

Folsom 2040 General Plan Update - Public Comments
 Wednesday, May 10, 2017

Commenter	Comment	Action
Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) Figure LU-1 Folsom 2035 Land Use Diagram 1. The Land Use Diagram depicts a future planning area south of the recently annexed S50 project (south of White Rock Road). Although it is common for General Plan's to consider surrounding areas as part of the General Plan process; I believe this is the first step of a longer term plan to eventually further expand the City southward. This is a step in the wrong direction and a step the community does not want to see. This future planning area should be eliminated from the General Plan, demonstrating the Council's commitment to the existing community over development pressures. If a developer is interested in this area in the future, they can always amend the General Plan on their own.	Description added to Land Use Element for the "Future Study Area" to clarify intent
Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) Figure LU-1 Folsom 2035 Land Use Diagram 1. If the City is to consider annexation south of Whiterock Road, the only consideration should be designated a greenbelt separating Folsom from the inevitable expansion of Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove, El Dorado Hills and development within the unincorporated county of Sacramento.	No change was implemented because idea was captured in other policies or was contrary to City Council policy.
Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) Figure LU-1 Folsom 2035 Land Use Diagram 2. The Transit-Oriented Development Overlay is a great idea; however, it should be expanded to include the entire Folsom Boulevard corridor. Future land use changes along this corridor may warrant another station or two along this corridor. The City should proactively plan for this and encourage redevelopment along this corridor. For example, the Toyota Dealership at Blue Ravine and Folsom Boulevard has redevelopment potential and would be a great location for another transit station.	Extended TOD overlay from 1/4 mile radius to 1/2 mile radius
Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) LU 1.1.3 Annexation and Services This policy needs to be expanded. Any annexations should be fiscally beneficial to the City AND should offer other benefits. There should be standards established for what would be considered beneficial, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • percentage of open space • availability of water • jobs/housing balance projected • VMT • Impact to existing City economics (i.e. are businesses leaving older areas to newer areas resulting in lower property values, blight, and disinvestment), etc. Also, the analysis should demonstrate that the annexation will be financially beneficial for the lifetime of the development, not just the immediate future. Quite possibly new development that is likely (also known as sprawl) will cost the City more than we get in benefit over the lifespan of the development. Furthermore, in the spirit of Measure W, any future annexations should require voter approval. (March 29, 2017) I feel like it would be helpful to build in standards the City would like to see in any new annexation - (minimum open	No change was implemented because idea was captured in other policies or was contrary to City Council policy.
Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) LU 3.1.5 East Bidwell Street, LU 3.1.6 Central Commercial District While these policies are well intended, they lack the teeth and tool set necessary to revitalize the Central Business District along this corridor. This district (Between Riley and Blue Ravine) is the most important and most in need of redevelopment anywhere in the City. If the City would truly like to see this district improved, the City should make it easier to redevelop the corridor than it is to develop land on the periphery of the City. The policy should include language similar to: "Develop a suite of tools to facilitate the redevelopment of this district. The toolbox should include reduced regulatory hurdles, reduced permit fees, financial incentives, technical assistance, outreach, etc. to make the	Added Implementation Program LU-4. Property Owner Outreach on Overlay Designations
Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) LU 4.1.2 Mix of Uses Near Station This policy seems to focus on Folsom as the origin of trips generated on light rail. The policy should-be revised to make Folsom the destination. Rather than send people to jobs in Sacramento, how about bring jobs to Folsom, in particular jobs located AT light rail stations. Offices and Employment Centers along the Folsom light rail (actually all light rail stations) are well overdue. The policy should be revised to insinuate that employment centers located along light rail are equally if not more important than housing. This will result in our Folsom stations being both origins and destinations for trips rather than just origins.	Modified Policy LU 4.1.2

Commenter	Comment	Action
Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) LU 4.1.3 Zoning This Policy states "Encourage mixed use development around transit centers by allowing property owners within a Transit Oriented Development Overlay to change their property's zoning to mixed use following a review of the proposed development by planning staff."</p> <p>If the City is serious about making TOD a reality, then the City should take on the burden of the rezoning to mixed use. A rezoning requires additional scrutiny, cost, and time, which will not encourage the redevelopment of these areas.</p> <p>The City should rezone this area and establish criteria to enable redevelopment in this corridor approval at a staff level or Planning Commission level rather than burden TOD development with the additional step of a rezone.</p>	No change required. Overlay allows for mixed use zoning
Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) LU 5.1.8 Enhanced Walking and Biking This policy should include a bullet point directing the reevaluation of the City's standard specifications for road widths. The existing road widths throughout the City encourage speeding creating an unsafe environment for anyone not in a car. ROW widths should be narrowed for vehicular lanes but should be should be adjusted for wider sidewalks at 6' minimum or 8' in higher traffic areas. The existing 44' ROW standard found throughout local streets in the City facilitates speeding and is wider than most other agencies in the region, including Sacramento County.</p>	No change was implemented because idea was captured in other policies or was contrary to City Council policy.
Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) M 2. 1.3 Sidewalk Network This policy (or perhaps an additional policy) should include a statement about the intent for adding sidewalks in Old Folsom. Old Folsom is the biggest destination in the City, however, the sidewalks are usually missing (other than within 1 block of Sutter Street). This is a major policy decision that should be considered as part of this General Plan instead of the ambiguity that has been around for the last decade or so. Those of us who walk to Old Folsom deserve a safe route to do so.</p>	No change. Policy already encourages filling sidewalk gaps. There is no neighborhood consensus on sidewalks in the Historic District.
Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) M 4.1.3 Level of Service I applaud the City at making this change. For the most part, road widening for through traffic should be extremely limited in the City. I believe the City should be clearer in the exception language contained in this policy. For example, how much ROW acquisition is considered unacceptable? Is it \$50 worth or \$5-Million? There should be clear guiding standards to eliminate ambiguity.</p> <p>Also, if something is determined to be "unacceptable" does the proposed development get a free pass? Or are there other mitigations that may be appropriate such as improvements to biking or walking either at the specific intersection or nearby or signal timing modification? The policy should dictate what the developer and City's responsibilities will be if an "unacceptable" situation is to</p>	No change
Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) M 4.1.4 Capital Southeast Connector This policy should include a statement that taxpayer dollars should not fund this project. This project clearly only benefits the developers of S50/South of Whiterock and should not be funded by taxpayers north of 50. Measure B performed poorly in Folsom and I believe it is attributed to the inclusion of the Capital Southeast Connector and the numerous overpasses over Highway 50 included in the Measure. If the City wants this expressway, development should fund it 100%.</p>	No change
Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) NCR 1.1. 7 Fugitive Light This measure should be Require in lieu of encourage (in other words, all new lighting is REQUIRED to eliminate fugitive light). New development (both private and public) should comply with dark sky requirements. The Policy should also include the retrofit of existing street lighting such as Lake Natoma Crossing -Imagine if you could see the stars walking across this bridge -Right now the lights on this bridge have no shielding and you can't see the stars. This should be resolved ASAP</p>	No change
Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) NCR 3.1.3 Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled This policy sounds good but lacks teeth or incentive to actually see it through. There should be some criteria linked to proposed GHG reductions to ensure this actually happens. New development south of 50 and/or south of Whiterock Road will only increase VMT. How the City can address this is unclear without unprecedented investment in transit and active transportation uses (which is not included in this General Plan). This policy should be expanded to have realistic milestones and programs to reduce VMT. Without these measures it will be hard to rely on a GHG reduction associated with VMT, which is likely necessary for the General Plan EIR. If the General Plan EIR is relying on VMT reductions from this measure or others to comply with GHG reduction mandates, this would be a risk</p>	No change

Commenter	Comment	Action
Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) Economic Prosperity This section includes two pages dedicated to Retail Development. While some of the policies are good, there appears to be an underlying assumption that Retail Development is here to stay and will support the City indefinitely. This section says nothing about the impact of e-commerce or the dramatic changes currently facing brick and mortar retail. The City should have a game plan to address this reliance on retail both locally and in the region. This game plan should address the fiscal ramifications as well as the land use ramifications (which are only partially addressed through the mixed use overlay). The impacts associated with the City being overretailed are likely to see additional struggle along the Central Business Corridor and the City should have a policy that develops a comprehensive approach towards managing this change over the life of the General Plan.	No change
Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) Greenbelt Buffer Either in the Land Use Chapter or Natural Resources Chapter, the City should consider the development of a greenbelt surrounding the City. The development pressures on Folsom, El Dorado Hills, Rancho Cordova, and unincorporated Sacramento County are likely to continue well past the life of this General Plan. The conglomeration of these entities is highly likely until you no longer know whether you are in Folsom or Elk Grove. The City should plan for, fund, and lobby for a greenbelt buffer surrounding Folsom (south of Folsom) ensuring we maintain our identity and preserve the view sheds and open space we have	No change
Casey Kempenaar	including an environmental justice component to the General Plan to comply with SB 1000, which was signed by the Governor in September. Although not required until after 2018, it would probably save the City time and money to incorporate into this current effort.	No change. There are no disadvantaged communities in Folsom, as defined by SB 1000.
David Storer, FedCorp	(March 27, 2017) NEW GOAL: NCR 1.1.4 Enhancement of Folsom's Riverfront areas Support the enhancement of Folsom's riverfront areas for current and future residents in order to increase public access, recreational opportunities and economic development by engaging in dialogue with stakeholders. <i>See attached proposed new Implementation Measure NCR-5: Create, review and update a plan to identify Folsom's riverfront resources with easy access to the public. Annual program; Implements Policy(ies): PR 1.1.2, PR 1.1.7, PR 4.1.3, and PR 4.1.5; Responsible</i>	Added new goal section LU-5 to Land Use Element and implementation Program LU-5.
David Storer, FedCorp	Parks & Recreation Commission to the City Council to create a designation for riverfront areas that will enhance Folsom's frontage along Lake Natoma (and related areas) that increases public access for active and passive recreation. I have attached a map/diagram depicting a riverfront project area that overlays on the land use map provided in the Preliminary Public Review Draft, January, 2017. The riverfront project area designation preserves option for achieving the goals stated in Goal PR 4.1.5. (New Policy, page PR-8)	Added River District Overlay to Land Use Diagram.
David Storer, FedCorp	(March 27, 2017) NEW GOAL: PR 3.1.4 Riverfront project area master planning. Encourage widespread community engagement in the planning of Folsom's riverfront area similar to those efforts conducted by similar waterfront communities.	Added new goal section LU-5 to Land Use Element and implementation Program LU-5.
David Storer, FedCorp	(March 27, 2017) New Proposed Implementation Measure: PR-3 Public engagement in community planning for Folsom's riverfront project area . Create, develop and maintain a community participation involvement plan for the purpose of enhancing Folsom's riverfront area. Implements Policy(ies): PR 4.1.1, PR 4.1.3, PR 4.15; Responsible Department(s): Community Development; Supporting Department(s): Parks and Recreation and City Manager.	Added new goal section LU-5 to Land Use Element and implementation Program LU-5.
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) 1. Introduction Trend #2: Driving Less, Sidebar The caption to the second sidebar photo states that "In some US cities, over 4% of all commute trips are made by bike." This is quite low. In fact, in CA, OR and WA alone, there are 14 cities with bike mode shares over 4%, and nine over 6% (LAB 2014 American Community Survey Report). It would be worth noting in this section that Folsom's bike commute mode share in 2014 was 0.7%, lower than 76 other US cities with populations between 65,000 and 100,000, and well below the CA state average of 1.2%.	No change. We were referencing the same report (http://bikeleague.org/sites/default/files/Where_We_Ride_2014_data_web.pdf). There are 18 cities with bike commute rates over 4%. This is a very small

Commenter	Comment	Action
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) Guiding Principles (GPs) GP #2: Focus on Historic Folsom as a center of shopping, dining, entertainment, and cultural attractions. Glaringly missing from the title of this GP is any mention of the residential portion of Historic Folsom, and the importance of maintaining quality of life for those who live in the district and support its businesses on a daily basis while focusing on the attractions. The first sentence of this GP should include "walkable neighborhoods". There should also be a statement here about mitigating the impacts of traffic generated by the focus on shopping, dining, entertainment and cultural attractions on the residential neighborhoods of the district. Without, safe, pleasant, thriving neighborhoods in the HD, the commercial district would not be the true heart of the city that it still is.	Clarified that Guiding Principle #2 is focused on Historic Folsom's Commercial District, and added policy LU 6.1.2
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) GP #8: Brand Folsom as the "gateway to the Foothill Wine Region" I believe this would be a mistake because it highlights what is not in Folsom, rather than the many attractions we have in the city.	No change
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) GP# 10: Provide for a range of attractive and viable transportation options, such as bicycle, pedestrian, rail and transit. "Bicycle" and "pedestrian" are not transportation options; "bicycling" and "walking" are. Better yet, simply refer to "active transportation". Similarly, "rail" and "transit" are redundant unless you are proposing reinstating freight rail in the city. Consider re-writing the first sentence of this GP to read: "Support higher-density, mixed use, transit-oriented development near light rail stations and in core areas conducive to or planned for active transportation and	Modified Guiding Principle #10
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) Add new GP #18: Promote the development of rooftop solar and other distributed, clean, renewable power generation.	No change
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) 2. Land Use Figure LU-1 Folsom 2025 Land Use Diagram The inclusion of a future planning area south of White Rock Road and west of Prairie City Road seems entirely unnecessary given the nearly 4000 acres of land in the recently annexed area south of 50 which will certainly not be built out prior to the horizon for this General Plan and clearly inconsistent with the will of the current residents. The General Plan should include language requiring that any future expansion of the city be put to a vote of the	No change
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) 2. Land Use Growth and Change Notably missing from this section is any reference to conforming to the principles of the SACOG Blueprint. This should be added.	Added Policy LU 1.1.15 and included Blueprint Growth Principles in Appendix B
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) LU 1.1.11 Infill Development This section should include language specifically stating how infill development will be encouraged over greenfield development, recognizing that the infrastructure construction and maintenance costs to the city are far less for the former than for the latter.	No change
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) Table LU-6: Overlay Designations The TOD overlay should clarify that the intent is to allow conversion of commercial land to mixed-use, not conversion of the historic residential housing to mixed use.	No change
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) Urban Centers/Historic Folsom. Throughout the plan, Historic Folsom is referred to as a commercial center, but rarely mentioned is the large residential part. In this section, there is no mention whatsoever of preserving the character and developing the potential of the residential part of the district. In fact, the list of improvement projects emphasizes the neglect the residential portions of the HD have received, and apparently will continue to receive from the city per this plan. To wit, in the Residential Neighborhoods section of Land Use, there should be a separate section for the residential portions of the HD, recognizing their unique character, qualities and challenges.	Added policy LU 6.1.2
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) Mixed Use Districts I'm glad to see mixed use designations along E Bidwell and TOD at stations (although half of designated land is in state park, making these hard to make dense enough to work).	No change
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) LU 5.1.8 Enhance Walking and Biking This should be two separate goals: one for walking and one for bicycling. When they are lumped together, the unique needs, issues and challenges of each get conflated and diluted. Bicyclists have as much in common with motorists as they do with pedestrians.	No change

Commenter	Comment	Action
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) LU 5.1.8 Enhance Walking and Biking Suggest deleting the introductory clause in the first sentence. This is an invitation to do nothing. Volume and capacity ratios have nothing to do with the need to provide safe pedestrian facilities or safe bicycling facilities. Rather, this statement perpetuates the status quo, which provides for pedestrian and bicyclist safety only to the extent that it does not impede the efficiency of motor vehicle traffic. Or, more simply, it entrenches the status of cyclists and pedestrians as second class citizens. ROW is rarely the issue; the inequitable apportionment of the ROW to all users is where the problems arise.	No change
Anthony Powers	LU 5.1.8 Enhance Walking and Biking The bullets should include one that plainly states that sidewalks will be built on all arterial, collector and residential streets where traffic volume and/or speed is such that walking in the road is not safe (and the speed and volume thresholds should be stated).	Added new Policy M 2.1.2
Anthony Powers	LU 5.1.8 Enhance Walking and Biking I'm glad to see traffic calming at least mentioned. But there should be a goal for provision for neighborhood traffic calming. Perhaps it would be worthwhile to define "appropriate" here given that the city's policy to date has been that no traffic calming beyond painting lines is appropriate. Without a major change in the city's policy on traffic calming, speeding on residential streets will continue to be a major problem in all areas of the city. Folsom is the only city in Sacramento County (not to mention the County) that does not have an active traffic	Added new Policy M 4.1.10
Anthony Powers	LU 8.1.3 Eliminate Large Blocks These are perhaps the three most important words in the entire document. Superblocks are responsible for a huge amount of out-of-direction travel, congestion at intersections, and discouragement of walking and bicycling for transportation. Hopefully, this goal is being implemented in the area south of 50.	Comment noted. No change.
Anthony Powers	LU 8.1.5 Pedestrian-Friendly Entrances This is an important addition. It would be even better if it would encourage (require) pedestrian-friendly entrances from all approaches to a commercial development, not just one.	No change
Anthony Powers	U 8.1.11 Cut-Through Traffic There should be a goal to limit the impact of traffic on residential neighborhoods. This should include provisions for traffic calming (there is no mention of the city's Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan). Sidewalks should be a given on all new roads; period!	Added new Policy M 4.1.10 and Policy M 2.1.2
Anthony Powers	3. Mobility The introductory paragraph states that Folsom's transportation network is designed to serve all modes, but does not mention the mobility-impaired. The last statement, "... and trails and paths provide facilities for passive recreation", while true, overlooks the transportation purpose of those facilities (and sidewalks). I would suggest that it be a new sentence starting with: "In addition to their transportation function, bikeways, trails and sidewalks provide facilities for passive recreation".	No change
Anthony Powers	General Mobility Suggested edits to fourth sentence in first paragraph: "Complete streets are designed with [replace "for"] all users in mind and may include sidewalks, bikeways [replace "bike lanes"], dedicated transit lanes, and intersections with enhanced safety features for bicyclists and pedestrians [replace "safer intersections"; safer than what?]."	Modified p. M-3
Anthony Powers	MI.1.4 Existing Streets Retrofits This language is weak and promotes the status quo. Suggest: "Actively pursue funding to update streets with new bikeways, sidewalks and transit lanes where these are designated in the Bikeway Master Plan, Pedestrian Master Pan or Transit Master Plan."	Modified Policy M 1.1.4
Anthony Powers	MI.1.5 Connected Neighborhoods A welcome addition! But why does "Existing Street Retrofits" say "when funding and staff resources are available"? This implies a low priority. But resources limitations are a given for all projects; delete the qualifier. The policy is to retrofit the streets	No change
Anthony Powers	MI.1.8 ITS Master Plan This section should be broader and prioritize maximize the "safety and efficiency" of the City's "intersections", while conforming to the Complete Streets Policy of MI.1.1. This should include consideration of roundabouts in lieu of traffic signals, consistent with Caltrans policy, wherever traffic volumes and ROW permit in recognition of their demonstrated safety, cost and efficiency benefits over signalize or stop-controlled intersections.	No change
Anthony Powers	Pedestrians and Cyclists As noted earlier, these should be two separate sections. When they are lumped together, the unique needs, issues and challenges of each get conflated and diluted. Bicyclists have as much in common with motorists as they do with	No change

Commenter	Comment	Action
Anthony Powers	Goal M2.1 Should say " ... encourages people to walk and bike for transportation in safety and comfort, ... ".	No change
Anthony Powers	M2.1.2 New Sidewalks This section should require that sidewalks be constructed at the time the road is built, not when the adjacent property is developed, as is the current practice. This implies that sidewalks are an amenity for the adjacent property rather than an integral part of the transportation system, and often leaves gaps in the sidewalk network for decades (in some places in Folsom, it is approaching centuries).	Modified Policy M 2.1.2
Anthony Powers	M2.1.3 Sidewalk Network This should address intent to complete the sidewalk network in the Historic District. Lack of safe pedestrian access between the residential and commercial portions of the Historic District has been ignored for the past quarter century because 25 years ago, when the city had 50,000 fewer people, it was controversial. The time to address this issue is now, and the place is	No change. Policy already encourages filling sidewalk gaps. There is no neighborhood consensus on sidewalks in the Historic District.
Anthony Powers	M2.1.5. Bikeway Facility Hierarchy This goal is wrong. The numbered bikeway classifications designated in the CA Streets and Highways Code (890.4) do not constitute a hierarchy. This is clearly stated in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, 1002.1(5). Each type of bikeway should be used where appropriate. Class I is not necessarily better than 11, 111, or IV (the legal definitions use roman numerals). This list needs to be expanded to include Class IV Bikeways (Separated Bikeways), a.k.a. Cycletracks.	Modified Policy M 2.1.5 (now M 2.1.6)
Anthony Powers	M2.1.6 Design Guidelines Suggest adopting NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide as an alternative design guide.	No change. Design standards are appropriate
Anthony Powers	M2.1.7 Road Repair This doesn't make sense. It seems to be trying to say three different things: 1) road modifications should not result in degradation of existing bike or ped facilities, 2) road modifications should consider upgrades to those facilities that do exist, including upgrades for ADA compliance, and 3) existing bike or ped facilities should be maintained, or a reasonable and equivalent detour provided, during construction. All worthwhile goals.	No change
Anthony Powers	M2.1.8 Bicycle Safety Education A good addition! It would be better if the goal was to include as a routine part of the public education curriculum. Suggest adding that it conform with the League of American Cyclists' Smart Cycling program.	No change
Anthony Powers	M2.1.9 Bicycle Parking Should require, not "encourage" bike parking in conformance with the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals' (APBP) "Bicycle Parking Guidelines". This should more broadly encourage/require end of trip facilities, such as showers and lockers for businesses over a certain size.	Modified Policy M 2.1.9 (now M 2.1.10)
Anthony Powers	M 2.1.12 American River Path This should use the proper name for the American River Parkway Bike Trail, or more generally refer to bike paths along the American River. It also needs to include CA Department of Parks and Recreation, which owns the portions of the parkway within the city of Folsom. The Sacramento County portion of the Parkway does not abut Folsom. (Reference American River Parkway MP).	Modified Policy 2.1.12 (now M 2.1.13)
Anthony Powers	M 2.1.13 Intersections "Bicycles" should be "bicyclists". What about existing intersections?	Modified Policy 2.1.13 (now M 2.1.14)
Anthony Powers	M 2.1.14 Funding There should be dedicated city funds as well, particularly for sidewalks. Funding of sidewalks should be tied to construction of the road, not the development of the adjacent property. Sidewalks are an integral part of the transportation system, not an amenity for the adjacent property or landscaping.	No change
Anthony Powers	MI.1.15 Safe Routes to School Good! The reference to state and federal SR2S programs needs to be updated to reflect the consolidation into the Active Transportation Program.	No change
Anthony Powers	MI.1.16 Public Involvement This should include a goal of establishing a Bicycle Advisory Committee and a Pedestrian Advisory Committee to ensure the needs of both are considered in all public and private development projects. The Traffic Safety Committee does not adequately cover this area.	No change
Anthony Powers	Vehicular Traffic and Parking The introduction should refer to drivers of cars, trucks and other vehicles, not the vehicles	Modified text on p. M-13
Anthony Powers	M4.1.1 Road Network Hierarchy The definition of Collector and Minor Collector does not match the designations on Fig. M-1: Major Collector and Collector.	Modified Figure M-1
Anthony Powers	M4.1.2 Roadway Maintenance " .. all vehicles, including pedestrians and cyclists" is incorrect. Pedestrians and bicyclists are not vehicles. Should say, all users, including drivers of cars, trucks and transit vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians Or something like	Modified Policy M 4.1.2

Commenter	Comment	Action
Anthony Powers	M4.1.3 Level of Service If still using LOS, then it should use multi-modal LOS, or have some other quantifiable way of assuring LOS for active transportation and transit. As written, it does not consider impacts on bicycle travel at all.	No change
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) M4.1.7 Landscape Maintenance Assessment Agreements Either sidewalk maintenance should be included in landscape Maintenance assessments, or there should be comparable language/policy for constructing and maintaining sidewalks. Ideally, sidewalk construction and maintenance should be decoupled from adjacent landowners and treated the same as the rest of the	No change
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) M4.2.2 Reduce Minimum Parking Standards How about eliminating minimum parking standards and let the market determine the number of parking spaces required. (Please refer to "The High Cost of Free Parking", Schuppe)	No change
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) M7.1.3 Funding Sources Specifically change the responsibility for sidewalk funding from the adjacent property owners to be included in the roadway construction to bring funding in line with the Complete Streets policy (assessments on development would still cover much of this, but it would unlink the construction schedule for sidewalks from development of the adjacent property).	No change
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) PFS 3.1.7 Water Supply Add the word "diversified" before supply of water. We should not be relying entirely on one source of water.	No change
Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) PFS 7.1.4 Optimal Siting This goal should specify adequately dispersed facilities to meet response times without excessive travel distance or speed. Residential street design should not promote speeding by the general public in the interest of emergency response time.	No change
Anthony Powers	goal regarding traffic safety. This should be a commitment to Vision Zero!	No change
Heritage Preservation League	(March 11) Draft General Plan is not silent on history, but such an important part of Folsom's "brand" needs more.	Added History section to Intro Chapter
Heritage Preservation League	(March 11) Policy LU 1.1.8 on p. LU-12 says to "maintain the existing natural vegetation landscape features, open space and viewsheds in the design of new development." There should be a comparable policy for maintaining and interpreting our cultural and historic features.	Added Policy LU 1.1.9 (also note that Policy NCR 5.1.1 relates to the preservation of historic resources)
Heritage Preservation League	(March 11) Land Use Map The Land Use Map needs to delineate the boundary of the 98-block Historic District. The land use designations used in the rest of the City are a poor match for the diversity of the Historic District. The density of the original Judah lots does not match the density of the SF land use designation, nor does subsequent development. This fact was recognized in 1998 when the existing Historic District boundaries were established, but the appropriate General Plan changes were never made. This has caused problems for applicants and City staff. HPL recommends either an umbrella Historic District land use designation or three new land use designations, one for the commercial subareas, one for the residential subareas, and one for the existing Corporation Yard site. A fourth one may be appropriate for the Railroad Wye.	Added inset map showing Historic District boundary
Heritage Preservation League	(March 11) Existing Corporation Yard Site The General Plan needs to reflect the West Leidesdorff Street Master Plan planning process which is already underway. It is insufficient to designate a study area without any policy guidance. As the Community Development Director explained to the citizens convened for this planning process, all options are on the table. However, there was a clear consensus on three points. All the stakeholder groups recommended that future uses have 1) a strong connection with the historic uses of the area, 2) open space, and 3) a meaningful interface with the adjacent state park land. There was no consensus that it should be a high-density housing project as might be concluded from the Draft's T.O.D. policies absent any other policy guidance.	Modified Land Use Diagram to reflect existing Industrial land use designation. Policy LU 4.1.6 provides policy guidance for studying this area.

Commenter	Comment	Action
Heritage Preservation League	<p>(March 11) Historic Folsom Light Rail Station In this Draft General Plan, Folsom’s three light rail stations and Transit-Oriented Overlay areas have been treated alike. However, when light rail was introduced in Folsom, the City designated the stations at Iron Point Road and Glenn Drive for commuters, while the end station in Historic Folsom was focused on visitors to the Sutter Street area. As a result, commuter parking lots were installed at Glenn Drive and Iron Point Road while the Historic Folsom station was provided with a drop-off/pick-up area. The parking structure on the railroad block was intended to provide parking for shoppers and tourists, not commuters.</p> <p>Additional transit-oriented development focuses on concentrating housing density and supportive commercial development in walking distance of stations. This has many beneficial results, but it doesn’t do much to bring people to such stations as a destination. The Historic Folsom station and its environs, including the existing Corporation Yard site, are an opportunity to focus goals on bringing people in to Folsom, not just plumping up ridership by forcing high density into an area that has strongly objected to such a radical change in character. The General Plan needs to differentiate the development goals for the light rail station in Historic Folsom from</p>	Modified Policy LU 4.1.2
Heritage Preservation League	<p>(March 11) Railroad Wye The Draft General Plan proposes to change the land use designation for the southwest corner of the Historic District to Industrial. Because there is no Industrial Subarea in the Historic District zoning, HPL recommends that the Wye remain commercially designated. If the City still finds a need to apply an Industrial designation, text for an Industrial Subarea needs to be simultaneously adopted to the Zoning Code. While many industrial uses would not be compatible with surrounding uses, the zoning code should specify that historic railroad uses are appropriate in the wye area...</p>	No change
Heritage Preservation League	<p>(March 11) Southern Pacific Rail Corridor One of Folsom’s great successes is creating a jobs/housing balance. It used to be that Highway 50 was only congested in one direction during peak hours, out of Folsom in the morning and back in at night. Now it’s congested in both directions, Why is that good?!? It’s because people who live here don’t have to leave and people who don’t live here have reason to come to Folsom, bringing their dollars with them. Right now the light rail system operates much the way Highway 50 used to, mostly taking Folsom people out of town. The complete historic Southern Pacific rail corridor (along Folsom Boulevard, across the City from the railroad wye and along East Bidwell Street) is currently set aside as a transportation corridor. It is owned by a Joint Powers Authority which includes the City of Folsom, El Dorado County, Sacramento County and Regional Transit. Focusing the Historic Folsom light rail station on visitor use partially addresses the need for transportation, but the larger issue of making transit serve citizens within Folsom can be addressed by assigning this SP rail corridor for study as a transit corridor. Not to do so is inconsistent with the draft General Plan’s overall philosophy of reducing reliance on the automobile. Study of long-term benefits may justify potential traffic and cost impacts. Those long-term benefits include 1) connection of the South of 50 area with the existing City, 2) connecting three major shopping districts, 3) connecting Folsom and El Dorado County’s population centers for shopping and employment, 4) increasing tourism opportunities with historic train excursions. The rail corridor can also accommodate</p>	No change
Heritage Preservation League	<p>placer mining fields along Folsom Boulevard was preserved and dedicated to the City as a part of the Natoma Station project (approved in 1989). West of the preserved site near the intersection of Folsom Boulevard and Hwy 50 was a separate buffer area with a commercial land use designation. In 1990, the combined parcels were determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, and in 2004, Betsy Strand with the Heritage Preservation League, nominated the parcels for listing on the City of Folsom Cultural Resources Inventory under the name Natoma Ground Sluice Diggings. Recently, the buffer area that fronts Folsom Boulevard (and the light rail corridor), was donated to the City (at the initiative of David Bugatto with Alleghany Properties). The City will now be able to implement the initial idea; to preserve</p>	Modified Land Use Diagram to reflect Open Space designation

Commenter	Comment	Action
Heritage Preservation League	(March 11) Natural and Cultural Resources Element As indicated by the title of this Element, natural and cultural resources are intertwined. Natural land forms and rock formations, permanent and seasonal waters, woodlands and trees, and native vegetation were vital to the lives of native Americans and early settlers. HPL finds that the City's preservation goals for both types of resources need to be more clearly stated, particularly in regard to historic and prehistoric resources. Citing so few "categories" of Folsom's diverse history leaves a false impression. The City should consult with the Folsom Historical Society for a more accurate representation of Folsom's cultural resources. Additionally, the Draft General Plan needs to acknowledge the adopted Historic Preservation Master Plan and particularly its goal of expanding and documenting its Cultural Resources Inventory. At minimum the list needs to be expanded to include the South of 50 resources.	Added Historic Preservation Master Plan to the list of approved plans on page IM-5, and added Implementation Program NCR-5 (Historic Preservation Master Plan). The Existing Conditions Report already includes a list of cultural resources, and Implementation Program NCR-4 (Cultural Resources Inventory) calls for maintaining a cultural resources inventory.
Heritage Preservation League	Summary of Proposed Changes:	
Heritage Preservation League	1. Delineate the boundary of the 98-block Historic District on the General Plan Map.	Modified Land Use Diagram
Heritage Preservation League	2. Create a new land use designation for the overall Historic District or separate the district into three new land use areas, including the commercial subareas, the residential subareas and the West Leidesdorff Street Master Plan area (the current corporation yard).	No change
Heritage Preservation League	3. Separate Historic Folsom Station from the two Light Rail commuter stations (at Glenn Drive and Iron Point Road) and describe Transit-Oriented Development Guidelines for the Historic District that are focused on attracting visitors.	Modified Policy LU 4.1.2
Heritage Preservation League	4. Maintain a commercial land use designation for the Railroad Wye area. If a new industrial land use designation is created for the this area, revised language needs to be added to the Zoning Code. Potential industrial land uses in this area should be railroad related and if possible, historic in nature.	No change
Heritage Preservation League	5. Add a description the of the ongoing planning process for the West Leidesdorff Master Plan to the Draft General Plan, including recommendations to incorporate historic uses, open space and projects that involve the adjacent State park land.	No change. Already addressed through existing policies.
Heritage Preservation League	6. Specify that the long term effects of expanding rail transportation in Folsom should be studied. The study should be focused on the existing Southern Pacific Rail Corridor (owned by a Joint Powers Authority).	No change
Heritage Preservation League	7. Assign the land use designation Open Space to the Natoma Ground Sluice Diggings site and specify that the maintenance and restoration of this site, with the intent to over time provide public access, is one of the goals of the General Plan.	Modified Land Use Diagram
Heritage Preservation League	8. List natural resources that are important to the City of Folsom (including natural land forms and rock formations, permanent and seasonal waters, wood lands and trees, native vegetation and cultural landscapes).	No change
Heritage Preservation League	9. Expand the information about Folsom's history to include the gold rush, the early railroad era and the following transition to agriculture (after consultation with the Folsom Historical Society).	Add History section to Intro Chapter
Heritage Preservation League	10. Promote the City sponsored Historic Preservation Master Plan and the Cultural Resources Inventory. Include the City's goal to expand the list of locally significant sites and structures. Prioritize adding cultural resources from the area south of Hwy 50.	Added Historic Preservation Master Plan to the list of approved plans on page IM-5, and added Implementation Program NCR-5 (Historic Preservation Master Plan). The Existing Conditions Report already includes a
Heritage Preservation League	11. Describe the Theodore Judah Map as the Historic District with Commercial and Residential Subareas and governed by the Historic District Design and Development Guidelines	No change
Heritage Preservation League	Page I-9. Add a Guiding Principle regarding the Historic Residential Area.	Added Policy 6.1.2

Commenter	Comment	Action
Heritage Preservation League	Page M-15. Policy M 4.1.3 needs to add provision to accept LOS F for the entire Folsom Blvd. tree corridor, including many heritage trees, not just 1/4 mile from station	No change
Heritage Preservation League	Page EP-10. Policy EP 6.1.6 needs to include cultural attractions like museum, galleries and performance venues. The Folsom Historical Society and its three museums, with a fourth to be added, is an anchor tenant of Sutter Street shopping center	Modified EP 6.1.1 to emphasize cultural attractions
Heritage Preservation League	Page NCR-4. Add Policy NCR 1.1.9 to address a requirement for visual and physical public access to passive and active recreational areas.	No change
Heritage Preservation League	Page NCR-5. Policy NCR 2.1.1 needs to include "New development shall not adversely impact historical sites".	No change
Heritage Preservation League	Page NCR-10. Expand the introduction to 'Historic and Cultural Resources' by including additional historical mile stones.	No change. See Existing Conditions Report.
Heritage Preservation League	Page NCR-10. Policy NCR 5.1.1 needs to add "preservation" to the citation of "restoration" and "maintenance."	Modified Goal NCR 5.1
Heritage Preservation League	Page NCR-10. Expand Policy NCR 5.1.3 by adding: , as listed in the <i>City of Folsom Historic Presevation Master Plan</i> . Nominate additional buildings and sites to the City of Folsom Cultural Resources Inventory of locally significant cultural resources.	Modified Policy NCR 5.1.4, and added new Policy NCR 5.1.3
Heritage Preservation League	Page NCR-11. Policy NCR 5.1.5 is too ambiguous in how it relates to lots that are not 50 x 140. A reference to the established Subareas of the Historic District could clarify that development standards are in	No change
Heritage Preservation League	Page PFS-3. The Historic Preservation Master Plan needs to be listed to be maintained and implemented.	Added NNCR-4
Heritage Preservation League	Page IM-5. The list of master plans needs to include the Historic Preservation Master Plan	Added to list on p. IM-5
Heritage Preservation League	Page IM-7. The list of state agencies to be coordinated with should include the State Office of Historic Preservation.	Added to p. IM-7
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District	1. Consider the inclusion of a Healthy Communities Element[1] to protect public health and safety. It could include indicators and policies on topics traditionally not found in General Plan Elements, such as social capital, access to healthy foods and nutrition, health care and mental health, recreational centers and day care centers.	Most of these policies are addressed throughout the General Plan. Separate Health Element is not recommended given it is a cross-cutting issue, and City
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District	2. The District supports the goal of including a <i>Qualified Climate Action Plan</i> . Please consult with District staff while developing the plan.	Comment noted. No change.
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District	3. Please expand Policy NCR 3.1.5: Air Emission from Development, to require that all new land use projects with operational emissions in excess of the District operational emission thresholds[2] to reduce emissions by a minimum of 15%.	Modified Policy NCR 3.1.5
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District	6. The District supports <i>NCR 1.1.8: Planting in New Development</i> to require the planting of street trees and parking lot canopy trees in new development. Please consider an additional policy to encourage the development of tree canopy in existing neighborhoods.	No change
Tim Hansen	1. Transportation within the city. I noticed the plan talks extensively about bike transportation, and th e need for walkable city centers. I was surprised that there wasn't any mention of facilitating better intra-town transport via an extension of lightrail. The only extension of light rail mentioned was "additional hours". What about extending light rail to the new city center south of 50, or to the Broadstone city center? How will people easily get from the rail station to anywhere in town? A bus isn't the answer for most Millennials. Something more frequent and dynamic will be needed. (which leads me to...)	No change

Commenter	Comment	Action
Tim Hansen	I didn't notice any anticipation for the coming autonomous car revolution. The use of autonomous cars with services like Uber are on the cusp of mainstream, and surely will be prevalent in the next 10 years. Some cities are getting ahead of this trend by working with tech companies to identify opportunities for infrastructure optimization. Not only for human transport, but also for goods/services during busy commute hours. Imagine Amazon shipping goods via Prime Now from their Sacramento distribution center, arriving by an autonomous car.	Added new policy M 4.1.9
Tim Hansen	Expansion of city technical infrastructure and services. Examples might include high bandwidth communications infrastructure (gigabit internet, e-city services).	Added new policy EP 3.1.4
Tim Hansen	While I saw a mention of collective working spaces, I didn't notice specific planning around OAS (office as a service) facilities that would enable multi-company leasing of co-working space. Tech companies are increasingly looking to have temporary facilities where people in the region can meet dynamically. Having this near a city center, with	No change
Parks and Rec Comm	A strategy for maintaining existing outdoor facilities and promoting new and/or expanded facilities needs to be included in the Plan.	Added Implementation Program PR-2
Parks and Rec Comm	The Commission agrees with Goal PR 4.1.5 and suggests creation of a so-called River District in the final General Plan and the inclusion of a "mixed-use overlay" of that district to preserve options for achieving	Modified, as described above
Parks and Rec Comm	The draft Plan makes little reference to indoor sport facility development. We should incorporate a strategy to ensure implementation of expanded indoor sports facilities as well.	No change. Have already proposed significant indoor facilities south of 50.
Parks and Rec Comm	Goal PR 1.1.16 in the draft Plan should be supported through an implementation strategy. The development of programs and initiatives to attain alternative sources of funding for the acquisition, development and renovation of parklands and for financing of expanded recreation programs is central to meeting the needs of City residents and maintaining Folsom's standing as a premier recreational and tourist destination. The Commission strongly endorses this recommendation.	Added Implementation Program PR-2
Parks and Rec Comm	Consistent with the previous recommendation, a Governmental Coordination Strategy needs to be added to the final Plan to ensure engagement and appropriate assistance from county, state, and federal agencies in achieving the goals and policies contained in the draft General Plan .	Added Implementation Program PR-3
Town Hall Forum Comments		
Beth K	There are many praiseworthy aspects of the Draft General Plan, but our comments focus on where it needs improvement - please see our pdf submittal to City. Folsom distinguishes itself by our attention to quality and high standards, such as parks, schools, roads, shopping. The most readily identifiable distinction from other communities is our history. This Draft General Plan is not silent on history, but such an important part of Folsom's "brand" needs more. The Land Use Map needs to delineate the boundary of the 98-block Historic District. The Corporation Yard Site must show strong connection with history, open space, and state park. Light rail station and railroads need more attention. Chinese Digging Site should be open space. Acknowledge the adopted Historic Preservation Master Plan, and woodlands and trees, native American.	See responses to HPL comments, above
Richard S	We need to attract more business to Folsom. More business allows for more activity at restaurants, shops, gas stations, etc. more and more people are forced to drive to Sacramento and roseville with stressful commutes. Live, work and play in Folsom should be the new	Comment noted. This is a major focus of the Economic Prosperity Element.
Julie H	Please place Open Space as a category under Safety and Noise. My husband and I moved to Folsom because there was a 30% or 40% open space regulation in place. That is what makes Folsom a beautifully natural place to live. We feel safer here and noise levels	Comment noted. Open space is a key policy topic in the General Plan, and is addressed in the Natural and Cultural Resources Element and Land Use Element.
Mike B	Yes, we need open space more explicitly covered in the Plan. Safety aspects of it (patrols, etc.) should be covered. Noise seems to be to be a less serious problem, except near heavily used bike paths of which there aren't a lot, yet. Open space does help with setbacks from some roads, which reduces noise impacts. But despite considerable open space and distance, the "steel surf" of 50 and E. Bidwell is still	

Commenter	Comment	Action
Kritika B	I have lived here for about 13 years and love this town. In the past 5 years or so, with the increased development, I've seen more roadkill, particularly in the winter time and even large animals like deer. If we remain distinctive by nature, can we do more to protect the critters that share this land? Create wildlife crossings to minimize conflict with vehicles or something similar (the technology exists). A project highlighting the wildlife diversity in the area would be cool as well - I envision a "What to look for while you're out on the trails" type of	Comment noted. The Natural and Cultural Resources Element, Goal NCR 1.1 addresses wildlife habitat preservation.
Mike B	Too many bike lanes are substandard in width, in many cases apparently to provide 4 or more car lanes in places where they're seldom needed. Case in point: Riley St. between Russi and Oak Ave Parkway; some of it is (barely) standard, but most is barely a handlebar wide, if you're riding in the gutter instead of on the asphalt. That part of Riley has few intersections, and really doesn't need to be 4 12' lanes+turning lane throughout. That's only an example; many other bike lanes are also too narrow. A Complete Streets policy - for all major streets not just E. Bidwell - should be part of the Plan and actually be implemented.	Comment noted. The General Plan contains several policies addressing complete streets and expanded bike lanes. The specific details of how these policies will be implemented will be part of the Bikeway Master Plan
Mike B	Transportation includes walking - which needs direct paths and wide enough. Look for places in "superblocks" where ped (and sometimes bike) paths can cut through. Examples: the "great wall of Broadstone" along Clarksville, and Folsom Middle School block on Blue Ravine. Both need cut-through for peds from the neighborhoods that don't involve fighting with cut-through traffic or mud. Also, sidewalks & paths need to be obstacle-free and wide enough for safe use; the sidewalk along Blue Ravine east of Target is a classic Bad Example. Perhaps the Plan could include citations to	Comment noted. The Pedestrian Master Plan contains pedestrian design considerations.
Mike B	Please provide a crosswalk between the way this plan is organized and the required elements (and other guidance) in the General Plan Guidelines: Chapter 4: Required Elements Land Use Circulation Housing Conservation Open-Space Noise Safety Also, any optional elements, including Air Quality using the best available guidance for that.	The Introduction contains a crosswalk showing how the Folsom 2035 General Plan elements relate to the State mandated elements.
Mike B	* May not need the Level of Service policy any more - check with OPR. * Bike/Ped policies are weak and general, with little in the way of commitment - where's a diagram of important routes and "complete street" priorities, as for streets in general? * Transit policies are also weak/excessively general. Does not address the need for more internal transit; current transit service is almost unusable for local residents. * Doesn't mention a key asset: the former Placerville rail line. Why not use it for a streetcar or other light-light rail service connecting the new South-of-50 area, E. Bidwell commercial, the College, and the Historic District (with light rail cross-platform). Just because it's	Comments noted. No change.
Marty D	The Southern Pacific Transportation Corridor, SPTC, that runs all through Folsom from the Auto Mall to Historic Folsom to White Rock Rd. should have its own designation. The property should have a transportation use for pedestrians, bikers, and rail use designation. The railroad wye property and corridor should also have a historical designation because of the Historic Railroad Supervisors house on the railroad wye and because the rail lines were the beginning of Folsom in 1856 and later the route on to Placerville in 1863.	Comment noted. No change.
Mike B	As a rail corridor, it would be useful to connect South of 50 to commercial along E. Bidwell (Broadstone area) and Historic Folsom. It also crosses E. Bidwell pretty close to the Complete Street area - worth connecting with shuttle, bikes, ped. Consider a streetcar?	Comment noted. No change.
Elisa L	Folsom should be a city where most resident live and work here. More tech jobs, medical jobs, State government jobs, etc that pay good salary. Not just retail jobs that don't pay well. With our Folsom lake for cooling systems, we should be able to attract Data Centers and backup systems for many companies. We are also earthquake free.	Comment noted. No change.

Commenter	Comment	Action
Gwynne W	Of the three current/proposed city centers, Broadstone and South are essentially back-to-back. That leaves a large outer corner of the city bordered by Briggs Ranch, The Parkway and Empire Ranch underserved as predominantly a bedroom community.	Comment noted. No change.