

## Folsom 2035 General Plan Update - Public Comments

**Tuesday, June 27, 2017**

### NEW COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER APRIL 15, 2017

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
1	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	Acknowledgements page omits the Historic District Commission and the Arts and Cultural Commission.	Modified acknowledgements page
2	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-3 In the first paragraph, change 2016 to 2017	Modified
3	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-4 Trend #2 - What This Could Mean for Folsom. Add “Likewise resources can be directed to improved walkability and increased transit opportunities.”	Modified
4	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-7 Trend #5 - What This Could Mean for Folsom. Add, “Additionally Folsom can continue to facilitate and expand Parks and Recreation Department and community-based educational offerings. ”	Comment noted, however, the focus of this guiding principle is on higher education
5	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	The vision omits our “Distinctive By Nature” facet and elevates the the wine country gateway concept too high. Touting Folsom by its proximity to somewhere else is a put-down of what we offer here, like the put-down of Sacramento that it’s 2 hours from San Francisco and 2 hours from Tahoe. The concept is good, but it needs to be recast in a Folsom-centric manner. History provides a solution; see second P. I-8 wording proposed below .	This was included based on other community input. Need Council direction for this change.
6	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-7 Trend #5, Lifelong Learning, should say “Continue to facilitate and expand Parks and Recreation Department and community-based educational offerings .”	Comment noted, however, the focus of this guiding principle is on higher education
7	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-8 First paragraph, last sentence: “...embraced its rich historical <u>and natural</u> heritage.”	Modified
8	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-8 Last paragraph: “As it did during the Gold Rush, when 21 stage lines met every train and fanned out into the Mother Lode, Folsom provides a gateway to the Sierra foothills, with their historic sites and the developing El Dorado and Amador wine districts replacing gold-prospecting as today’s attraction .”	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
9	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-9 Guiding Principle #1 needs an additional sentence: “Inherent to that small-town feel is the Historic District, a complete small town preserved within the larger city.”	Modified
10	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-9 Guiding Principle #2 is too narrow. Sutter St. is only one of more than 100 historic sites on the City’s inventory, which does not yet include South of 50. They are not all Gold-Rush related. See proposed Guiding Principle #18 below.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
11	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	It is appropriate to keep this Guiding Principle, but it needs to be re-titled and amended to encompass the entire Historic District, including residential areas. The word "entertainment," a red flag to the neighborhood, needs to be omitted. Revise this principle wording with "Focus on maintaining the Historic District's attractiveness as both a vibrant down-town and a desirable, walkable residential neighborhood. Preserve and enhance the District's pedestrian orientation, architectural integrity, residential quality of life, and collection of unique, locally owned businesses. Design and zoning standards unique to this District promote high-quality housing, a dynamic nightlife and rich shopping and cultural experiences for residents and visitors."	Already modified in earlier version to clarify that this guiding principle focuses on the commercial district
12	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-9 Guiding Principle #4: Acknowledge the evolution of Folsom's commercial development, which is a microcosm of national trends. See comment re P. LU-14 below .	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not
13	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-9 Guiding Principle #7 doesn't acknowledge the parks and recreation role for citizens, just as a destination for outsiders. Also, didn't you mean to say "resource" instead of "revenue"?	Partially modified
14	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-10 Guiding Principle #8: This should be an implementation measure re connectivity to the Sierra, not a guiding principle. See comment re the vision statement above.	This was included based on other community input. Need Council direction for this change.
15	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. 1-10 Guiding Principle #12 Add walkability to the list of quality features.	Modified
16	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-11 Guiding Principle #16: "...through pedestrian, bicycle <u>and transit</u> linkages...."	Modified
17	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-11 Guiding Principle #17: This principle needs an implementation measure in Chapter 10.	Added new Policy LU 1.1.16 Community Engagement in the Planning Process; also see Policy M 2.1.7 (Public Involvement) and Goal section PR 3.1 in the parks and Rec Element (Community Involvement)
18	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. I-11 Add Guiding Principle #18: "Citywide Cultural Resources. Embrace the city's rich historic and prehistoric heritage, pre-serving, restoring, maintaining and enhancing heritage sites throughout the city.	Added as GP #17

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
19	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-1 This list of uses should be the same as the designations on the Land Use Diagram.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
20	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-3 Density: This appears to be a different way of calculating density, using net acreage instead of gross acreage. What will be excluded? How will density be calculated? Because the GP is promoting "higher" densities this section needs to be clearer on the topic.	Modified. Changed net to gross.
21	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-6 The colors of Table LU-3 do not match the Land Use Diagram.	Modified
22	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-8 The patterns of Table LU-6 do not match the Land Use Diagram.	Modified
23	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-9 Land Use Diagram: This diagram has a structural problem relating to both the E. Bidwell Mixed Use District and the Historic District. We suggest two additional diagrams for these two areas: inserts like street maps use to focus greater detail on a downtown, for example. On the insert maps the Districts would be subdivided into the specific commercial, residential, etc. colors while the main Diagram would use the colors now indicated on its legend.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
24	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	The Land Use Diagram has other confusion that should also be clarified. Adding more explanatory text for all the legend items into the same area where Tables LU1-6 are located might resolve some of the confusion, but some rearranging and/or retitling might be useful. There needs to be a definition of the Overlay, the Study Area and the Planning Area. The purposes are not clear simply from the ways they are grouped. The Overlay heading combines a generalized T.O.D. boundary with two Districts that have specific boundaries. The Study Area heading combines vacant land areas with areas already carrying entitlements. Adding to the confusion is a Planning Area boundary that lumps the entitled and vacant lands together. Adding explanatory text for the Planning Area would head off some of the criticism that Folsom is preparing an annexation application to LAFCo. If this delineation is to allow for an annexation to be considered in the next 25 years, it would be better to be honest and just state that there is no current intent; it's merely reserving the option. If the purpose is only to have some say in the actions of other jurisdictions adjacent to the City, the Planning Area should ring the entire City. The T.O.D. seems to be a Study Area, not an Overlay. Already entitled areas outside the City are named, but the Corporation Yard is not. The Urban Centers are not shown. The Lake Natoma area outside the City limits is given Folsom land use designations.	Already modified to reflect most of these comments in earlier version.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
25	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	Regarding the Historic District, the intent, never implemented with a General Plan amendment, was to apply the SFHD designation to the entire Historic Residential Primary Area. This determination was the result of a forensic analysis, stepping back in time to see what density the Judah map could have been assigned if the planning profession had existed in 1850, assuming the area as a PD to allow for the variations inherent to historic development patterns. The first step was calculating the original overall density of the residential area, based on gross acreage and assuming all the 50' x 140' lots were to be developed. This calculation resulted in an allowable density of 3.9 d.u./ac. Next was totaling the number of existing d.u.'s to compare existing density with allowable density. The difference yielded the number of new units that could be allowed under the original plan. The numbers should be updated, but the conclusion then was that applying the SFHD designation over the entire Historic Residential Primary Area would allow for the densities that would have occurred in a comparable small town built out in the 1850-1950 era. Since the Historic District was not built out, the SFHD was in-tended to allow for second units, for development of vacant land, and for residential units to be added in commercial areas. It also kept the exist-ing high-density multifamily developments as conforming uses. The Public Works Department at that time concluded that the infrastructure had the carrying capacity for the maximum density of the SFHD. These numbers and conclusions need to be updated to current conditions.	Modified. SF parcels in Historic District redesignated to SFHD.
26	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	In rereading Section 5.02.03 of the DDG's regarding the Railroad Wye, we see no purpose in changing the designation to Industrial. It is now a Subarea of the Historic Commercial Primary Area, allowing light industrial use but not heavy industrial use. Also, the boundary is incorrect; it should not include the residential properties fronting on Bidwell St.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
27	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	The ground-slucice mining site, aka Chinese diggings, and the adjacent Lot Y recently acquired by the City should be shown as Open Space, not Commercial.	Modified
28	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	Regarding the Riverfront Project Area proposed by FedCorp, HPL notes that sections of the riverfront area are located within the boundaries of the Judah map and adopted Historic District. All of the riverfront was significant in Folsom's history and pre-history, and any planning effort should include means of honoring and interpreting that heritage.	Added Policy LU-5.1.4
29	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-11 LU 1.1.2. Spell out SACOG and LAFCo to improve readability for laypersons.	Modified
30	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-11 LU1.1.4: Where is the inconsistency between the SOI and the policies of this General Plan?	Modified to clearly relate this policy to the corp yard relocation and need to modify SOI
31	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-12 LU1.1.7: Add "preservation of open spaces, cultural re-sources and natural features...."	Modified

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
32	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-13 LU1.1.13: Shouldn't the implementation code be JP instead of IGC?	Modified
33	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-13 Add LU 1.1.14: Preserve, Restore and Enhance Historic and Prehistoric Assets. Maintain historic and prehistoric assets as part of the design and construction of public and private projects.	Already added new policy in previous revisions. Also, already covered in the NCR Element
34	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-14-16 Folsom is a microcosm of national urban development trends (and bridge-building evolution, by the way), and the Urban Centers section misses an opportunity to illustrate that Folsom is always cutting edge. Folsom consciously moved its Central Business District from Sutter St. to E. Bidwell between Coloma and Wales, transitioning from a center established on horse and pedestrian travel modes to one centered on accommodating the automobile. As Folsom and the region grew, the automobile remained central, but planning of the Broadstone District illustrates the swinging of the pendulum back toward people-centered development. This General Plan illustrates that people, not a particular mode of transportation, are at the center of Folsom's planning today, a very appropriate shift that should be recognized in this document.	Added language on p. LU-16
35	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	This section needs to define what is meant by an urban center. The language of the introductory paragraphs describes commercial areas, but LU 2.1.4 implies a broader area that includes surrounding residential. This policy should be moved under a residential heading and/or clarified as to its applicability. For this policy to be usable it needs to define at least an approximate extent of the area for which higher density is encouraged and how this encouragement relates to the maximum density of the Land Use Designation. Policy LU2.1.4 says that the urban centers and mixed use districts are to comply with the South of 50 standards, surely not the intent, but that is the only standard cited. The Historic District has the DDG's, and Broadstone has a Specific Plan.	Modified to remove reference to Specific Plan and moved to residential section (now Policy LU-6.1.3)
36	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-16 LU 2.1.1 assumes there is one commercial area in the Historic District; there are several. Change the word "area" from singular to plural in the third line.	Modified
37	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	<b>Mixed Use Districts.</b> P. LU-17 This section is mis-titled. See comments on the Land Use Diagram above. As delineated, these policies relate only to the East Bidwell Mixed Use Overlay. This is another place where the historic commercial development pattern could be cited. (See earlier comment.) HPL isn't proposing preservation of development that doesn't measure up to today's quality standards. A principle of the Historic District DDG's (p. 3-2) is applicable: "There is no compelling reason to re-create a poorly designed structure or an offensive use simply because it actually existed in the past. It is enough to provide interpretive materials which acknowledge the past without repeating its errors." The General Plan needs to include a policy that E. Bidwell's history be acknowledged with interpretive materials as part of new development or redevelopment.	Clarified that some of the policies apply more broadly than E. Bidwell St.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
38	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	<p><b>Transit-Oriented Development.</b> PP. LU-19 through 21 The Historic Folsom light rail station needs to be differentiated in this plan from the other two, if for no other reason than its identification as part of an Urban Center, unlike the other two. To focus this section of the General Plan only on broadly interpretable Citywide T.O.D. policies ignores the very real differences between the Historic District and the City as a whole. The adopted DDG's provide a clear statement that the City intends the Historic District to continue to differ from the rest of Folsom, for a very specific reason: to maintain Folsom's small-town character by preserving this particular area as a demonstration of that character, "with deference to the practical needs of current users." (p. 1-2 of the DDG's). Further, "The concept is to maintain a traditional small town at the heart of a modern, developing small city." (p. 1-3 of the DDG's). The Historic Folsom Station paragraph on p. LU-19 needs to acknowledge this difference, either by summary lan-guage or by reference that the area is governed by the DDG's.</p>	Added language on p. LU-21

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
39	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	<p>Besides citing that different visual and density standards apply in the Historic District, the General Plan needs to acknowledge the different nature of the parking issue in relation to this station. It is already a T.O.D. station in many ways and should not be expected to accommodate the type of additional density expected at the other two. The Sutter Street merchants, property owners and adjacent residents have already accepted a parking standard which is, in effect, half the requirement in the rest of the City. Property owners and the City have recognized that requiring each property to provide full parking would destroy the fabric of Sutter Street. The City has assumed a large share of the burden of parking for the District. (See Section 3.03.03 of the DDG's, attached.) The Railroad Block was purchased by the City to assure sufficient parking to keep both commercial and adjacent residential uses healthy. The City built the parking structure with Redevelopment Agency funds and expected to use the same source of funds for 2-3 additional structures as infill development occurs. Therefore the City approved buildings to be constructed on the Railroad Block instead of devoting the whole site to parking. Like the rest of Sutter Street, the Bernau project on the Railroad Block does not provide even the District's lower parking requirement on-site.</p> <p>Now that Redevelopment funding no longer exists, construction of additional public parking will require financial participation of property owners. To promote policies encouraging high-density development without acknowledging the future deficit of parking for Sutter Street will mislead persons who may be interested in developing the Corporation Yard. If the City approves under-parked projects on the Corporation Yard property or a potential Riverfront Project Area, it also leaves the City vulnerable to accusations it is renegeing on its promise to share/relieve the parking burden of Sutter Street.</p> <p>The Railroad Block and/or other approved projects are likely to be built out and occupied within the time horizon of the General Plan, but no one can seriously expect American drivers, particularly suburban ones, to embrace a carless lifestyle in that time period. They may individually own fewer cars, but Uber, Lyft, Zip and driverless cars have their own parking demands. There is no plan underway to expand transit, a process that takes at least a decade, and existing transit serves only a fraction of the City's transportation needs.</p> <p>It is appropriate to set lofty goals in a General Plan, but they need to be placed in context. Any high-density T.O.D. development within a quarter mile of this station, if it can meet the aesthetic and density standards of the Historic District, needs to mitigate its parking impacts on Sutter Street and surrounding residential uses. The General Plan needs to recognize these differences in relation to the Historic Folsom station.</p>	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
40	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	This section should also recognize that Lot Y at U.S. 50 and Folsom Boulevard was acquired by the city as a historic-preservation and tree-preservation site, not a development site.	We believe this comment is referring to the Chinese Digging site? Land Use Diagram was modified to designate it open space
41	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-20 Policy LU 4.1.1 needs to add coordination with affected residential areas and historic interests.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
42	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-20 Policy LU 4.1.3 is a radical change to rezoning policy in Folsom. Does this really intend to permit zoning changes ministerially, without a public hearing or notification of any sort? Clarify!	Modified Policy LU 4.1.3 to clarify
43	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-2 1 Policy LU4.1.6. Add to the end: "...when Folsom moves its corporation yard. The study will include recommendation of appropriate land use designation(s); all options are to be considered. Parameters to be taken into account in the study include:  1) the site's history. In the earliest beginnings of the Gold Rush, Folsom originated in this location, prior to Joseph Folsom's decision to map out a city. 2) the impact on parking needs of the Sutter Street area and adjacent residential areas, 3) provision of an open space component, and 4) a meaningful interface with the adjacent Lake Natoma parkland.	Noted. Too detailed for General Plan. Will be worked out through Corp Yard study.
44	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-22 LU 5.1.5. Add: "Allow residential densities within <u>the Historic District</u> , an area plan...."	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
45	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-22 LU 5.1.6 Grammatical correction: "With issuance of a home occupation permit, allow home offices and home-based businesses that are compatible with character of the residential unit and do not significantly impact the neighborhood."	Modified
46	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-23 In first line, add "Where volume to capacity analysis demonstrates...."	Modified
47	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-23 Add LU 5.1.9: "Recognize that the combination of a grid-street layout and adjacency of commercial uses of the Historic District requires creative solutions in regard to traffic, noise, and safety to maintain the residential quality of life envisioned for all of Folsom.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
48	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-26 Policy LU 8.1.1 needs minor grammatical correction: "link" should be "linking" or "to link."	Modified
49	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-27 Policy LU 8.1.4 needs revision, particularly in light of the ground-sluice mining site/aka Chinese diggings: "Continue to establish key gateways to Folsom through landscape design, signage, building form <u>and historic themes</u> to create a unique sense of place."	Modified
50	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-27 Policy LU 8.1.7 needs revision, "...use of signage, wayfinding signage, streetscape and building design standards, advertising, <u>and site-specific historic themes.</u> "	Modified
51	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. LU-28 Policy LU 8.1.10 needs minor grammatical correction: " Re-quire the use <u>of</u> solar, wind...."	Modified

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
52	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. M-3 First paragraph. Add a sentence: “...dedicated transit lanes and safer intersections. <u>A light-rail system is operated by Regional Transit, and the City is a joint owner of the historic Southern Pacific rail right-of-way.</u> Policies in this section....”	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
53	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. M-5 The southern City boundary is not shown.	It is partially visible under the roadway
54	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. M-7 M 1.1.4. Other policies support adding bikeways, side-walks, etc. everywhere possible. Why does this policy limit them, and where are the designated ones shown in this Element? As written, it seems to conflict with Policy M2.1.3.	Modified. Rewrote to reference bikeway master plan, pedestrian master plan, and transit master plan.
55	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. M-7 M.1.1.5 Add: “...continuation of the street network <u>and commercial driveways</u> between....”	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
56	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. M-8 Add Policy M 1.1.11: “Historic Southern Pacific Rail Right-of-Way. Facilitate use of the right-of-way by rail, cyclists, and pe-destrians.”	Added new Policy M1.1.11
57	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. M-9 Add to the end of Policy M 2.1.3: “including the Historic District.”	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
58	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. M-10 M.2.1.12 Isn’t the goal to add trails, not just preserve existing ones?	Modified
59	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	Transit. This section omits the Southern Pacific rail corridor. Its existence should at least be acknowledged as a site to be studied.	Added new Policy M1.1.11 to first goal section
60	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. M-13 Policy M 3.1.6: Where does the plan identify the designated study corridors? The map or page needs to be cited here.	Added explanation on p. M-13
61	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. M-14 Policy M 4.1.1(3). Natoma and Riley Streets are shown on the map on p. M-5 as minor arterials, but they don’t meet this definition. Riley Street in particular should not be widened to four lanes, due to im-pacts on significant historic sites. Revise either the map or the definition.	Added the word “typically” to each definition (i.e., Minor Arterials are <u>typically</u> undivided four-lane roadways).

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
62	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. M-15 Policy M 4.1.3. Add "LOS F is acceptable on the full length of Folsom Boulevard north of U.S. 50; maintaining the historic tree-lined corridor is a higher priority than improving above LOS F."	The LOS policy is intersection-based, not segment-based. Any intersection improvements that might be designed to accommodate the LOS policy would not impact the tree corridor on Folsom Blvd.
63	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. M-16 Policy M 4.2.2. Add a final sentence: "In the Historic District the demand analysis must consider the parking needs of the Sutter Street Subarea and nearby residential areas."	Noted
64	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. M-16 Policy M 4.2.3. Add a final sentence: "Location in the Historic District constitutes a special circumstance to be considered in a shared-parking proposal."	Noted
65	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. EP-3 Policy EP 1.1.2 Revise "Maintain and enhance the social and cultural amenities of the city (such as attractive public spaces, public art displays, art galleries, <u>historic venues and sites</u> , and recreational...."	Modified
66	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. EP-9 Policy #P 6.1.1. Add "Besides tourist sites Folsom is also home to tourist-attracting community-originating events, such as the Folsom Pro Rodeo, street fairs on Sutter Street, outdoor music performances, etc. The Parks and Recreation Department stages many events that attract participants from outside Folsom."	Modified into language
67	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. EP-10 Policy EP 6.1.6. Revise: "Support its local dining, lodging, <u>cultural and natural attractions</u> , and retail sectors...."	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
68	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. NCR-3 Goal NCR 1.1 Add as the last sentence, "Among the city's natural resources are original land forms, rock formations, heritage trees and natural vegetation."	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
69	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. NCR-4 Add Policy 1.1.9 "Public Access. Encourage visual and/or physical public access to passive and active recreational areas."	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
70	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. NCR-5 Policy NCR 2.1.1. Need a reference to a map or page where scenic corridors are delineated. New corridors need to be delineated south of U.S. 50.	The General Plan Background Report already contains Figure 6-1 Scenic Corridors.
71	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. NCR -5 Policy NCR 2.1.2. Revise: “Through the planned development process <u>and/or Historic District approval process</u> , require new development be located and designed <u>in such a way that it will complement heritage sites and natural environments</u> along....”	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
72	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. NCR-10 Title is inaccurate. It should be “Historic and Prehistoric Resources OR “Cultural Resources.” Likewise, the introductory paragraph has inaccuracies. The term “Cultural Resources” encompasses historic and prehistoric resources.	Modified
73	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	The buildings along Sutter Street do not date back to the Gold Rush; there were too many fires. Folsom’s history is much more diverse than this paragraph communicates. The omission of significant historic genres (the Powerhouse, Chinese settlement, etc.) unwittingly sets up a hierarchy of importance that needs to be corrected either by listing all the significant genres or by incorporating Appendix A of the Historic District DDG’s by reference.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
74	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. NCR-10 Goal NCR 5.1: Revise: “Encourage the preservation, restoration and maintenance of cultural resources, including buildings and sites, to enrich our sense of place and our appreciation of the city’s history.”	Modified
75	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. NCR-10 Policy NCR 5.1.2. Revise, “Cultural Resources Inventory <u>and Documentation</u> . Maintain an inventory of <u>prehistoric and historic resources, including structures and sites. Each listed item needs to be provided with documentation of its historic significance. Cultural resources in the area South of Highway 50 need to be added to the city’s Historic Preservation Master Plan document and added to its Cultural Resources Inventory and Map.</u> ”	Partially modified. Made changes to first two sentences. Other details should be worked out in implementation
76	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. NCR-11 Policy NCR 5.1.5. Replace with, “Historic District Standards. Maintain and implement Design and Development Guidelines for the Historic District.”	Modified
77	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. NCR-11 Add a new Policy NCR 5.1.6, “When cultural resources are newly identified within the City, the Historic District Commission shall determine if these resources are eligible for addition to the Cultural Resources Inventory listing. If a resource is considered eligible, it shall be added to the Inventory and the Cultural Resources Map as soon as possible. When development applications are processed, the City shall consider the potential impact on listed sites and sites eligible for listing. The Historic District Commission shall advise other Commissions when development applications are received for sites outside the Historic District which contain cultural resources. As a part of the approval process, the City may require that applicants submit Cultural Resource Nominations for sites and structures within the proposed project boundary.”	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
78	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. NCR-11 Add a new Policy NCR 5.1.7, "National, State and Local Registers. Encourage nomination and listing of cultural resource sites to national, state and local registers. Once declared eligible, city-owned cultural resource sites are to be listed promptly."	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
79	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	<b>Civic and Community Facilities.</b> P. PFS-3 Introductory paragraph. Why are no history venues listed among the community facilities? They "provide facilities for civic activities, entertainment and cultural enrichment for residents." Since Folsom's historic and prehistoric resources are called out in the General Plan as an important part of Folsom's character and since the City relies on the expertise of the history community for information on and maintenance of those resources, history venues—and other private-sector contributors—should be called out as a civic resource with a policy comparable to the Harris Center one. Such inclusion is consistent with the Joint Partnerships with the Private Sector (JP) implementation measure on p. IM-7.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
80	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. PFS-3 Policy PFS 1.1.2. Revise to more accurately match the role of the Arts and Cultural Commission.	Modified
81	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P.PFS-3 Add a new Policy PFS 1.1.6, "Partnerships with the Private Sector. Encourage community organizations' activities in support of city purposes and responsibilities."	Added
82	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. PFS-3 Add a new Policy PFS 1.1.7, "Historic Preservation Master Plan. Maintain and implement the Historic Preservation Master Plan to preserve, restore, maintain, enhance, and expand awareness of historic and prehistoric sites and events in Folsom.	Already added this as an implementation program. It doesn't belong in this section. It belongs in the cultural resources section.
83	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. PFS-4 Goal PFS 2.1 omits the educational purpose of the Parks and Recreation Department and community organizations such as the Folsom Historical Society.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
84	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. PFS-5 Add a new Policy PFS 2.1.6, "Community Educational Offerings. Facilitate and support the Parks and Recreation Department's and private-sector non-profit organizations' ability to offer educational classes for the public."	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
85	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. PR-6 Goal PR 3.1. Add "Encourage community members <u>and organizations</u> to...."	Modified
86	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. PR-6 Policy PR 3.1.2. Add the Arts and Cultural Commission	Modified
87	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. IM-5 In the bullet list for Regulation and Development Review, amend the third bullet to read "Historic District Zoning ordinance and Design and Development Guidelines."	Modified

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
88	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. IM-5 In the bullet list for City Master Plans, Strategies, and Programs, add a bullet for the Historic Preservation Master Plan.	Modified
89	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. IM-7 In the bullet list for Inter-governmental Coordination, add the State Office of Historic Preservation to the list of state agencies.	Modified
90	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	Several parts of the General Plan make reference to public participation. There needs to be an implementation program for public participation or at least a reference to the Public Participation Ordinance.	Added new Policy LU 1.1.16 Community Engagement in the Planning Process; also see Policy M 2.1.7 (Public Involvement) and Goal section PR 3.1 in the parks and Rec Element (Community Involvement)
91	Heritage Preservation League (April 22, 2017)	P. IM-17 Table 9-5 needs an implementation program for the Historic Preservation Plan and its Cultural Resources Inventory and Map. 1616	Modified
92	Barbara Leary (May 23, 2017)	My concerns center on the following: Sections 1-9: I find the statement that Folsom should be noted as the "Gateway to Wine Country" is short sighted and severely limits the range of amenities our town has to offer, including historical, cultural and recreational activities along with natural elements existing in the adjacent State Park and trail system and waterways. I believe that focusing on improving diversity in businesses and activities in the Historic District needs to be given more thought.	This was included based on other community input. Need Council direction for this change.
93	Barbara Leary (May 23, 2017)	When discussing Sustainable building, LEED certification should be added as a goal for new building.	Added a reference to LEED certification in Policy LU 1.1.13
94	Barbara Leary (May 23, 2017)	Concentrated development in vacant, underutilized sites slated for infill should include a statement about maintaining open space by encouraging increased building height.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
95	Barbara Leary (May 23, 2017)	LU 15 -16 Connectivity is currently poor with multiple 6 lane thoroughfares intersecting the town. Improved overpasses for bikes/pedestrians/alternative transit need to be added. Improved planning of grids for easy access to major arterials would lessen the burden on smaller, heavily traveled main arterials through dense housing areas.	Added new Policy M2.1.17 Pedestrian and Bicycle Overpasses

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
96	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	LU 3.1.3- "minimizing building setbacks" does not support statements in later sections and reduces tree canopy/green corridors/open space and increases heat zones associated with asphalt.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
97	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	LU 19 & EP-8-The plan focuses on limited areas of town though it mentions 'Town centers'- and excludes aging corridors including areas such as exist in Natoma Station, American River Canyon, Lexington Hills among others with high and longstanding empty rates in existing strip malls.	No change. See Goal Section LU 7 (Commercial Centers)
98	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	LU 4.1.5 and Page M-16 Parking- we need to be encouraging under building parking or multi-level parking structures for high density residential units, highlighting efforts to increase open space around all projects. A requirement for underground parking/parking structures in high density areas to reduce heat islands of asphalt should be added.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
99	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	5.1.4 Senior Housing should be augmented by encouraging communities with on-site amenities and low impact transit, not just senior apartments and dementia units when discussing mixed use zoning.	No change. See Housing Element for more policies on senior housing.
100	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	LU 6.1 In regards to commercial centers- a reduction in allowed large parking lots, and encouraging under building parking should be strongly encouraged. Increase the size of landscape spaces and treed zones in parking lots, improved bicycle and pedestrian access through parking lots must be strongly supported.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
101	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	LU 6.1.5 & 8.1.2 Change open space requirement of commercial and mixed-use development to 15%, preferably 20% instead of 10%. Compensation for density/housing units can be accomplished with increased height variances in densely populated infill and I strongly support and encourage the City increasing height variances to allow for more open space in all new projects.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
102	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	LU 8.1.4 Signage should exclude the addition of massive "reader boards" along transportation corridors that disrupt the natural views and distract drivers.	Added "appropriately-scaled" signage
103	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	LU 8.1.7 District Identity- numerous small districts, already in existence, with "strip mall" type commercial areas need to be addressed and enhanced- businesses should be encouraged to diversify use with retro-fitting these areas with mixed use type buildings.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
104	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	M 1.1.4 Existing street retrofits should include traffic calming features, narrower width of streets, signed crosswalks, and bicycle lanes. A long-term funding plan should be developed to continue the retrofits.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
105	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	M 2.1.9 Single family high density should be defined as a land use that needs bicycle parking- these units are often small without adequate space for alternative transportation storage.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
106	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	M- 15 The consideration of the Capital Southeast Connector must contain alternative transit options to reduce greenhouse gases such as improved public transit along that corridor.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
107	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	Pg EP-6, Goal EP 3.2 Add section encouraging small lot farming/local produce production- Farm to Fork businesses. This will reduce transport of foodstuffs to some degree and add to a broader cultural perception of Folsom. All sites should not be "ready to develop" for housing and retail. This could be a good example of a public-private partnership that would enhance the community.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
108	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	Continuity of resources such as oak woodlands, savannahs, grasslands, riparian corridors along with protecting these areas from transit and high density corridors is essential and should require limiting public access to many of these "open space" areas.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
109	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	NCR 1.1.5 -I encourage a greater percentage of open spaces be designated as passive to encourage the persistence of various plant and animal species and enhancing the visual aspects of life in the foothills.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
110	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	NCR 1.1.8- It must be mandated that the tree planting areas in parking lots, along streets and in new development must be large enough to accommodate trees capable of creating a large canopy, that planting strips are large enough to accommodate multiple trees and allowing for root growth that is healthy for all plantings. Native trees should be strongly encouraged.	Modified Policy NCR 1.1.8
111	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	NCR 3.1.1- Regions need to co-operate on limiting ongoing intrusion into existing open spaces and look to improve air quality, water availability and habitat conservation by working together to create sustainable economies not dependent on ongoing outward sprawl. This would also serve to accommodate NCR 3.1.3 and Goal NCR 3.2- reducing vehicle miles traveled.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
112	Barbara Leary (May 23,2017)	PR 4.1.5 Coordinating with regional, State and Federal agencies - The River District mentioned by several residents at the prior hearing includes a variety of high could become high impact uses along what is State Park land. One of the great advantages of the current design of the Lake Natoma/American River parkway is that we have the opportunity to feel that we've left an urban area within a few blocks of our homes and can enjoy nature in its diverse form along the existing trails. A repeated goal in this document is stated as "managing, preserving and protecting the waterways" yet much of the uses as described by the "River District" proponents will not accomplish, and are actually, inconsistent with this. Ideas such as building a promenade along the waterfront, adding a dock large enough to accommodate party boats to cruise along Lake Natoma, adding a boathouse and ramps open the possibility of creating a commercial and obtrusive enterprise to what is valued by much of the Folsom and surrounding community as a valuable amenity as it already exists.	The details of the River District would be developed through the River District Master Plan.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
113	Barbara Leary (May 23, 2017)	Page PFS 3.1.1 Water Supply - I believe there is sufficient evidence, based on a recent State Water Board evaluation, that the water supply for further growth within the City boundaries is not sufficient to adequately supply already planned growth. Further investigation and planning regarding this section must be done.	The EIR will study this issue in detail and provide more information to the public about water supply.
114	Casey Kempenaar (May 19, 2017)	1. The update from the last round includes a fairly long description of the planning area. I do not disagree with the City including the Easton/Glenbrook area in the General Plan, as this is already entitled. Since any annexation would require a revenue neutrality agreement with Sacramento County, I have my doubts that this would pencil for the City.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
115	Casey Kempenaar (May 19, 2017)	My biggest contention is with the area south of Whiterock Road. During the last Council meeting Councilmember Howell voiced her opinion that the City need to annex this land to keep Rancho Cordova from annexing it first or prevent the County from building a strip club. Both these scenarios are unlikely and a red herring for continued sprawl southward (particularly since the land is owned by families with a track record of developing sprawl).	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
116	Casey Kempenaar (May 19, 2017)	The new addition (Page LU 9) to the DRAFT General Plan attempts to justify this expansion by saying “ However, the 2050 Sacramento Regional Blueprint identifies this area as “vacant urban designated land”. This implies that well SACOG identified it as vacant urban, so it must need to be planned for. Upon further review of SACOGs MTP, the area south of Whiterock is defined as: Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period: These areas of the region are not expected to develop to urban levels during the MTP/SCS planning period (2050). So the big question is – IF SACOG is saying that it is NOT expected to be developed by 2050 (by any City – Rancho Cordova OR Folsom) then - WHY is the City’s General Plan with a horizon of 2035 considering it within its future planning area? Again, I ask you - Please remove this area from the General Plan. If the City has no intentions of developing the land, the City should state that is the case for clarity. I’d love for the City to annex the land in as 100% permanent open space (but specify that in the Plan language). That would protect it from Strip Clubs and Rancho Cordova for sure.	No change. The SACOG MTP/SCS covers a period through 2036. As described in the General Plan, the 2050 Blueprint identified this area as "vacant urban designated land." This fact was included simply to explain that there may be regional pressures to develop the land, which is further justification for the City to monitor what goes on in this area. There are no policies in this General Plan supporting the development of this area.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
117	Casey Kempenaar (May 19, 2017)	<p>2. Since it seems the City is set on marching south of Whiterock Road, I had asked for a General Plan Policy to develop a greenbelt along the perimeter of the City so we can have a natural barrier to adjacent development. The City's response to comments states: No change was implemented because idea was captured in other policies or was contrary to City Council policy. I am unclear where this would be identified elsewhere and/or how this is contrary to Council policy? It is good planning, there are examples across the state including as nearby as Dixon. If the City keeps the area south of Whiterock Road in the Plan this greenbelt policy is of paramount importance.</p>	<p>Language has been added to the General Plan to clearly explain that the city is not "set on marching south of Whiterock Road." There has not been any other expressed interest in a greenbelt, however, this area is part of the County Habitat Conservation Plan.</p>
118	Casey Kempenaar (May 19, 2017)	<p>3. M 4.1.3. has to do with roadway impacts created by new development. If a new development reduces a intersection's LOS to E, it "may be acceptable due to costs of mitigation or when there would be other unacceptable impacts, such as right of way acquisition"... This is too easy for new development to wiggle out of making improvements to offset their impact. For example- Lets say a new development were to go in on Sibley Road causing the intersection at Glenn and Sibley to drop to LOS E. One potential mitigation could be to install sidewalk down the street (more than just onsite) from the development on the premise that enabling walking will reduce VMT, thereby improving intersection operations. Or what about building a transit stop? These are two examples of feasible mitigation measures - but does the development get a free pass because they may have to acquire some right of way to make it work or it cost too much? How much is too much? I agree with allowing exceptions, however, I recommend making some changes to ensure it is clear that they don't just get a free pass – some mitigation that achieves a trip reduction should still be considered. Perhaps a policy to develop a multi-modal transportation impact study guidelines would be helpful to address this concern and make it easier for staff when determining what is acceptable.</p>	<p>Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.</p>
119	Arts and Cultural Commission	Add language to strengthen attention to cultural diversity	Added new guiding principle #18

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
120	Will Kempton, Greater Folsom Partnership (June 1, 2017)	<p>At the May 23rd Council Meeting, we recognized that there has been a reasonable expression of concern from some residents within and adjacent to the boundaries of the proposed district. We provided suggested language that evening to respond to those concerns and I have attached a copy of that language to this email...</p> <p><u>River District Compatibility with Existing Land Uses.</u> Improve conditions along and within the proposed River District to accommodate a diverse mix of recreational users and activities. Designate and invest in strategically-located sites along the length of Lake Natoma for passive or active recreation and tourism activities that are compatible with nearby land uses, historically and culturally important sites, significant habitat areas, restoration sites, and native fish and wildlife usage. Enhance the role of Lake Natoma as a place to recreate, as an amenity for Folsom residents, neighborhoods adjacent to the lakefront, and in supporting local and regional business and commerce, including tourism, recreation and leisure.</p>	Added Policy LU-5.1.5
121	Will Kempton, Greater Folsom Partnership (June 1, 2017)	We suggest that on Page IM 5, the River District Master Plan be added to the list of Master Plans, Strategies and Programs that the City plans to consider in the future.	Modified
122	Will Kempton, Greater Folsom Partnership (June 1, 2017)	We also think that the timing for implementation of a River District Master Plan process as shown on Page IM 10 should be advanced to the 2017-19 timeframe as opposed to delaying this process until 2020-2024.	Staff and the consultants have considered this comment and do not recommend any changes.
<b>COMMENTS RECEIVED PRIOR TO APRIL 15, 2017 (addressed in April revisions)</b>			
#	Commenter	Comment	Action
123	Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) <b>Figure LU-1 Folsom 2035 Land Use Diagram</b> 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

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
124	Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) <b>Figure LU-1 Folsom 2035 Land Use Diagram</b> 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.
125	Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) <b>Figure LU-1 Folsom 2035 Land Use Diagram</b> 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
126	Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) <b>LU 1.1.3 Annexation and Services</b> 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• percentage of open space</li> <li>• availability of water</li> <li>• jobs/housing balance projected</li> <li>• VMT</li> <li>• Impact to existing City economics (i.e. are businesses leaving older areas to newer areas resulting in lower property values, blight, and disinvestment), etc.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p>(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 space, maximum VMT, etc) into the General Plan - I know that would give me more comfort.</p>	No change was implemented because idea was captured in other policies or was contrary to City Council policy.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
127	Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) <b>LU 3.1.5 East Bidwell Street, LU 3.1.6 Central Commercial District</b> 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.</p> <p>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 redevelopment of this area easier than greenfield development elsewhere in the City."</p>	<p>Added Implementation Program LU-4. Property Owner Outreach on Overlay Designations</p>
128	Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) <b>LU 4.1.2 Mix of Uses Near Station</b> 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.</p>	<p>Modified Policy LU 4.1.2</p>
129	Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) <b>LU 4.1.3 Zoning</b> 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>	<p>No change required. Overlay allows for mixed use zoning</p>
130	Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) <b>LU 5.1.8 Enhanced Walking and Biking</b> 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>	<p>No change was implemented because idea was captured in other policies or was contrary to City Council policy.</p>

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
131	Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) <b>M 2. 1.3 Sidewalk Network</b> 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.	No change. Policy already encourages filling sidewalk gaps. There is no neighborhood consensus on sidewalks in the Historic District.
132	Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) <b>M 4.1.3 Level of Service</b> 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. 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 occur. This will make implementation of this policy much easier. This is also applicable to Policy M 1.1.2.	No change
133	Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) <b>M 4.1.4 Capital Southeast Connector</b> 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%. Also applies to several of the overpasses affiliated with M 4.1.5.	No change
134	Casey Kempenaar	(February 13, 2017) <b>NCR 1.1. 7 Fugitive Light</b> 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 and avoided for all future projects.	No change

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
135	Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) <b>NCR 3.1.3 Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled</b> 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 ofWhiterock 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 for future legal challenges to the EIR or other future developments.</p>	No change
136	Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) <b>Economic Prosperity</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	No change
137	Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) <b>Greenbelt Buffer</b> 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 left surrounding us.</p>	No change
138	Casey Kempenaar	<p>(February 13, 2017) <b>Environmental Justice</b> The City should consider 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.</p>	No change. There are no disadvantaged communities in Folsom, as defined by SB 1000.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
139	David Storer, FedCorp	(March 27, 2017) <b>NEW GOAL: NCR 1.1.4 Enhancement of Folsom's Riverfront areas</b> 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:</i> 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 Department(s): Community Development; Supporting Department(s): Parks & Recreation and City Manager	Added new goal section LU-5 to Land Use Element and implementation Program LU-5.
140	David Storer, FedCorp	(March 27, 2017) 2. I am in support of the direction provided by the 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.
141	David Storer, FedCorp	(March 27, 2017) <b>NEW GOAL: PR 3.1.4 Riverfront project area master planning.</b> 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.
142	David Storer, FedCorp	(March 27, 2017) <b>New Proposed Implementation Measure: PR-3 Public engagement in community planning for Folsom's riverfront project area</b> . 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.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
143	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>1. Introduction Trend #2: Driving Less, Sidebar</b> 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 ( <a href="http://bikeleague.org/sites/default/files/Where_We_Ride_2014_data_web.pdf">http://bikeleague.org/sites/default/files/Where_We_Ride_2014_data_web.pdf</a> ). There are 18 cities with bike commute rates over 4%. This is a very small number of cities when compared to the number of cities included in the ACS.
144	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>Guiding Principles (GPs) GP #2: Focus on Historic Folsom as a center of shopping, dining, entertainment, and cultural attractions.</b> 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
145	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>GP #8: Brand Folsom as the "gateway to the Foothill Wine Region"</b> 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
146	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>GP# 10: Provide for a range of attractive and viable transportation options, such as bicycle, pedestrian, rail and transit .</b> "Bicycle" and "pedestrian" are not transportation options; " <b>bicycling</b> " and " <b>walking</b> " 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 transit use."	Modified Guiding Principle #10
147	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>Add new GP #18:</b> Promote the development of rooftop solar and other distributed, clean, renewable power generation.	No change

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
148	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>2. Land Use Figure LU-1 Folsom 2025 Land Use Diagram</b> 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 residents.	No change
149	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>2. Land Use Growth and Change</b> 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
150	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>LU 1.1.11 Infill Development</b> 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
151	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>Table LU-6: Overlay Designations</b> 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
152	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>Urban Centers/Historic Folsom.</b> 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
153	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>Mixed Use Districts</b> 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
154	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>LU 5.1.8 Enhance Walking and Biking</b> 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
155	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>LU 5.1.8 Enhance Walking and Biking</b> 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
156	Anthony Powers	<b>LU 5.1.8 Enhance Walking and Biking</b> 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
157	Anthony Powers	<b>LU 5.1.8 Enhance Walking and Biking</b> 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 calming program.	Added new Policy M 4.1.10
158	Anthony Powers	<b>LU 8.1.3 Eliminate Large Blocks</b> 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.
159	Anthony Powers	<b>LU 8.1.5 Pedestrian-Friendly Entrances</b> 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
160	Anthony Powers	<b>U 8.1.11 Cut-Through Traffic</b> 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
161	Anthony Powers	<b>3. Mobility</b> 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

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
162	Anthony Powers	<b>General Mobility</b> 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
163	Anthony Powers	<b>MI.1.4 Existing Streets Retrofits</b> 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
164	Anthony Powers	<b>MI.1.5 Connected Neighborhoods</b> 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
165	Anthony Powers	<b>MI.1.8 ITS Master Plan</b> 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
166	Anthony Powers	<b>Pedestrians and Cyclists</b> 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 pedestrians.	No change
167	Anthony Powers	<b>GoalM2.1</b> Should say " ... encourages people to walk and bike for transportation in safety and comfort, ... ".	No change
168	Anthony Powers	<b>M2.1.2 New Sidewalks</b> 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
169	Anthony Powers	<b>M2.1.3 Sidewalk Network</b> 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 here, in the 2035 GP.	No change. Policy already encourages filling sidewalk gaps. There is no neighborhood consensus on sidewalks in the Historic District.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
170	Anthony Powers	<b>M2.1.5. Bikeway Facility Hierarchy</b> 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)
171	Anthony Powers	<b>M2.1.6 Design Guidelines</b> Suggest adopting NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide as an alternative design guide.	No change. Design standards are appropriate for Bikeway Master Plan.
172	Anthony Powers	<b>M2.1.7 Road Repair</b> 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
173	Anthony Powers	<b>M2.1.8 Bicycle Safety Education</b> 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
174	Anthony Powers	<b>M2.1.9 Bicycle Parking</b> 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)
175	Anthony Powers	<b>M 2.1.12 American River Path</b> 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)
176	Anthony Powers	<b>M 2.1.13 Intersections</b> "Bicycles" should be "bicyclists". What about existing intersections?	Modified Policy 2.1.13 (now M 2.1.14)
177	Anthony Powers	<b>M 2.1.14 Funding</b> 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
178	Anthony Powers	<b>Ml.1.15 Safe Routes to School</b> Good! The reference to state and federal SR2S programs needs to be updated to reflect the consolidation into the Active Transportation Program.	No change

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
179	Anthony Powers	<b>M1.1.16 Public Involvement</b> 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
180	Anthony Powers	<b>Vehicular Traffic and Parking</b> The introduction should refer to drivers of cars, trucks and other vehicles, not the vehicles themselves.	Modified text on p. M-13
181	Anthony Powers	<b>M4.1.1 Road Network Hierarchy</b> The definition of Collector and Minor Collector does not match the designations on Fig. M-1: Major Collector and Collector.	Modified Figure M-1
182	Anthony Powers	<b>M4.1.2 Roadway Maintenance</b> " .. 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 that.	Modified Policy M 4.1.2
183	Anthony Powers	<b>M4.1.3 Level of Service</b> 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
184	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>M4.1.7 Landscape Maintenance Assessment Agreements</b> 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 roadway.	No change
185	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>M4.2.2 Reduce Minimum Parking Standards</b> 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
186	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>M7.1.3 Funding Sources</b> 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
187	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>PFS 3.1.7 Water Supply</b> Add the word "diversified" before supply of water. We should not be relying entirely on one source of water.	No change
188	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>PFS 7.1.4 Optimal Siting</b> 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
189	Anthony Powers	(March 27, 2017) <b>9. Safety and Noise</b> This chapter should include a goal regarding traffic safety. This should be a commitment to Vision Zero!	No change

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
194	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
195	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)
196	Heritage Preservation League	(March 11) <b>Land Use Map</b> 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
197	Heritage Preservation League	(March 11) <b>Existing Corporation Yard Site</b> 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
198	Heritage Preservation League	<p>(March 11) <b>Historic Folsom Light Rail Station</b> 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 the two commuter stations along Folsom Boulevard.</p>	Modified Policy LU 4.1.2
199	Heritage Preservation League	<p>(March 11) <b>Railroad Wye</b> 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

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
200	Heritage Preservation League	<p>(March 11) <b>Southern Pacific Rail Corridor</b> 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.</p> <p>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. <b>The rail corridor can also accommodate pedestrian and bicycle transportation.</b></p>	No change
201	Heritage Preservation League	<p>(March 11) <b>The Chinese Digging Site</b> A small portion of the historic 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).</p> <p>The City will now be able to implement the initial idea; to preserve the digging site as open space and start planning for safe public access to a portion of the site. This project also needs to be listed among the goals of the General Plan and the land use designation for the 8-acre site should be open space.</p>	Modified Land Use Diagram to reflect Open Space designation

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
202	Heritage Preservation League	(March 11) <b>Natural and Cultural Resources Element</b> 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.
203	Heritage Preservation League	<b>Summary of Proposed Changes:</b>	
204	Heritage Preservation League	1. Delineate the boundary of the 98-block Historic District on the General Plan Map.	Modified Land Use Diagram
205	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
206	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
207	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

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
208	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.
209	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
210	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
211	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
212	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
213	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 list of cultural resources, and Implementation Program NCR-4 (Cultural Resources Inventory) calls for maintaining a cultural resources inventory.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
214	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
215	Heritage Preservation League	Page I-9. Add a Guiding Principle regarding the Historic Residential Area.	Added Policy 6.1.2
216	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
217	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
218	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
219	Heritage Preservation League	Page NCR-5. Policy NCR 2.1.1 needs to include "New development shall not adversely impact historical sites".	No change
220	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.
221	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
222	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
223	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 place.	No change
224	Heritage Preservation League	Page PFS-3. The Historic Preservation Master Plan needs to be listed to be maintained and implemented.	Added NNCR-4
225	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
226	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

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
227	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 already has a separate Recreation Element.
228	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.
229	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
230	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
231	Tim Hansen	<b>1. Transportation within the city.</b> I noticed the plan talks extensively about bike transportation, and the 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
232	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
233	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
234	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 lodging, would be highly desirable.	No change
235	Parks and Rec Commission	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
236	Parks and Rec Commission	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 this goal.	Modified, as described above
237	Parks and Rec Commission	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.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
238	Parks and Rec Commission	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
239	Parks and Rec Commission	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
240	<b>Town Hall Forum Comments</b>		
241	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. Chines 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
242	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 theme!	Comment noted. This is a major focus of the Economic Prosperity Element.
243	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 are reduced.	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.
244	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 quite obvious.	

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
245	Kritika B	<p>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 project.</p> <p>I've also seen a spike in litter and graffiti over the last 3 years - which seems to be a sign of growth - but it'd be nice to retain the cleanliness and beauty of the small town Folsom I came to in 2004.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Natural and Cultural Resources Element, Goal NCR 1.1 addresses wildlife habitat preservation.</p>
246	Mike B	<p>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.</p>	<p>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</p>
247	Mike B	<p>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 &amp; 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 some sidewalk standards.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Pedestrian Master Plan contains pedestrian design considerations.</p>

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
248	Mike B	<p>Please provide a crosswalk between the way this plan is organized and the required elements (and other guidance) in the General Plan Guidelines:</p> <p>Chapter 4: Required Elements  Land Use  Circulation  Housing  Conservation  Open-Space  Noise  Safety</p> <p>Also, any optional elements, including Air Quality using the best available guidance for that.</p>	The Introduction contains a crosswalk showing how the Folsom 2035 General Plan elements relate to the State mandated elements.
249	Mike B	<p>* 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 only used for occasional tourist trains now doesn't mean it has to stay that way!</p>	Comments noted. No change.
250	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.
251	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.
252	Elisa L	<p>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.</p>	Comment noted. No change.

#	Commenter	Comment	Action
253	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.