobility; connect to the river too. Design to promote a sense of journey and discovery.

Make it inconvenient for cars to pass through the site. If traffic is bad, people will use light rail or bikes instead.

Drop-off is hard as it is right now with cars lining up.

Demand for Uber and Lyft is growing. Consider designing an efficient drop-off for people using these ride-sharing services.

Consider a drop off along the street that comes into the Shops area of the Railyards plan. In the plan, these are private streets with public access.

People in Sacramento don’t want to give up parking.

The existing parking lot is maxed out.

Reimagining H Street is important for experiencing the station. All modes of transportation should be orchestrated so that people traveling can seamlessly connect to the station at H Street. H Street should have a strong character because it is the hard-working street.

Redesign the I-5 on-ramp at I Street to enter the freeway at a right angle.

Do not prioritize cars.

Drop-offs are hard now.

Need to recapture water and solar.

Need to design the station with thought for a good experience.

Need affordable housing.

Need bike-sharing programs.

Has the project team considered electrical bus fleets? Charging stations?

A covered bus station is a good idea; consider ventilation.

Consider consolidating the Greyhound Station.

Messaging of the incremental phasing is important and will require graphics.

Not to preclude electrification for all rails.

Need a grander staircase that is inviting with plants.

We need to find opportunities for visitors to be able to experience the river and connect to it!

Make the farmer’s market here to make this a destination.

Need to honor the spirit of mobility.
• Need ADA ramping. Option 1 is easier compared to Option 2 which is more difficult to implement.
• Need bike parking.
• Disability access is a concern.
• Need to identify opportunities for users to create this space.
• Need after-hours programming in the station.
• There is no on-site station parking. Shared parking structures are located outside the site. Is that a concern?

**Option 2**

• The station needs to look like it is connected. Currently it lacks character because it is not connected at 5th Street. My concern with Option 2 is the drop off point might separate the drop off from the direction that people going, and from Old Sacramento. Choosing an option with better connectivity along 5th Street is my recommendation.
• The traffic will be better with Option 2. My concern is how this will affect getting folks from Land Park to 5th Street.
  
  o **Response**: Converting 5th Street to a two-way corridor will provide enhanced access to the station.

• I live in Alkali-Flats and am concerned about connectivity to my neighborhood from the station. I like Option 2 better than Option 1. I like the density both will bring to the station, but am concerned about it disrupting the historic shops and their connection to the station along 5th Street.
• The 5th Street drop disconnects the new station from the historic station, especially with the tall developments between the new station and the historic station.
• It’s best to keep the mode changes/transfers in one place and Option 2 doesn’t do that, particularly on H-street.
• Emphasize a wide range of options for mobility, and connect to the river too. Design to promote a sense of journey and discovery.
• I am concerned about historic resources and not losing them. We need good adaptive reuse because this is a sustainability issue and preservation issue.
• Keep streetcar as close as possible. Likewise, bike access to rail is important. Transit operations, especially buses, need two-way access in and out of the station.
• Keep streetcar as close as possible.
• Providing shaded places for people to wait and keeping the bus separate from the main drop-off is important. Option 2 is better for these two things.

• The options need to address autonomous vehicles, increased drop-off capacity, and staging for ride share. Parking also needs to be addressed and the parking facilities need to be used effectively.

• For buses and the security concerns with open space, there should be enhanced safety like an airport security type of protection. Development here would bring the density and residential to the area and hopefully also the amenities they need.

• In Option 2, the big tower blocks views.

• We really need more bike facilities and storage for the bikes too.

• Need Wi-Fi throughout the station.

• Option 1 makes better use of the existing station.

• No benefits of moving street car loop into the site - no justification to counteract the higher cost and longer travel time.

• Option 1 frames the station well.

• What types of eco-friendly features could be used throughout the station?
  o Response: Some cities use a trolley station that operates using solar panels to power them and this might be a flexible solution for Sacramento using adaptive urbanism.

Open Space Framework:
Comments pertaining to Option 1 and Option 2 have been grouped for this section because the open space framework is the same for both.

• There should be programming that provides amenities and brings the characteristics of Sacramento as well as some of the local goods into the station.

• Allow visitors to experience and connect to the river.

• Move farmer’s market to the historic plaza.

• Need to integrate tactical urbanism.

• Disability access is a concern; this station needs to be made accessible to disabled people. We have these boats and waterways so how can we make an open space that makes us feel safe when accessing these things?

• Need moveable furniture for flexible open space.

• Station must connect to Old Sacramento.

• A station to Old Sacramento connection is a primary concern.

• Need more bicycle parking.

• Need bike facilities integrated into the station or on-site development.
- Response: Should encourage bike use by providing good bike facilities: secure bike storage, repair, rentals, lockers, and even showers for Station Staff.

- Need more public art.
- If a train is delayed, there should be spaces where users will spend money, but also have safe and pleasant environments for waiting.
- Include water features in the open spaces like splash parks and fountains.
- Need more public art in the open spaces.
- For Option 2, bringing the open spaces up onto the podium is a very different urban experience, but it can work if designed well. Consider grand civic staircases to invite people in.
- Need food trucks in the river side open space.
- Consider incorporating ADA regulations.
- The pedestrian/bike tunnel that has already been built under the freeway is nice.
- Under the freeway is an uncomfortable area with circulation issues.
- Consider basketball courts, climbing walls, and skating rinks under the freeway.
- Design kid-friendly open spaces.
- Don’t build Capitol Mall!
- The triangle zone on the west side (bounded by H Street to the south, the new station location to the east, and the tracks and platform to the north) needs to accommodate easy pedestrian access from all sides. Open space program needs to be further studied.
- Incorporate Ferry building/Eataly concept for historic station with more retail.
- Livability is very low right now. Midtown is a good example of livability.
- Incorporate history onto the site.
- Lots of interest in referring to the local history, but not in a hokey way.
- Use design to reinforce connection to historic shops (north of station).
- Need more public restrooms.
- The station needs to be a potential catalyst for better/more neighborhood amenities in Old Sacramento and other surrounding areas.
- Need dog parks or areas specified for pets to relieve themselves.
- Option 1 has desirable aspects to creating a welcoming connection between the tracks and the existing station. The streetcar connection will ensure there is a 360-degree connection. There is no reason to have height restriction, then the room for residential would be a key aspect to optimize the space. The idea of a station that is human scale in design is good, but the design needs to welcome people. The plaza is one way to welcome people.
- These amenities should also complement the growing number of commuters who will use the station. Add efficiency and improve lifestyles.
- Integrate parking with vehicle layover and waiting areas for bus and taxi, ride share, and private vehicles.
- Need gateway access into Old Sacramento and to the riverfront.
• Using moveable furniture would be better than having bolted down furniture and could make people feel more comfortable moving around and interacting with the space. For example, the plazas in New York City that have bolted furniture in a planned space make it difficult for people to get comfortable in their environment.

• Steer clear from making the station look too like the Ferry Building in San Francisco and add kiosks throughout the space to provide wayfinding opportunities for travelers and people using the station. More public art is also needed at the station, potentially put lights under the freeway to make it safer to walk but also beautify the area surrounding the station.

• Need free programming for the public in this space.

• Outdoor heating during the colder months would make these free events more enjoyable as well. Along with this, there would need to be adequate lighting (not bright lighting but friendly lighting).

• Potentially rent out the plaza space for events like if Kaiser needed to use it for a fundraiser.

• Need clean public restrooms because this can provide a resource to allow visitors to the station to stay longer than they might otherwise without a restroom. The nicer it looks, the more people will respect it and go back to use it.

• Having lived in Old Sacramento for a year, livability is low. Old Sacramento residents need bodegas for food and nearby tourists will too. There also needs to be flower shops along with groceries, as well as a different scale of food options (something in between Firehouse and Subway—maybe rooftop restaurants).

• Could use more retail, specifically higher end. Create sight lines to riverfront including a café with rooftops and views.

• Need to recapture water.

• Need to incorporate water-wise landscaping.

• Consider the variety of scales of open space provided and ensure there are areas of respite for travelers.

• How do you secure the station and open spaces, prevent loitering, pan-handling and homeless camps? Sheriffs on site?

• Given the residential proposed in both options, amenities for residents such as groceries, dry cleaning, and parking should be on site.

• In Option 2, the tower behind the historic station blocks views to the historic station from the north and interrupts the historic station elevation from the south.

• Would be great if that tower could be placed in the open space around the Option 2 drop off along 5th Street. Depending on the program of that tower it could have a small footprint.

• Lots of interest in view sheds to facilitate intuitive site navigation.

• I Street has good access to Old Sacramento which helps tie in Old Sacramento with the train station.
Transit Network:

**Option 1**
- There is a sense of arrival, but because the heavy rail tracks were realigned it makes it too far to walk; the more compact all modes/transit access is, the better.
- Need more station parking.
- Need more parking for station retail.
- If the station does not accommodate adequate parking, it loses ridership.
- Development parking needs to be addressed to function as “destinations.”
- Streetcar should loop through Railyards to shuttle train passengers from parking there to the station.
- This station needs to be more efficient to get more people using transit with fast transfers between modes.
- 4th Street Connection: The Chinatown courtyard is not ADA accessible. If the master plan imagines a main connection through 4th Street, then it must be made ADA accessible.
- The sunken courtyard offers an area for refuge and respite, and there are cultural activities held in the plaza which should not be disrupted.
- Getting an elevated pathway (pedestrians/bikes) or flyover will be challenging given the existing buildings.
- The restaurants in this area must not be cut off by the flyover or any other paths made through this area.
- Drop off is shared with the bus routes on 3rd Street, which is not ideal. Bus routes whenever possible should be kept separate from other modes.
- Is it possible to do an island drop off at H Street, so some vehicles can go back out on H Street? Or a North/South drop off on the west side of the station?
- The geometry of Option 1 with drop off may mean users will have to walk very far from the west or east to get to the station entrance.
- F Street can be shared with light rail and buses on the same lane/track.
  - Response: Need bus access from both 7th Street and 3rd Street.

**Option 2**
- Users of streetcars may be going to the airport (so with luggage) especially if they are coming from West Sacramento, so there may be a reason to integrate streetcar closer to the other transit modes.
- Drop off does not seem to be ADA compliant with the slope needed.
- Roseville Transit runs commuter buses that drop people from Roseville off at the station. The time for having a more regular route is one thing to keep in mind. Access just off 3rd Street would be better if it is more accessible for our drops offs. It would be limiting to just use 3rd Street. Right now, we only get in during Kings games, so servicing these commuter buses more regularly is better for Roseville commuters.
• Light rail Green Line connection to the Airport will be far beyond the 20-year timeline. To accommodate the interim connection between the airport and the SVS, shuttle service may be needed. Shuttle buses would need space in the bus terminal or elsewhere on site.
• Streetcar operation needs to start by 2021, requiring the light rail platform plan to be finalized before then at the site.
• Potential phasing for light rail: The relocation of the current light rail platform to where it is planned (west of Lot 40) would come first because of the planned streetcar operation in 2021. The track work north of the planned platform extending to F Street will likely come later.
• No preference on the light rail side platform versus center platform.
• Is Front Street an active roadway? What about the park between I Street and J Street?
• In terms of the framing of the station, cut back freeway on-ramps so that you can walk around. You can break up the station with kiosks and allow for flow around the building.
• Moving the Greyhound station here is a good idea to consolidate services.
• Bus fleets are electrifying and need charging stations.
• Design rail platforms to not preclude electrification.
• Consider how this station plugs into the rest of the system including light rail and streetcar.
• Do we need a storage track beyond the site for rail cars to stop?
• Right now, the distance is too huge from the historic station to the tracks.
• Development and station building design need to be human scale.
• The large bus plaza should have sufficient amenities, shade, and landscape elements. The security of this plaza needs to be considered. How to you prevent people from crossing the bus lanes from the south?
• Are fire lanes and mechanical ventilation of busways covered by development?
• Potentially the street front next to the court house could be inactive, so development on the west of 5th Street and north of G Street are important components to activating 5th Street. Commercial development, instead of residential, on Lot 40 would be preferred. If residential uses come into Lot 40 due to the narrow width available on Lot 40, the ground level needs to be retail shops. People from the court house would visit the retail shops on site daily.
• Closing I Street northbound on-ramp could increase congestion.
• Need to do more studies.
- The parking lot under I-5 currently has only one in and out, causing congestion. Access to Old Sacramento needs more studies to work with the parking lot access not to exacerbate congestion.
- For the street network, the concepts discussed create adequate solutions for traffic.
- Could you get from Broadway to Downtown via water taxi?
- Please bring history to the site.
- The station can become a homeless camp.
- Keep the station clean and safe.
- Need to connect visually to the Railyards.
- Need more public restrooms!
- The rail alignment feels too far!
- More density at the station is great!
- Make sure no kiosks are hidden.
- Public art is needed, for example big lamps.
- Need to be able to bike to the train.
- The station and Old Sacramento is a food desert now.
- Need services for residents; livability is very low right now.
- Midtown Sacramento is a good example for livability.
- Who are we serving?
- Sacramento is too hot, windy, and cold.
- Need fast transfers at the station.
- Need to consider the rest of the system (light rail and street car).
- Need food trucks along the river; they should be open and safe.
- Make it inconvenient for cars.
- F Street should be where the main bicycle track is located.
- Traffic is bad, use light rail or bus instead.
- Sacramento: Parking is hard to give up.
- Keep bikes protected on north.
- Lead the Railyards development.
- Need bike parking on north side of station.
- Bikes go south/east to jobs.
- There are circulation issues.
- Need basketball courts, climbing halls, skating rinks, etc.
- Existing parking lot is maxed out.
- Demand is growing for Uber/Lyft.
- Need kid friendly amenities in the Historic district like splash parks.
- Develop the area closest to the concourse first.
- With the rail alignment, the distance is huge from the station to the tracks.
Built Form:

*Comments pertaining to Option 1 and Option 2 have been grouped for this section.*

- Modeling our station after the Ferry Building would make this station a destination. We could model the station after the Ferry Building by including all the retail you see near it, like the higher end shops. We should maintain the old history of the building in addition to connecting the riverfront to the station. We have these rivers but we can’t see them.
- If we don’t want to prioritize the riverfront, then more rooftop restaurants could be used to make this station more iconic. The density should be in the Railyards. You need to be able to see that there are shops no matter where in the station you might find yourself.
- Bring elevated, civic staircases. This can look at the Railyards with Spanish steps, and be used more for sitting than waking. This could be a nice place to rest whether or not you have a train to catch. This would address the built form and be a good use of the space.
- If we are going to go elevate over the tracks, the first thing we want to do is make sure it can be imagined as a high-speed concourse.
- Blend in the old and new architecture.
- The court building is iconic for the Sacramento skyline.
- The 40-foot height limit at corner of 5th Street/H Street is too restrictive – it would be better at 60 feet or more.
- Consider using the full building code/wood frame height of 70 feet.
- The development heights of the Option 1 work great in that they create terrace/step-up toward north.
- Visually connect north/south from historic station, through the station to historic shops. The old station is no longer used for transit, so it is okay to change this to draw people north/south.
- This project needs to lead the direction of the Railyards development.
- Consider mixed-use buildings.
- Shield freeway noise with height.
- Add height on 5th Street or against tracks.
- More development = more successful.
- Be mindful of wind draft.
- If there is a new hotel built it should have freeway visibility.
- The proposed program is good at full buildout.
- Messaging of incremental phasing is imperative.
- Start with the concourse and phase out from there.
- Concern about the design and the link between the old buildings and the new buildings. Don’t want the new design to be too stark.
- Include affordable housing, especially for students.
- Covering the bus station with development is a good idea. Shading the area will be nice. Consider ventilation. Design with thought for a good experience.
Sacramento can be too hot, too windy, and too cold. Design buildings to protect from this weather.

- Be mindful of the wind draft with towers.
- Design for security – planters, bollards, etc.
- It’s okay for the buildings west of the historic station to be taller so that they can shield the site from the freeway.
- Residential condos would be preferred further from the freeway.
- Residential next to the tracks will be difficult because of the noise.
- The hotel on 5th Street is a good idea.
- Put height on 5th Street or against tracks.
- The node of high intensity with towers near 5th is nice.
- Consider putting the hotel next to the freeway for visibility.
- The tracks and the Historic Shops District in the Railyards site will be a dip in massing across the skyline.
- If the pedestrian flow will be coming from 5th Street, consider breaking down the building at the corner of 5th and I Street into two smaller buildings or kiosks to invite people into the site.
- Ramps vs. elevators – how do these options compare? Option 1 is gentler, Option 2 is more compact and relies more on elevators, escalators, and stairs.

Feedback Forms
The following is a summary of all the input gathered through feedback forms.

1. Please provide any thoughts, observations, or remaining questions regarding any topics discussed today.
   - I’m excited about having a station that is more inviting.
   - Need to build community trust. Be clear that Option 2 is denser (this was too subtle).
   - Concerned about connectivity between the station and Alkali Flats (neighborhood to the east of the station).
   - Option 1: Potential for pedestrian/bike/rail conflict on H Street like covers bus station but need high 2nd story cover/building. Target end users? Bikers/commuters are ideal.
   - Keep open spaces open. No buildings. Make it inviting, community friendly, and park like.
   - Do not see transit users being the ones to stay in hotels. Need more parking and easy car accessibility if want to attract people traveling longer distances.
   - Include affordable housing/student housing.
   - Ideal for Option 1 to not be condensed; this keeps an inviting atmosphere if the station is meant for commuters. If this station is meant more as a community center, then the existing layout and more open space layouts would be ideal.
   - Option 1 layout is great for local.
   - Option 2 is more compact and seems more ideal for travelers with traditional car entrances.
• Streetcar appears to run through the station area down H Street. Describe this "car" and its proposed routes through the City as well as its timing.
• Streetcar runs down 3rd Street and terminates at the station. This doesn't appear to be city friendly, but more rail rider friendly only.
• As a person in hotel and hospitality I did not have many questions or proposed ideas but I did enjoy being a part of this discussion in terms of new development for my guests. Having guests be dropped off from the train and immediately feel as if they have reached their destination by de-boarding and seeing this beautiful plan for shops, courtyards, restaurants, and the park/river will be a wonderful way to greet newcomers from around the world, rather than walking through what is the current path which makes it feel as if they still have on are travelling (though the tunnels and station) to get to their destination.
• More access to the river would be wonderful.
• Being able to have grocery shops within walking distance and having options of dining rather than the limited resources of now and the broken-up feel of old town or downtown.
• I like the "drop-off" area of off 5th Street in Option 2. I think there is a better connection from the new passenger concourse to the Historic Sacramento Valley Station (and its new active use).
• In Option 1, the building that sits between the two in Option 2 would block awareness and ready access to the historic Sacramento Valley Station and may prevent it from reaching its potential.
• As one of the major components in the transit plan, the project team should meet individually with Greyhound to make sure their needs are met (and they have a lot of experience)!
• Open Space: Small playgrounds in multiple locations and open spaces near residential for pets (don't make them walk two blocks).
• Maybe use one of the proposed parking lots as a regional bus transfer site. Yolo, Roseville, Elk Grove, El Dorado, Placer Transit all bring their passengers there to transfer to the streetcar. Benefit would be to remove large volume of buses from city streets and allow more space for bike lanes/pedestrians.
• Moving the streetcar to rear of station (closer to Light Rail and heavy rail) is a good idea. It makes for an easier switch and is cleaner along H Street.
• How do pedestrians get quickly from the bus bays to the tracks? It looks like they must back track via the concourse.
• Is public art a planned part of the station amenities?
• Option 2 seems overly crowded. It blocks downtown from the tracks and isolates the drop off point from downtown.
• Thanks for having public commentary about housing, but we need MORE.
• Allow potential for mixed-use housing in planned employee center buildings.
• Option 1 is better. Option 2 streetcar alignment is overly complex and problematic.
• Assumption on bike circulation does not address actual bike use. Most bikes move on street grid to south and east where jobs are. How does this impact concourse? A lot of bikes dragged down concourse? At minimum, include actual bike pattern in diagram.
• Option 2: The second level podium offers an opportunity to separate drop off areas and improve circulation. The plan should sustainably integrate infrastructure such as the Streetcar.
• 2040 Horizon “Planning:” Streetcar proximity. I Street northbound I-5 on-ramp removal.
• Curb space is needed for Uber/Lyft/taxis.
• Programming spaces for bikes/pedestrians should not be just the minimum amount
• Allow taller buildings (don’t preclude the market) and no 30 foot height restrictions.
• Option 2: The bus platform will have adequate shade provided for those waiting on transit platform. Keep regular drop-off traffic away from bus entryway and exits.
• The age group of 65-85 is the fastest growing segment of the population. Therefore, expect more walkers, wheelchairs including motorized. With all the above-grade structures, people will flock there during a flood event. Don’t forget the large population center being built in West Sacramento. They will use the streetcar to get to Light Rail to Airport.

Appendix
• Meeting Invite
• Presentation
• Feedback Form
You’re invited!

The next Sacramento Valley Station Master Plan Stakeholder focus group meeting will take place on Friday, June 9 from 10:00 – noon at the Stanford Gallery, located at 111 I Street in Sacramento.

At this meeting the City, in collaboration with the Perkins + Will team, will preview preliminary concepts for a new Sacramento Valley Station transit hub that will not only meet current and projected future transit services but will also become a central destination as downtown Sacramento becomes more densely populated and the Railyards district begins to develop.

Please RSVP by Monday, June 5th by emailing Nicole Porter at nporter@aimconsultingco.com or calling (916) 442-1168.

Additional information will be sent to you by next week.
AGENDA

10:00 - 10:10 AM  Introductions
10:10 – 10:30 AM  Preliminary Master Plan Concept Presentation
10:30 – 11:30AM  Breakout Group Discussions
   • Street Network
   • Open Space Framework
   • Transit Network
   • Built Form
11:30 – 12 NOON  Report Back + Wrap-up
PLACEMAKING

Respond to the existing context

• Create an civic landmark and a welcoming gateway to the City
• Create a vibrant destination
• Catalyze new development
MOBILITY
Station building as a Connector

• Create an efficient multimodal hub
• Provide ease of connectivity to, from and through the station
• Ensure parking need is minimized
SAINT PANCras, LONDON

USER EXPERIENCE
Programming and Wayfinding

- Showcase the culture and identity of Sacramento
- Enable a diverse mix of uses and activities
- Ensure a clear and legible urban environment
SUSTAINABILITY
Whole-systems thinking

• Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
• Leverage and enhance the natural systems
• Prioritize health and well-being of the people
SERVICE PLANNING

BAGGAGE HANDLING
FOR RAIL

TO PLATFORM

BAGGAGE HANDLING
FOR BUS

TO PLATFORM

RETAIL LOADING

RETAIL LOADING
STATION VIEW FROM H STREET
OPEN SPACE HIERARCHY

RIVER PARK

UNDERPASS ACTIVATION

NEIGHBORHOOD COURT YARD

HISTORIC PLAZA

TRANSIT PLAZA

SITE BOUNDARY

OPEN SPACE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILT FORM PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GFA (sf)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,260,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>460,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hotel = 140,000 sf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MASTER PLAN CONCEPT

OPTION 2
STATION PROGRAMMING
STATION PROGRAMMING
**GFA (sf)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMMERCIAL</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>460,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Units**

|            | RESIDENTIAL | 460 |

**Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Built Form Program**

- Residential
- Commercial
- Active Uses
- Plaza
- Soft Scape
THANK YOU
Feedback Form

Please provide any thoughts, observations, or remaining questions regarding any topics discussed today:

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

Name ________________________________________ Organization ______________________________
Email _________________________________________ Phone ___________________________________

Please submit your feedback to the project team today or send via email to nporter@aimconsultingco.com, fax at 916-442-1186, or mail to 2523 J Street, Suite 202 Sacramento, CA 95816.
We strive to make each meeting valuable and results driven. We look forward to any comments and/or ideas to improve the meeting experience for you. Please feel free to provide us with your thoughts.

1. Information shared at the meeting was useful?   o YES   o NO

_________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________

2. Discussions were appropriately facilitated to engage all participants?   o YES   o NO

_________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________

3. The participants involved in the process are appropriate?   o YES   o NO

_________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________

4. Any other recommendations to improve the meetings?

_________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________