

- Commentator 1:
 - “The city took a corner of my property for access to the site. I’m afraid they are going to eminent domain more property”.
- Commentator 2:
 - “They already decided what they’ll do, our comments won’t do anything!”
 - “The homes are going to look into our yards! One story would be okay”.
- Commentator 3:
 - “I’ve been here for 63 years, worried about traffic on Woodland. Everyone is going to use our street to go up to Foothill. This is just a rendering though and not set in stone, so there should be options”.
 - “Is the extension of Woodland on the site plan wide enough for traffic?”
 - “Tell the city that we all want them to sell the city lot for an access point, to alleviate the traffic on Woodland”.
- Commentator 4
 - One woman asked for her neighbor across the Wash on Cossacks if we would develop past the wash. The city deeded that property to them. Olson responded no, we wouldn’t develop across the wash.
- Commentator 5:
 - “San Jose is too narrow, people will all go to Woodland and ruin the street”.
 - “I remember a park plan, and the city has disposed of all the documents relating to it. You run the record request and there is nothing. They have thrown everything out. There is something shady happening with that”.
 - “Somebody is being paid off to make this happen. The city manager probably. We will get to the bottom of this, and it will come to light! Why are none of them here, such cowards”.
 - Her neighbor started a website called Stopthe41.com, where people are organizing to stop the project.
 - “I have two kids, they and their friends play on Woodland all hours of the day and night. It is a very old school way of growing up. That will all be ruined with more traffic on woodland and turning it into a busy street/throughway for all the homes”.
- Commentator 6:
 - “I live on San Jose and it is tough to get out of my driveway at many times of the day because of traffic. You have to wait 5 minutes sometimes for cars to pass.” Woodland is much wider and should be less affected. You can go directly to Lorraine and Foothill from there.
 - “There are tons of gophers on the site, squirrels, as well as coyotes and red hawks. All the wildlife if the site is developed will go to into the neighborhood”.
- Commentator 7
 - “I have tons of lawyers, they will tie you up in court forever”.
- Commentator 8:
 - “Little green space on the site map will be right behind my house. It also looks like there will be an outlet street right by it too”. (Concerned about privacy and safety)
 - “Does the small road going South have enough width to fit firetrucks and other emergency vehicles? It doesn’t look like it”.

- “I had a son who passed away a year ago with special needs, emergency vehicle access is really important to families like mine”.
- “I have been after the city for years to get a stop sign on San Jose and Foothill, maybe we can finally get one”.
- Commentator 9:
 - There are only 5 homes on Woodland and all of the traffic will go there, not San Jose. I’ve lived in the area for 20 years. This is absurd!
- Commentator 10:
 - “I am actually a supporter of what you are trying to do. For one, the pests on the site are a nuisance, so anything you can do to get rid of those will help us all”.
 - “I would love to see walking access through the new neighborhood. That property is all fenced off right now, breaks up the neighborhood”.
 - “People are very upset about access points: construction and permanent access points. You need to make clear in the future, which will be used for which, and how all the cement trucks, bulldozers, etc. will be moving in and out”.
 - “Do what you can to make sure there is less traffic impact everywhere you can”.
 - “I am assuming San Jose will require a traffic light when you do a traffic study, because of Glendora High. IF THAT IS ADDED, WOULD SIDEWALKS BE ADDED ON SAN JOSE AS WELL?”.
- Commentator 11:
 - Not excited about being in the middle of the traffic coming off of Woodland and heading towards Lorraine or Foothill.
 - “A traffic light on San Jose is inevitable, a no brainer”.
- Commentator 12:
 - “All of my kids are grown and my grandkids are too old to be playing outside in the same way, but there is no place for kids to play anymore in the area”.
 - “I wanted a park or community garden to be put on the site. Kids can’t play in Williams yard, it is all fenced off now”.
 - “If your plan goes through, it seems like one I can live with...better than what was proposed by the city. They were talking about much more height and density”.
 - “People are mad about the first community meeting. I don’t trust the city anymore. They told us what was happening at that first meeting. It wasn’t to get our input like they said”.
- Commentator 13:
 - “All the critters coming down the wash onto the property. We don’t want them coming down to Ada”.
 - Wants some of the trees saved.
- Commentator 14:
 - Biggest concern is traffic, need a light on San Jose.
- Commentator 15:
 - “Lots of wildlife on the site that is a bother. We would like some of the Oaks removed, because of them providing habitat for critters and shading their fruit trees”.

- Commentator 16:
 - Mentioned building a bridge across the wash to allow for connection to other streets and alleviate traffic concerns.

Concerns	Tally
General Safety	I
Wildlife (concern for it)	II
Wildlife (want it gone)	II
Trees (want saved)	III
Trees (want cut down)	I
Traffic (on Woodland and San Jose)	IIIIIIII
Density of Product	I
Walkability	I
Open Space/Amenities or lack thereof esp. for kids to play in	III
Privacy	III
Sewer Capacity	I
Preservation of Views	I
Emergency Vehicle Access	II