#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						barriers to improve connectivity."
228	7/31/2008	Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 1.3.3.b (Grade separated crossings) Recommend including canals and other barriers (creeks, etc.) in this section so as not to limit the plan to railroad and freeway crossings.	2-163	**Recommended** Revised bullet "b" in policy: "The City shall plan and seek funding to construct grade-separated crossings of freeways, ~~and~~ rail lines, canals, creeks, and other barriers to improve connectivity."
229	8/5/2008	Mod	Larry Greene, SMAQMD	M 1.3.3.b (Grade separated crossings) The District recommends that this measure also address other barriers to mobility by rephrasing it to read: "The City shall plan and seek funding to construct grade-separated crossings of freeways and rail lines and other barriers to improve connectivity."	2-163	**Recommended** Revised bullet "b" in policy: "The City shall plan and seek funding to construct grade-separated crossings of freeways, ~~and~~ rail lines, canals, creeks, and other barriers to improve connectivity."
230	7/31/2008	Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M.1.3.3 (Eliminate Gaps) The Sacramento TMA supports the elimination of bikeway gaps, and notes that the term "well-connected" in M 1.3.1 should be defined or clarified by establishing connectivity standards.	2-163	**Recommended with Modifications** New implementation measure will be added: "The City shall prepare and adopt connectivity standards based on a review of standard applied by other municipalities with similar policy goals."

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
231	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 1.3.3 (Eliminate Gaps) We support this policy but note that a new multi-modal crossing of the American River that includes a travel lane for vehicles would not be consistent with the Parkway General Plan. We recommend that this clarification be added.	2-163	**Comment Noted** The City's analysis of potential multi-modal river crossings is not yet complete; therefore the form that such a crossing might take, including where it would be located and what modes would be accommodated, has not yet been determined. If needed, the American River Parkway Plan provides a mechanism to initiate an amendment for consistency with the 2030 General Plan.
232	7/31/2008	Edit	Traci Canfield, RT	M 1.3.6 (Regional Transportation Planning): Add coordination with Sac RT.	2-164	**Recommended** Edit M 1.3.6 as follows: "...and continue to work with the Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) and the California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) on transportation planning, operations, and funding."
233	7/31/2008	New	Traci Canfield, RT	Goal M 1.4 (Transportation Demand Management): Suggest adding a policy that the City shall provide information for these programs through indoor/outdoor means such as kiosks, way-finding, information, signs, etc.	2-164	**Not Recommended** These programs are under Sacramento Regional Transit District's jurisdiction; however, we will work with RT as indicated in M 1.3.6.

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
234	7/25/2008	New	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 1.4 (Transportation Demand Management) Recommend adding a goal to decrease Vehicle Miles Traveled.	2-164	**Addressed Elsewhere** We are using this as an Indicator as part of the Livability Index (see Part 4, page 4-3), but not as part of the General Plan Goals and Policies.
235	7/31/2008	New	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 1.4 (Transportation Demand Management) Recommend adding a goal to decrease Vehicle Miles Traveled.	2-164	**Addressed Elsewhere** We are using this as an Indicator as part of the Livability Index (see Part 4, page 4-3), but not as part of the General Plan Goals and Policies.
236	8/5/2008	Mod/New	Larry Greene, SMAQMD	Include the objective of reducing per capita vehicle miles traveled.		**Addressed Elsewhere** We are using this as an Indicator as part of the Livability Index (see Part 4, page 4-3), but not as part of the General Plan Goals and Policies.
237	7/31/2008	Other	Sue Teranishi	M 1.4 (Transportation Demand Management) We need to do more with Transportation Demand Management, including discouraging more people from driving alone.	2-164	**Comment Noted**
238	7/31/2008	Edit	Traci Canfield, RT	M 1.4.1: Add RT to the list of agencies	2-164	**Recommended** Edit policy as follows: **"M 1.4.1 Increase Vehicle Occupancy.** The City shall work with a broad range of

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						agencies (e.g., SACOG, SMAQMD, Sacramento Regional Transit District, Caltrans) to encourage and support programs…."
239	7/25/2008	Mod	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 1.4.2. (Commute Trip Reduction) Retitle to "Automobile Commute Trip Reduction". Recommend adding parking cash-out programs and spelling out that bicycle facilities include bike parking, clothing lockers and showers.	2-164	**Recommended with Modifications** New policy title: **"M 1.4.2 Automobile Commute Trip Reduction"** Parking cash-out is addressed by Policy M 6.1.8. Bicycle facilities are addressed by Policy M 5.1.11.
240	7/31/2008	Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 1.4.2. (Commute Trip Reduction) Retitle to "Automobile Commute Trip Reduction". Recommend adding parking cash-out programs and specifying that bicycle facilities include bike parking, clothing lockers and showers.	2-164	**Recommended with Modifications** New policy title: **M 1.4.2 Automobile Commute Trip Reduction** Parking cash-out is addressed by Policy M 6.1.8. Bicycle facilities are addressed by Policy M 5.1.11.
241	7/31/2008	Mod	Jodi Samuels, Planning	M 1.4.2, 1.4.3 – Why are these policies for Transportation Demand	2-164	**Not Recommended** The current language is

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
			Commissioner	Management written as "encourage" instead of "require"? The language used here should be stronger.		consistent with California state law.
242	7/25/2008	Other	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 1.5.5 (Neighborhood Electric Vehicles) Encouraging street systems that support NEV use will also encourage use by bicyclists and pedestrians. NEVs may only be driven on streets with a speed limit of 35mph or lower. Slower speeds make pedestrian and bicycle use safer. Including NEVs in the General Plan helps assure that we have Complete Streets, provided that they are not separate facilities for the NEVs.	2-165	**Addressed Elsewhere** See Goal M 4.2 (Complete Streets) which directs the provision of streets that meet the diverse needs of diverse users. Also see Mobility Implementation Measure # 9, which would develop NEV standards.
243	7/31/2008	Other	Jodi Samuels, Planning Commissioner	M 1.5.5 (Neighborhood Electric Vehicles)– Are there issues with current City ordinances that could prevent the use of Neighborhood Electric Vehicles?	2-165	**Addressed Elsewhere** Mobility Implementation Measure # 9 directs the City to develop standards for future NEV facilities. This would include studies to determine conflicts with existing City ordinances and identify resolutions.
244	7/31/2008	Other	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 1.5.5 (Neighborhood Electric Vehicles) Encouraging street systems that support NEV use will also encourage use by bicyclists and pedestrians. NEVs may only be driven on streets with a speed limit of 35mph or lower. Slower speeds make pedestrian and bicycle use safer. Including NEVs in the General Plan	2-165	**Comment Noted**

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				helps assure that we have Complete Streets, provided that they are not separate facilities for the NEVs.		
245	8/5/2008	Endorsement	Larry Greene, SMAQMD	M 1.5.5 (Neighborhood Electric Vehicles) The District endorses.		**Comment Noted**
246	9/29/08	New	EIR Mitigation	Add the following new policy under Goal M 1.5 as part of project mitigation: **"M 1.5.6 Provide Fair Share of Intelligent Transportation Systems Improvements.** The City shall coordinate with Caltrans and provide a fair share of funding to implement Intelligent Transportation Systems improvements on the following freeway segments: • Interstate 5 – Arena Boulevard to I-80 • Interstate 5 – I-80 to West El Camino Avenue • State Route 50 – Freeport Boulevard to State Route 99 • State Route 50 – 59th Street to 65th Street • State Route 50 – Howe Avenue to Watt Avenue • State Route 51 (Capital City Freeway) – Watt Avenue to I-80 • State Route 51 (Capital City Freeway) – Arden Way to El Camino Avenue		**Recommended**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				• State Route 99 – Broadway to 12th Avenue"		
247	7/31/2008	Other	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 1.6 (Transportation and Land Use Coordination) The Mobility Element should support and reinforce the Land Use Element of the GP.		**Comment Noted**
248	7/31/2008	New	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 1.7 (Equity of Access) People's ability to walk or bike to local services varies widely across the City. Pedestrian and bicycle access is often much more difficult in poorer neighborhoods, especially along major arterials. This is an environmental justice issue and also has serious implications for health and nutrition. ECOS recommends that the City adopt a stated Equity of Access policy committing to enhanced ped/bike access in underserved areas of the City. We suggest the following language: "The City shall prioritize low-income areas when considering roadway improvements to enhance pedestrian and bicycle access to services."		**Addressed Elsewhere** The City has an adopted Pedestrian Master Plan and a court order to provide access for the disabled. Social justice will be a factor in the prioritization of the implementation of these plans.
249	2/08	New	Long Range Planning Staff, based on Annie deSalernos via Accessibility Town Hall Forum	Encourage paths and sidewalks that are accessible to disabled people between light rail stations and multi-family developments.		**Recommended with Modifications** Add the following new policy under Goal M 1.3 (Barrier Removal): "M 1.3.7 Barrier Removal

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						for Accessibility. The City shall remove barriers, where feasible, to allow people of all abilities to have access within and among infrastructure serving the community."
250	7/31/2008	Other	Anonymous	M2 It is important to improve pedestrian accessibility and safety, especially in the downtown.	2-167	**Comment Noted** Goal M 2.1 addresses pedestrian safety.
251	7/31/2008	New	Traci Canfield, RT	Goal M 2.1: Add a policy on transit connectivity: "The City shall provide direct pedestrian routes to transit stops and stations with amenities designed for a pleasant walking environment."	2-167	**Recommended with Modifications** Will address by adding language on complete streets to M 1.3.4 as follows: "The City shall provide connections to transit stations by identifying roadway, bikeway, and pedestrianway improvements to be constructed within ½ mile of major transit stations. Transportation improvements in the vicinity of major transit stations shall emphasize the development of complete streets." The City cannot guarantee access improvements to all transit stations because the

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						funding for such improvements is tied to new development. In built-out areas where development may not occur at sufficient levels to fund access improvements, a new funding source would need to be identified.
252	7/31/2008	Other	Sue Teranishi	M 2.1 We are an aging population and need to make it safer to walk places. Complete Streets needs to be the philosophy of the future because streets are not just for motor vehicles.	2-167	**Comment Noted**
253	7/31/2008	Mod	City Staff, Department of Transportation, Planning	DOT: M 2.1.1: Change as follows: "The City shall maintain ~~and implement~~ a Pedestrian Master Plan that defines the type and location of pedestrian-oriented streets and pathways; ~~standards for sidewalk width, improvements, amenities, and street crossings; the schedule for public improvements; and developer responsibilities~~." Planning: Add language about the Pedestrian Master Plan carrying out the General Plan's goals and policies, and about requiring new development to be consistent with the Pedestrian Master Plan.	2-167	**Recommended with Modifications** New Policy Language: M 2.1.1 Pedestrian Master Plan. The City shall maintain and implement a Pedestrian Master Plan that carries out the goals and policies of the General Plan and defines: the type and location of pedestrian-oriented streets and pathways; standards for sidewalk width, improvements, amenities, and street crossings; the schedule for public improvements; and

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						developer responsibilities. All new development shall be consistent with the applicable provisions of the Pedestrian Master Plan. (MPSP)"
254	7/31/2008	Mod	City Staff, Department of Transportation	M 2.1.1 The Pedestrian Corridors and Nodes Map as shown in the Pedestrian Master Plan (PMP page 57, Figure 5.4) should be either included or referenced. This is the currently adopted policy for pedestrian planning in the city.	2-167	**Recommended** Map will be added to Mobility Element.
255	7/31/2008	New	City Staff, Department of Transportation	M 2.1.1 A key message of our currently adopted Pedestrian Master Plan is that all areas of the City should have a basic level of pedestrian facilities, and that depending upon the level of activities and land uses, some areas should receive even more than a basic level. I think that the General Plan should be indicating this. Perhaps this could be a stand-alone policy statement.	2-167	**Addressed Elsewhere** Prioritization of pedestrian facility improvements will be addressed as Community Plans are updated.
256	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 2.1.10 (Safe Pedestrian Crossings) Remove "bulb-outs." Bulb-outs are opposed by bicycle advocates because they create a major hazard to bicyclists while providing only minimal benefit to pedestrians.	2-169	**Not Recommended** There is not sufficient basis to rule out the possibility of using bulb-outs in the General Plan. Specific design standards can be addressed at other levels, such as in the Bicycle Master

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						Plan, the Pedestrian Master Plan, and on a project-by-project basis.
257	7/31/2008	Other	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 2.1.11 (Speed Management Policies) The Sacramento TMA supports development of speed management policies and notes that lower speeds benefit the safety of bicyclists and motorists as well as pedestrians.	2-169	**Comment Noted**
258	7/31/2008	Mod	Traci Canfield, RT	M 2.1.2: Add that transit stops must connect to the curb from the sidewalks.	2-167	**Addressed Elsewhere** This design standard is too specific for inclusion in the General Plan. Refer to Mobility Implementation Measure # 1, which calls for the development of new multi-modal street standards.
259	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 2.1.2 (Sidewalk design) Change "in districts intended to support active pedestrian use" to "wherever possible." All sidewalks should be designed to encourage active pedestrian use.	2-167	**Recommended** New policy language: "The City shall require that sidewalks ~~in districts intended to support active pedestrian use~~ wherever possible be developed…"
260	7/31/2008	Mod	Traci Canfield, RT	M 2.1.3: Add transit shelters	2-168	**Recommended** Revise policy as follows: **"M 2.1.3 Streetscape Design.** The City shall require pedestrian-oriented streets shall be designed to provide a pleasant environment for walking

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						including shade trees; plantings; well-designed benches, trash receptacles, news racks, and other furniture; pedestrian-scaled lighting fixtures; wayfinding signage; integrated transit shelters; public art; and other amenities."
261	7/31/2008	Other	Jodi Samuels, Planning Commissioner	M 2.1.3 – What is the City policy for replacement of trees in the context of this policy on Streetscape Design? From personal experiences, I've seen many trees removed and not replaced for weeks or months. As a City of Trees, we need to have a clear policy about the process and timeline for tree replacement.	2-168	**Addressed Elsewhere** This will be addressed in the update of the Urban Forest Management Plan, required by Environmental Resources Implementation Measure # 3. Also, Environmental Resources Implementation Measure # 5 directs the City to prepare and continually update an inventory of trees within the city. This can be used to require a more timely replacement of street trees.
262	7/31/2008	Mod	City Staff, Department of Transportation	M 2.1.4 Add: How the City shall work to provide pedestrian walkways in areas that currently have none.	2-168	**Addressed Elsewhere** Prioritization of pedestrian facility improvements will be addressed as Community Plans are updated.
263	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 2.1.5 (Continuous Network) Add "Pedestrian crosswalks shall be provided at every leg of every intersection, to provide a continuous	2-168	**Not Recommended** The recommended language is too absolute and cannot be included due to the lack of

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				network."		an identified funding mechanism for implementation.
264	7/31/2008	Mod	Traci Canfield, RT	M 2.1.6: Add examples, such as entrances facing streets and opening to sidewalks	2-168	**Recommended** Revise Policy M 2.1.6 as follows: "The City shall ensure that new buildings are designed to engage the street and encourage walking through design features such as placing the building with entrances facing the street and providing connections to sidewalks."
265	7/31/2008	Mod	City Staff, Department of Transportation	M 2.1.6 Suggest: "The City shall ensure that new buildings are designed to engage the street and encourage walking". Also reference appropriate urban design sections here.	2-168	**Recommended** Revise Policy M 2.1.6 as follows: "The City shall ensure that new buildings are designed to engage the street and encourage walking through design features such as placing the building with entrances facing the street and providing connections to sidewalks."
266	7/31/2008	Mod	Traci Canfield, RT	M 2.1.8: Replace "bus stops" with "transit stops and stations".	2-169	**Recommended** Edit Policy M 2.1.8 as follows: **"M 2.1.8 Housing and Destination Connections.**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						The City shall require new subdivisions and large-scale developments to include safe pedestrian walkways that provide direct links between streets and major destinations such as ~~bus stops~~ transit stops and stations, schools, parks, and shopping centers."
267	7/31/2008	Other	Sue Teranishi	M 2.1.8 We need to provide shortcuts for bicyclists and pedestrians to encourage more non-motorized travel.	2-169	**Comment Noted**
268	7/31/2008	Map Change	Traci Canfield, RT	Page 2-175 Diagram: Add DNA's optional stations: Metro Air Park and 7th Street/Railyards	2-175	**Not Recommended** Adopted stations are the appropriate level of detail; we do not want to show features that may not come to pass.
269	7/31/2008	Edit	Traci Canfield, RT	Public Transit (M3) Intro.: Rewrite last sentence: "Plans will be developed for all modes of transit, such as…". Add light rail to the list.	2-171	**Comment Noted** Wording of intro already addresses additions of lines to existing service
270	2/08	Other	Merle Levy via Accessibility Town Hall Forum	Paratransit should have shorter trips for commuters.		**Comment Noted** M 3.1.9 (Demand-Responsive System) indicates support of the provision of paratransit services. The type of service provided is best addressed during implementation.
271	7/31/2008	Other	Ed Cox, DOT	Map:	2-173	**Recommended**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				I'm not sure what is meant on this map with the yellow arrow lines. The legend says "Candidate Transit Corridor," but all I see is straight lines with arrowheads connecting activity centers. I'm not sure I see the logic to this map. On one hand there is an indication of a connection between the downtown area and the 65th Street Light Rail Station area, which already exists. On the other hand, there is no indication of a connection between downtown and any activity centers north of the American River. How will this map be useful?		Further clarification of map will be provided in introduction to M 3: "Figure M1 shows transit corridors including existing and future light rail routes, the Capitol Corridor rail line, the proposed high speed rail alignment, and candidate transit corridors. The candidate transit corridors shown on Figure 1 do not represent specific routes but indicate links between major activity centers that are anticipated to be served in the future by bus service such as bus rapid transit, enhanced bus, and/or express bus service."
272	7/31/2008	New	Phil Garcia, Exec. Director, Govt. and Civil Affairs, Sacramento State University	Please add this policy: M 3.1.X Public University Transit Plans The City shall continue to work with public institutions of higher education to support projects, programs and plans that reduce single occupancy vehicle automobile trips and increase the use of alternative modes of transportation.		**Addressed Elsewhere** Too specific for the General Plan. Could be addressed in the Community Plans.
273	7/25/2008	New	Walt Seifert, SABA	Goal M 3.1 Accommodations for bicycles on transit should be included in these policies.	2-171	**Recommended with Modifications** The City cannot guarantee

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				Multi-modal transportation would be encouraged by this inclusion. Direct Access to Stations (M 3.1.12) and bicycle parking are both important, but many riders will want their bikes at the other end of their transit trips. For this reason, SABA suggests including bicycle accommodations on all modes of transit, and policies that ensure that any new transit options will include these accommodations in the future.		bicycle access on transit because such facilities are under the jurisdiction of the applicable transit agencies New policy language will be added: "**M 3.1.1 Transit for All.** The City shall support a well-designed transit system that meets the transportation needs of Sacramento residents and visitors including seniors, the disabled, and transit-dependent persons. <u>The City shall enhance bicycle and pedestrian access to stations.</u>"
274	7/31/2008	New	Traci Canfield, RT	Goal M 3.1: Add policy that the City work with transit providers to incorporate transit facilities into new private development and City project designs. Suggest including incorporation of transit infrastructure, electricity, fiber, etc.	2-171	**Recommended with Modifications** Will address by adding language to 3.1.10: "**M 3.1.10 New Facilities.** <u>The City shall work with transit providers to incorporate transit facilities into new private development and City project designs including incorporation of transit infrastructure (i.e.,</u>

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						electricity, fiberoptic cable, etc.). The City shall work with transit providers to identify alignments for light rail and bus route extensions and new station locations."
275	7/31/2008	Other	Sue Teranishi	M 3.1 Bus stops need to be on sidewalks with safe areas for waiting.	2-171	**Comment Noted**
276	7/25/2008	Mod	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 3.1.1 (Transit for All) Transit for All should include bicyclists more fully. Bicycle access to transit stations and stops vastly increases the "rider shed" for transit. The Federal Highway Administration's Course on Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation points out the advantages to bicyclists as well as the advantages to the transit system. For example, cyclists are able to travel farther distances and overcome topographical barriers, and services to recreational destinations during off-peak periods can increase overall ridership and efficient use of capacity.	2-171	**Recommended with Modifications** Will add language about cyclists to policy. "**M 3.1.1 Transit for All.** The City shall support a well-designed transit system that meets the transportation needs of Sacramento residents and visitors including seniors, the disabled, and transit-dependent persons. The City shall enhance bicycle and pedestrian access to stations."
277	7/31/2008	Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 3.1.1 (Transit for All) Transit for All should include bicyclists more emphatically. Bicycle access to transit stations and stops vastly increases the "rider shed" for transit.	2-171	**Recommended with Modifications** Will add language about cyclists to policy. "**M 3.1.1 Transit for All.** The City shall support a

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						well-designed transit system that meets the transportation needs of Sacramento residents and visitors including seniors, the disabled, and transit-dependent persons. The City shall enhance bicycle and pedestrian access to stations."
278	7/31/2008	Edit	Traci Canfield, RT	M 3.1.1: Add lifeline and lifestyle riders to the list.	2-171	**Not Recommended** Current list is considered comprehensive by staff.
279	7/31/2008	Edit	Traci Canfield, RT	M 3.1.11: Please revise: "...suitable for transit services"	2-172	**Recommended** New policy language. "The City shall assist Regional Transit in identifying and preserving rights-of-way suitable for ~~light rail and bus rapid~~ transit services."
280	7/31/2008	New	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 3.1.12 (Direct Access to Stations) Many riders will want their bikes at the other end of their transit trips. Because of this, the Sacramento TMA suggests including bicycle accommodations on all modes of transit, and policies that ensure that any new transit options will include these accommodations in the future.	2-172	**Addressed Elsewhere** The City cannot guarantee bicycle access on transit because such facilities are under the jurisdiction of the applicable transit agencies New policy language will be added: **"M 3.1.1 Transit for All.**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						The City shall support a well-designed transit system that meets the transportation needs of Sacramento residents and visitors including seniors, the disabled, and transit-dependent persons. The City shall enhance bicycle and pedestrian access to stations."
281	7/31/2008	Other	Terry Preston	M 3.1.12 Direct Access to Stations. - The City should also work to provide pedestrian and bicycle improvements within a quarter mile of major transit stops and as needed at all transit stops to ensure safe, easy walking and biking to transit.	2-172	**Comment Noted** The City cannot guarantee improvements around all major transit stops. The policy directs the City to extract transit benefits from new development projects near light rail stations, but in built-out areas with limited development opportunities, there will be less opportunity to improve access without identifying a new funding source.
282	7/31/2008	New/Mod	Traci Canfield, RT	M 3.1.13: Suggest revising: "Light Rail Extensions and Enhancements. The City shall support…South Sacramento and other improvements to facilities (such as Royal Oaks, Swanston, and 65th St. stations)." Suggest adding a similar policy to support transit centers.	2-175	**Recommended** New policy language: "**M 3.1.13 Light Rail Extensions and Enhancements** ~~to Airport and South Sacramento~~. The City shall support the extension of light rail service

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						to Sacramento International Airport, ~~and~~ further extension in South Sacramento and other improvements to facilities such as the 65th Street, Royal Oaks, and Swanston stations."
283	7/31/2008	Other	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 3.1.13 Although ECOS strongly supports enhanced transit access to and from the Sacramento International Airport, we do not support the City's clear commitment to the currently proposed Light Rail expansion to the airport. Most of the City is currently grossly underserved by transit. There is a need for more guidance in the policies with regard to public transit priorities and other modes of transport in consideration of the most efficient and beneficial fiscal resource allocation that supports the multifaceted goals of the general plan. An expensive new light rail line to the airport with questionable ridership numbers and serious environmental implications should not be a City transportation priority at this time.	2-175	**Comment Noted**
284	7/31/2008	Other	Dennis Rogers, North State BIA	M 3.1.15/16 Dedicated Bus Facilities, Developer Contributions. We are supportive of contributing to transit infrastructure, but have concerns	2-176	**Comment Noted**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				with dedicated bus lanes. In reviewing this policy, we again raise the concern that the ability to fully fund the operations of the transit system will not keep pace with the investment of the infrastructure.		
285	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 3.1.12 (Direct Access to Stations) Remove "to the extent feasible" (this is inherent in all policy statements). Also, add "direct grade level pedestrian and bicycle access to the station area." RT currently has plans for the new south area stations that include pedestrian over-crossings of major roadways. These are not acceptable as routes into a transit facility, and should be replaced with grade-level crossings.		**Not Recommended** The language "to the extent feasible" is necessary to avoid forcing small developers to overcome major access barriers that are out of their control. Specific design standards such as "direct grade level pedestrian and bicycle access to the station area" are outside the scope of the General Plan and should be addressed on a project-by-project basis.
286	7/31/2008	Other	Traci Canfield, RT	M 3.1.4: Comment: Fares are a financial and RT Board issue, unless the City is able to subsidize RT fares.	2-171	**Comment Noted** The City still deems it appropriate to include a policy to work with RT to reduce fares.
287	7/31/2008	Mod	Traci Canfield, RT	M 3.1.6: Suggest expanding this to include "safe, clean, comfortable waiting environment" at all transit stops (not just stations) that meet transit providers' standards.	2-172	**Recommended** New policy language: "**M 3.1.6 Safe System.** The City shall coordinate with Regional Transit to maintain a safe, clean, comfortable,

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						and rider-friendly waiting environment ~~near transit stations~~ at all transit stops within the city."
288	7/31/2008	Other	Traci Canfield, RT	M 3.1.7: Suggest adding that the City will provide reinforced bus pads at stops during street development or renovations. Comment: RT does not support Business Access Transit lanes as a "transit only lane" option; RT does not recognize them as an enhancement to bus service.	2-172	**Comment Noted**
289	7/31/2008	Edit	Traci Canfield, RT	M 3.1.8: Why is this policy limited to just bus and light rail?	2-172	**Recommended** New policy language: "**M 3.1.8 ~~Light Rail and Bus~~ Transit Service.** The City shall support the enhancement and improvement of ~~light rail and bus~~ transit service."
290	7/31/2008	New/Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 3.3.2 (Taxi Service) Sacramento's taxi fleet contains a disproportionate number of old vehicles with poor gas mileage. ECOS encourages the City to regulate the gas mileage and/or fuel type of taxis or to provide incentives for improvements.	2-177	**Recommended with Modifications.** The following new language will be added: "**M 3.3.2 Taxi Service.** The City shall promote the continued operation of taxi service, including the provision of dedicated on-street loading spaces where appropriate, incremental improvements in gas mileage, and improved

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						access for passengers with disabilities."
291	7/31/2008	New/Mod	Long Range Planning Staff	Sacramento's taxi fleet should be more accessible to people in wheelchairs and others with disabilities.	2-177	**Recommended with Modifications.** The following new language will be added: **"M 3.3.2 Taxi Service.** The City shall promote the continued operation of taxi service, including the provision of dedicated on-street loading spaces where appropriate, incremental improvements in gas mileage, and improved access for passengers with disabilities."
292	7/25/2008	New	Walt Seifert, SABA	This Element should include a policy supporting the preferred use of roundabouts instead of signals. Roundabouts are an air pollution and CO2 reduction measure, safer for motorists and can be safer and more convenient for bicyclists.		**Recommended with Modifications.** New policy: **"M 4.1.6 Roundabouts.** Roundabouts, as an intersection traffic control option with demonstrated air quality and safety benefits, shall be considered where deemed feasible and appropriate."
293	7/31/2008	New	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	Include a policy supporting the preferred use of roundabouts instead of signals. Roundabouts are a air pollution and CO2 reduction measure, safer for		**Recommended with Modifications.** New policy: **"M 4.1.6 Roundabouts.**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				motorists and can be safer and more convenient for bicyclists.		Roundabouts, as an intersection traffic control option with demonstrated air quality and safety benefits, shall be considered where deemed feasible and appropriate."
294	7/31/2008	Mod	Jodi Samuels, Planning Commissioner	Commercial Streets – This description sounds like exactly what we're trying to avoid: "buildings set back behind fronting parking lots… numerous intersections and driveways." Shouldn't this description focus on how we'd like these types of streets to look in the future rather than on how they've traditionally been constructed?	2-189	**Comment Noted** This description is intended to address existing conditions and not necessarily what the City is striving to achieve.
295	8/6/2008	Mod	Alyssa Begley/Gabriel Corley, CalTrans	Figure M2 ("Street Classification") and Figure M3 ("Street Classification: Core Areas") should show the planned bus/carpool lane system on the State Highway System in part because it can help the City achieve the goals and policies set forth in the Mobility Element to achieve an integrated, multi-modal transportation system.	2-183	**Not Recommended** The map is intended to show the City's plan for traffic circulation on roads under the City's jurisdiction. California State facilities are beyond the jurisdiction of the City and the General Plan, so they are not shown on the map.
296	2/08	Other	Patti Uplinger via Accessibility Town Hall Forum	Streets should not be too wide, as wide streets are difficult for some disabled and elderly people to cross.		**Addressed Elsewhere** Policy 1.2.2 (LOS) helps to prevent roads from getting too wide. See also Policy M 2.1.10 (Safe Pedestrian Crossings).
297	7/31/2008	Other	City Staff,	MAPS: "Special Study Segment"	2-183	**Comment Noted**

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
			Department of Transportation	What does this mean?		Will clarify in legend on map.
298	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	Goal M 4.1 (Roadway System) This goal makes no mention of the key policies of reducing CO2, pollution and auto dependence or of encouraging alternative travel modes. The Roadway section of the Mobility Element is the most important place to integrate these goals into specific policies, because roadways are the main determinants of all transportation outcomes.	2-179	**Recommended** New language. **"Goal M 4.1 Roadway System.** Create a roadway system that will ensure the safe and efficient movement of people, goods, and services that supports livable communities and reduces air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions."
299	7/31/2008	Mod	Traci Canfield, RT	M 4.1.2 (Balancing Community Impacts with Economic Development Goals). Rewrite: "Balance impacts to the community and the environment with economic development."	2-179	**Recommended** New policy language: **"M 4.1.2 Balancing Community Impacts with Economic Development Goals.** The City shall evaluate and strive to balance impacts to the community and the environment with economic development goals when adding or modifying roads and bridges."
300	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 4.1.2 (Balancing Community Impacts with Economic Development Goals) This policy should include environmental impacts.	2-179	**Recommended** New policy language: **"M 4.1.2 Balancing Community Impacts with Economic Development**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						Goals. The City shall evaluate and strive to balance impacts to the community and the environment with economic development goals when adding or modifying roads and bridges."
301	7/31/2008	Endorsement	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 4.2 (Complete Streets) The Sacramento TMA supports the concept of Complete Streets.	2-180	**Comment Noted**
302	7/31/2008	Endorsement	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 4.2 (Complete Streets) We commend the City for adopting a policy on Complete Streets and for being in the forefront of the national movement to define what this term actually means.	2-180	**Comment Noted**
303	7/31/2008	Other	Sue Teranishi	M 4.2 We absolutely need to keep a Complete Streets philosophy all over the City and make it safer for walkers and cyclists to get around.	2-180	**Comment Noted**
304	8/5/2008	Endorsement	Larry Greene, SMAQMD	M 4.2 The District endorses.	2-180	**Comment Noted**
305	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 4.2.2 (Pedestrian and Bicycle-Friendly Streets) The term "pedestrian refuge" suggests that pedestrians are second-class users of the street. We suggest that this sentence should read "large medians to reduce perceived pedestrian crossing distances." We also suggest that the reference to "frontage roads" be	2-180	**Recommended with Modifications** Will change "pedestrian refuge" language but retain the reference to frontage roads, because they are still necessary on many Sacramento roads.

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				removed, because if the arterials are bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly there should be no need for frontage roads.		New policy language: "…such elements as detached sidewalks, frequent and safe pedestrian crossings, large medians ~~for pedestrian refuge~~ to reduce perceived pedestrian crossing distances, Class II bike lanes, frontage roads with on-street parking, and/or grade-separated crossings."
306	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 4.2.6 (Identify Gaps in Complete Streets). We commend the City for this far-sighted policy, which will allow the principle of road diets to be extended from midtown out to other areas of the City where it is more desperately needed. We encourage the City to identify the arterials that are most in need of lane reductions and improvement of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and then, in the interest of environmental justice, to prioritize streets in low-income neighborhoods for road diets. We also recommend that, to be effective, this policy should include a statement of how "gaps" are to be identified by the City, for instance that "Candidate streets should be identified on the basis of the quality of their existing pedestrian and bicycle	2-181	**Addressed Elsewhere** Prioritization of transportation improvements is addressed in the Transportation Programming Guide.

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				facilities, and the degree of overcapacity of the existing roadway."		
307	7/31/2008	Other	Traci Canfield, RT	Goal M 4.3: Comment on traffic control measures: They may turn gridded street patterns into neighborhoods of cul-de-sacs. This causes a problem for bus routing/scheduling and schedule adherence. RT recommends street-calming where there are over 3,000 ADT to facilitate continued or improved neighborhood service.	2-182	**Recommended with Modifications** New language for Goal: **"Goal M 4.3 Neighborhood Traffic.** Enhance the quality of life within existing neighborhoods through the use of neighborhood traffic management techniques, <u>while recognizing the City's desire to provide a grid system that creates a high level of connectivity.</u>"
308	7/31/2008	Mod	Ron Maertz, MENA	Neighborhood Traffic. Enhance the quality of life within existing neighborhoods through the use of project related traffic impact mitigation and neighborhood traffic management techniques.	2-182	**Addressed Elsewhere** Planning Commission direction is to develop a methodology to measure neighborhood level of service. This analysis has not been completed but the following implementation measure will be added: "<u>The City shall prepare and adopt a methodology to measure neighborhood level of service.</u>"
309	7/31/2008	Other	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 4.3 (Neighborhood Traffic) Note that in the figure, a traffic circle is wrongly labeled as a roundabout.	2-182	**Comment Noted** Traffic circle label will be corrected.

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				ECOS is concerned about the City's rationale for "managing neighborhood traffic," specifically that the existing Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) is an expensive NIMBY program that forces traffic on to some streets at the expense of others and leads to a net increase in VMT and pollution. We also note that the goal of this section is vague ("Enhance the quality of life within existing neighborhoods…").		
310	9/29/08	Mod	EIR Mitigation	Make the following changes to M 4.3.1 as part of project mitigation: **M 4.3.1 Neighborhood Traffic Management ~~Program~~.** ~~The City shall continue its efforts to manage neighborhood traffic through the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program *(NTMP)*.~~ The City shall continue wherever possible to design streets and approve development applications in such as manner as to eliminate high traffic flows and parking problems within residential neighborhoods.	2-182	**Recommended**
311	7/31/2008	New/Edit	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	The three policies on the NTMP in the GP (M 4.3.1-4.3.3) could be combined into a single policy.	2-182	**Recommended** The three policies will be combined into one policy. New policy language:

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						"M 4.3.1 Neighborhood Traffic Management ~~Program.~~ ~~The City shall continue its efforts to manage neighborhood traffic through the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program *(NTMP)*.~~ The City shall continue wherever possible to design streets and approve development applications in such as manner as to eliminate high traffic flows and parking problems within residential neighborhoods."
312	7/31/2008	New	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	We also recommend the addition of a policy stating that the City will review the NTMP for compliance with the City's other transportation goals and social and environmental justice.	2-182	**Recommended with Modifications** The NTMP is initiated at the neighborhood level; however, the City will provide opportunities for this process to be initiated throughout the City through upcoming Strategic Neighborhood Action Plan (SNAP) and Community Plan processes. Also, revise Goal M 4.3 as follows: **"Goal M 4.3 Neighborhood**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						Traffic. Enhance the quality of life within existing neighborhoods through the use of neighborhood traffic management techniques, while recognizing the City's desire to provide a grid system that creates a high level of connectivity."
313	7/31/2008	New	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	One approach to neighborhood streets that ECOS believes could be beneficial for the City is the German idea of "spielstrasse," (i.e., short streets that are limited access for motor vehicles and are therefore safe enough for children to play in the street). This would be a logical extension of current NTMP programs that slow and calm traffic.		**Comment Noted** This will not be adopted as General Plan policy but could be suggested at the project level in the future.
314	7/31/2008	New	Ron Maertz, MENA	M 4.3.1 Project Related Traffic Impact Mitigation. The City shall require new development to mitigate the impact of increased traffic attributable to the development on the livability of existing established residential neighborhoods. (RDR)	2-182	**Addressed Elsewhere** Planning Commission direction is to develop a methodology to measure neighborhood level of service. This analysis has not been completed but the following implementation measure will be added: "The City shall prepare and adopt a methodology to measure neighborhood level of service."
315	7/31/2008	New	Ron Maertz, MENA	M 4.3.2 Neighborhood Traffic	2-182	**Not Recommended**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				Management Program. The City shall continue its efforts to manage neighborhood traffic not related directly to new development projects through the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP). A specified percentage of the proposed citywide transportation development fee shall be allocated to the NTMP.		This recommendation is too specific for the General Plan
316	7/25/2008	Mod	Walt Seifert, SABA	Major Arterials are defined as: High-speed/high-capacity roadways that provide access to regional transportation facilities. Access to parcels is a secondary function and should be limited to the extent feasible. Four lane to six-lane arterials have right-of-way widths of approximately 100 to 120 feet. Boulevards have right-of-way widths of approximately 90 to 160 feet. The chart on 2-188 (Table M1) suggests that such a highway would be a suitable mixed-use street. This is extremely unlikely to be the case. An arterial wider than four lanes is dangerous and intimidating to bicyclists and pedestrians, and creates intersections that are too wide for a pedestrian to easily or safely cross. While bike lanes do provide some measure of safety for thru-traffic of bicycles, they do not simplify making left turns onto a cross street or driveways, let alone access to what	2-187-188	**Recommended** Remove "Main Street" and "Mixed Use Street" from the typology "Major Arterial" in Table M1.

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				facilities are on the street. Wider six-lane streets also encourage higher traffic speeds. We recommend the city not construct or widen streets to more than four lanes.		
317	7/31/2008	Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	Table M1 suggests that major arterials (see description on page 2-187) would be suitable mixed-use streets. This is extremely unlikely. An arterial wider than four lanes is dangerous and intimidating to bicyclists and pedestrians, and creates intersections that are too wide for a pedestrian to easily or safely cross. While bike lanes do provide some measure of safety for thru-traffic of bicycles, they do not simplify making left turns onto a cross street or driveways, let alone access to what facilities are on the street. Wider six-lane streets also encourage higher traffic speeds. We recommend the city not construct or widen streets to more than four lanes.	2-187	**Recommended** Remove "Main Street" and "Mixed Use Street" from the typology "Major Arterial".
318	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 4.4 (Roadway Functional Classifications and Typology) "Main Streets" and "Mixed Use Streets" are clearly not possible on major arterials, as shown in Table M1. These uses require frequent access and pedestrian-friendly environments, which are not possible along a major arterial. Major arterials would have to	2-182	**Recommended** Remove "Main Street" and "Mixed Use Street" from the typology "Major Arterial".

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				be re-designated as minor arterials to receive this treatment. The text for Main Streets states that "unlike commercial streets, Main Streets are designed to promote walking, bicycling and transit." There should not be any street types that do not encourage walking, bicycling and transit (i.e., all streets should promote walking, biking and transit use). Planning for streets that do not promote walking, biking and transit is inconsistent with most of the other policies in the GP. Also, remove "arterial main street segment" and "curb extensions" (see section 2.1.10).		
319	7/31/2008	Mod	Sue Teranishi	M 4.4 I support limiting major arterials to a maximum of 4 lanes.	2-182	**Not Recommended** The new LOS Standard (M 1.2.2) will decrease the number of roads that will be widened beyond four lanes, but the City cannot state categorically than no road will be widened beyond four lanes.
320	6/18/2008	Mod	EIR Mitigation Measure	Table M 4 – Based on EIR Mitigation Measure 6-1-12-b) the Street Classification Diagram must be modified to increase the number of through lanes on the following	2-182	**Recommended**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				roadways in order to meet the LOS D-E threshold. • Elkhorn Boulevard (SR 99 to E. Commerce Parkway): 6 to 8 lanes • Rio Linda Boulevard (Grand Avenue to north city limits): 2 to 4 lanes • Silver Eagle Road (Northgate Boulevard to Norwood Avenue): 2 to 4 lanes		
321	7/31/2008	Mod	Jodi Samuels, Planning Commissioner	M 4.4.1 & related diagrams – NO 8-LANE ROADS NEEDED IN THE CITY!!!	2-182	**Comment Noted**
322	7/31/2008	New	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 4.5 (Intersection Air Quality and GHG Impacts) A logical and effective extension to the City's existing policies to reduce greenhouse gases and improve air quality would be to conduct an analysis of the greenhouse gas impacts of various intersection types. Specifically, we believe that the City should investigate the increased use of roundabouts to help maintain low and therefore safe vehicle speeds, and to reduce the noise, expense and pollution associated with braking and accelerating. Large roundabouts could be used in place of some large signalized intersections, and small ("mini") roundabouts could be used in place of the traffic circles currently	2-189	**Recommended with Modifications.** New policy: **"M 4.1.6 Roundabouts.** Roundabouts, as an intersection traffic control option with demonstrated air quality and safety benefits, shall be considered where deemed feasible and appropriate."

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				installed in Midtown, and in other neighborhoods. Roundabouts have consistently been shown to dramatically reduce the number of vehicle collisions, and can be made pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly.		
323	7/25/2008	New	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 5.1 Add a goal (in the form of a policy) for Sacramento to receive the Gold-level Bicycle Friendly Community award from the League of American Bicyclists (LAB). The city currently has Bronze-level status. This award provides a metric of how bicycle-friendly the city is. This could be used as one indicator for a general livability index.	2-191	**Addressed Elsewhere** This would be more appropriate as an Indicator in the Livability Index (See Part 4 Administration and Implementation, page 4-3) rather than as a Policy.
324	7/31/2008	New	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 5.1 Add a goal for Sacramento to receive the Gold-level Bicycle Friendly Community award from the League of American Bicyclists (LAB). The city currently has Bronze-level status. This award provides a measure of the city's bicycle-friendliness and could be used as one indicator for a general livability index.	2-191	**Addressed Elsewhere** This would be more appropriate as an Indicator in the Livability Index (See Part 4 Administration and Implementation, page 4-3) rather than as a Policy.
325	7/25/2008	New	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 5.1 Add a policy to provide bicycle parking as appropriate in the public right-of-way, as requested by businesses or citizens. Consider use of on-street bike parking. Offer incentives to businesses	2-191	**Addressed Elsewhere** Appropriate for Transportation System Management regulations rather than the General Plan.

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				to install secure, long-term bicycle parking for employees and short-term bicycle racks for visitors.		
326	7/31/2008	New	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 5.1 Add a policy to provide bicycle parking as appropriate in the public right-of-way, as requested by businesses or citizens. Consider use of on-street bike parking. Offer incentives to businesses to install secure, long-term bicycle parking for employees and short-term bicycle racks for visitors.	2-191	**Addressed Elsewhere** Appropriate for Transportation System Management regulations rather than the General Plan.
327	7/25/2008	New	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 5.1 Add a policy to link bikeways through the use of named routes and trails with dedicated signage and regional bikeway maps that include the routes.	2-191	**Addressed Elsewhere** This will be addressed in the update of the Bicycle Master Plan (Mobility Implementation Measure # 14).
328	7/31/2008	New	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 5.1 Add a policy to link bikeways through the use of named routes and trails with dedicated signage and regional bikeway maps that include the routes.	2-191	**Addressed Elsewhere** This will be addressed in the update of the Bicycle Master Plan (Mobility Implementation Measure # 14).
329	7/31/2008	New	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 5.1.16 (Class III Bikeways) The existing Class III bikeway network is designed to be a continuous network of low-speed streets, suitable for less confident bicyclists. At present, the utility of this network is low because cyclists do not know where the "bike routes" lead and therefore have a reduced incentive to use them. We	2-193	**Addressed Elsewhere** This will be addressed in the update of the Bicycle Master Plan (Mobility Implementation Measure # 14).

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				encourage the City to provide Class III routes with names and to provide informative on-street signage with destinations and distances. The Class III network is a useful resource and should be emphasized because of its potential role in promoting cycling to novice riders.		
330	7/31/2008	Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 5.1.11. (Bike Facilities in New Development) Change "bicycle racks" to the more inclusive term bicycle parking and distinguish between long-term bicycle parking for employees and short-term parking for visitors.	2-192	**Recommended** New policy language: "The City shall require that larger new development projects.... provide bicycle ~~racks~~ parking (i.e., short-term bicycle parking for visitors and long-term bicycle parking for residents or employees), personal lockers, showers, and other bicycle-support facilities."
331	7/31/2008	Other/Endorsement	Sue Teranishi	M 5.1.11 Require bike facilities in new developments.	2-192	**Comment Noted**
332	7/31/2008	Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 5.1.12 (Bicycle Parking at Transit Facilities) Retitle "Bicycling and Transit" and add bicycle access to transit stations and stops.	2-192	**Addressed Elsewhere** Addressed in M 3.1.12 (Direct Access to Stations).
333	7/31/2008	Other	Sue Teranishi	M 5.1.13 More information and education for both bicyclists and motorists is needed for everyone's safety.	2-193	**Comment Noted**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
334	7/31/2008	New	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 5.1.15 (Continuous Network) ECOS recommends that, as per pedestrian facilities, the City adopt a policy to provide a continuous network of bikeways (i.e., eliminate gaps).	2-193	**Addressed Elsewhere** Policy M 1.3.3 states that the City will construct new bikeways to "eliminate gaps." Additional detail is left to the Bikeway Master Plan (see M 5.1.1)
335	7/25/2008	Mod	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 5.1.2 (Appropriate Bikeway Facilities) Add that the city will consider designating some streets as bicycle boulevards.	2-191	**Addressed Elsewhere** This will be addressed in the update of the Bicycle Master Plan (Mobility Implementation Measure # 14).
336	7/31/2008	Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 5.1.2 (Appropriate Bikeway Facilities) Add that the city will consider designating some streets as bicycle boulevards.	2-191	**Addressed Elsewhere** This will be addressed in the update of the Bicycle Master Plan (Mobility Implementation Measure # 14).
337	7/31/2008	Edit	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 5.1.4. (Motorists, Bicyclists and Pedestrian Conflicts) Add multi-use trails as locations where bicycle/pedestrian conflicts should be reduced.	2-191	**Recommended** New policy language: "The City shall develop safe and convenient bikeways that reduce conflicts between bicyclists and motor vehicles on streets, and bicyclists and pedestrians on <u>multi-use trails and</u> sidewalks."
338	7/31/2008	Other	Sue Teranishi	M 5.1.4 More effort should go into reducing bike and vehicle conflicts.	2-191	**Comment Noted**
339	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein,	M 5.1.7 (Class II Bikeway	2-192	**Addressed Elsewhere**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
			ECOS	Requirements) This is an excellent and very simple policy. ECOS commends the City for adopting this policy. It would be appropriate to require that "Bikeways along roads with speed limits over 35 mph shall be at least 6 feet wide. Bikeways along other arterials and collectors shall be at least 5 feet wide."		Bike lane widths can be addressed in the update of the Bicycle Master Plan (Mobility Implementation Measure # 14).
340	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	ECOS recommends that, following the success of the road diets and addition of bike lanes in midtown, this policy should be expanded to require all roads in the central business district to be converted to two lanes, preferably with two-way traffic.	2-192	**Not Recommended**
341	7/31/2008	Edit	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 5.1.8 (Connections Between New Developments and Bikeways) We support the intent of this policy but we believe the language is ambiguous. It could be taken to mean that developers simply have to stripe class II bikeways along their arterials, whereas we believe the intent is that developers should provide frequent access points for bicyclists and pedestrians to enter or leave the development, not just by a single large roadway but by a multitude of smaller, more convenient access points. We also believe this policy can apply equally to commercial developments as	2-192	**Recommended** New policy language: "The City shall ensure that new commercial and residential development projects provide ~~a~~ frequent and direct connections to the nearest bikeways ~~along an arterial or collector.~~"

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				to residential developments.		
342	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 6.1.1 (Appropriate Parking) Change "appropriate parking is provided" to "excessive parking is avoided."	2-195	**Not Recommended** Staff believes that the current language fulfills the intent of this comment.
343	7/31/2008	Mod	Sue Teranishi	M 6.1.1 Appropriate parking should include requiring valet bike parking at many special events to encourage bicycling.	2-195	**Not Recommended**
344	7/25/2008	New/Mod	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 6.1.2. (Reduce Minimum Parking Standards) Free or subsidized parking is a powerful encouragement of automobile use. We recommend that maximum parking standards be established and that the city work on a regional basis to create parking policies that require motorists to pay the actual costs of supplying, maintaining and operating parking.	2-195	**Comment Noted** Staff does not believe it is appropriate to adopt parking maximums as a citywide strategy, but they will be phased in as appropriate in locations with adequate multi-modal infrastructure.
345	7/31/2008	New/Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 6.1.2. (Reduce Minimum Parking Standards) Free or subsidized parking is a powerful encouragement of automobile use. We recommend that maximum parking standards be established and that the city work on a regional basis to create parking policies that require motorists to pay the actual costs of supplying, maintaining and operating parking.	2-195	**Comment Noted** Staff does not believe it is appropriate to adopt parking maximums as a citywide strategy, but they will be phased in as appropriate in locations with adequate multi-modal infrastructure.
346	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 6.1.2 (Reduce Minimum Parking Standards)	2-195	**Comment Noted** Staff does not believe it is

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				We support this policy. Parking is an extremely poor use of land in urban centers. We recommend that the City move toward abolishing minimum parking standards entirely over the next few years. We also recommend that the title of this policy be changed to "Parking Standards" and include three additional requirements. First, the City should institute maximum parking standards for commercial and residential developments. Second, the City should institute standards for the maximum allowable length of vehicle parking bays. Third, the City should require on-street bicycle parking in urban centers.		appropriate to adopt parking maximums as a citywide strategy, but they will be phased in as appropriate in locations with adequate multi-modal infrastructure.
347	8/5/2008	Mod	Larry Greene, SMAQMD	The District recommends that the City expand this policy to include the establishment of parking maximums.		**Comment Noted** Staff does not believe it is appropriate to adopt parking maximums as a citywide strategy, but they will be phased in as appropriate in locations with adequate multi-modal infrastructure.
348	7/31/2008	Mod	Dennis Rogers, North State BIA	M 6.1.4 Reduction of Parking Areas. In pursuing the laudable goal of reducing the land needed for vehicular parking, we would caution the City against the use of structured parking in the General Plan policy. Structured parking is very expensive. We support	2-195	**Not Recommended**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				and encourage the use of shared parking to achieve that laudable goal. We would respectfully request that the reference to structured parking be removed.		
349	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 6.1.6 (Residential Permit Parking) The current residential permit parking system makes it illegal for non-residents to park in controlled areas during the day. ECOS believes that the City should investigate alternative time restrictions that allow non-residents to park during the day for commercial reasons, to maximize the use of parking spaces and to reduce the demand for additional spaces (per 6.1.4, Reduction of Parking Areas). Residents would be the only users allowed to park in controlled areas overnight.	2-196	**Recommended Elsewhere** This will be added as a new implementation measure: "The City shall investigate alternatives to the current residential permit parking policy that would provide alternative time restrictions to allow non-residents to park in controlled areas during the day for commercial reasons in residential permit parking areas."
350	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 6.1.7 (Disincentives for Single-Occupant Vehicle Trips) We support this policy but note that alternative transportation is available throughout the City (bicycling, walking and buses) so this policy should be extended to cover all areas of the City.	2-196	**Not Recommended** In many parts of the City it is not yet feasible or desirable to discourage automobile travel, due to lack of supportive infrastructure for other modes.
351	7/31/2008	Delete/New	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 6.1.9 (Parking Discounts) Monthly discounts or other bulk discounts for parking create a strong disincentive for workers to use transit, bicycling or walking as a means of getting to work. We recommend that	2-197	**Comment Noted** Note: This policy had been removed by the publication of the Draft 2030 General Plan. Commentor may have been working off of an older

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				the City institute a policy of not offering bulk discounts in City-operated parking facilities and consider adopting a policy of requiring private parking facilities not to provide bulk discounts.		draft of General Plan.
352	7/31/2008	Other	Traci Canfield, RT	Goods Movement section (M7): Are grade separations from downtown freight trains being considered? The trains have an impact on bus schedules throughout the entire span of bus service (not just peak hours).	2-199	**Not Recommended** Grade separations have been deemed infeasible.
353	7/31/2008	Mod	Traci Canfield, RT	M 9.1.2: Add transit facilities	2-205	**Addressed Elsewhere** M 9.1.2 addresses only facilities that are directly funded by the City, which does not include transit. M 9.1.3 addresses securing funding from other sources and addresses "all modes," which includes transit. To clarify, M 9.1.3 will be edited as follows: "**M 9.1.3 Dedicated Funding Sources.** The City shall investigate additional sources of funding and support the development of a stable, dedicated funding source ~~at the national level~~ for all modes to provide

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						continuing maintenance, operation, and management of the city's transportation network."
354	7/31/2008	Other	Sue Teranishi	M 9.1.4 I support the use of pricing to maximize resources to fund new transportation facilities which should include amenities for pedestrians, including sidewalks, landscaping, street furniture, and bicycling improvements, not just roads and expanded transit. Pedestrian and bike improvements are cheaper to provide and yet we're way behind on making them.	2-205	**Comment Noted**

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: **PART 2, UTILITIES**

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
355	07/31/08	New	Jodi Samuels, Planning Commissioner	U 4.1.1 (Adequate Drainage Facilities), 4.1.2 (Master Planning) U 5.1.5 (Yard Waste and Street Sweeping) The tradition of disposing of green waste on the streets is an impediment to these policies related to adequate drainage and master planning to prevent floods. Revise policies to require green waste to be placed in bins rather than dumped into the streets.	2-219, 2-222	**Recommended with the following modifications:** Add a policy to the U5 (Solid Waste) section of the General Plan stating: "The City shall continue to expand its voluntary containerized program." (Note: Staff agrees with the comment. However, because the voters approved "loose in the street" yard waste, the City cannot require containerized yard waste, unless the voters rescind the decision.)
356	7/31/08	Other	Jodi Samuels, Planning Commissioner	U 5.1.15 – What is the "Sacramento Regional Recycling Market Development Zone"?	2-223	**Comment noted.** See the definition on Page App-57 of the Glossary.
357	07/31/08	Other	Jodi Samuels, Planning Commissioner	Telecommunications – some discussion of the potential health impacts related to cell phone towers should be included. The City should at least acknowledge that many people have concerns about this issue and that some research suggests that long-term effects may occur.	2-229	**Comment noted.**
358	7/31/2008	New/Mod	Rick Bettis	The General Plan should be modified to reflect	2-213,	**Recommended.**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				the fact that the use of reclaimed wastewater will become increasingly viable in the future. State and Federal Regulations may be modified to require a higher level of treatment than is now required. This, along with the fact that population growth is causing water resources to diminish, will potentially increase the economic viability of using reclaimed water during the life of the General Plan.	2-217	Add the following policy to the U2 (Water Systems) or U3 (Wastewater Systems) section of the General Plan: "Recycled water. The City shall continue to investigate the feasibility of utilizing recycled water where appropriate, cost effective, safe and environmentally sustainable."
359	7/31/2008	New/Mod	Rick Bettis	Address water conservation in a proactive manner. The City is a signatory to the Water Forum Agreement, which includes Best Management Practices for Water Conservation. Such practices are intended to result in a reduction in per capita water use by about twenty five percent before the year 2030. Also, since the conveyance and treatment of water utilizes approximately twenty percent of our electrical energy usage, and water resources are being stretched, the State of California may soon require much more aggressive water conservation efforts.	U 2.1.9 2-214	**Recommended.** Add the following new policies to further promote water conservation: "Recycled water. The City shall continue to investigate the feasibility of utilizing recycled water where appropriate, cost effective, safe and environmentally sustainable." (See above.) "Emergency Water Conservation. The City shall develop a response plan to assist citizens in reducing water use during periods of water shortages and emergencies." "Water Conservation Enforcement. The City shall continue to enforce City

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						ordinances that prohibit the waste or runoff of water, establish limits on outdoor water use, and specify applicable penalties."
360	7/31/2008	New/Mod	Rick Bettis	The General Plan should reflect an enhanced recycling program. The California Air Resources Board Scoping Plan for AB 32 includes enhanced recycling targets. Implementing State legislation may be introduced in the foreseeable future.	U5 2-222 2-223	**Recommended.** Add the following new policies: "Zero Waste. The City shall achieve zero waste to landfills by 2040 through conversion technology." "Recycled Materials for Goods Packaging. The City shall support state legislation calling for use of recycled materials and smaller packaging of retail goods and require that retail uses use recycled materials for goods packaging in lieu of plastic bags." "City Recycling. The City shall serve as a role model to businesses and institutions regarding purchasing decisions that minimize the generation of solid waste in addition to encouraging all City staff to recycle at City facilities."
361	8/21/08	New	Sarah Ropelato, Legal Services of	U 1.1.11 Compatibility with Natural Gas Facilities. The City shall ensure, wherever	2-211	**Recommended to be Addressed Elsewhere**

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
			Northern California	possible, that natural gas storage facilities are located away from park and recreation areas and urban residential land uses due to potential health and safety hazards associated with natural gas storage.		Add new policy to PHS 3-Hazardous Materials after PHS 3.1.6: **"Risks from Hazardous Materials Facilities.** The City shall review proposed facilities that would produce or store hazardous materials, gas, natural gas, or other fuels to identify, and provide feasible mitigation, for any risks. The review shall consider, at a minimum, the following: presence of seismic or geologic hazards; presence of hazardous materials; proximity to residential development and areas in which substantial concentrations of people would occur; and nature and level of risk and hazards associated with the proposed project. (RDR)" (Also, change the title of Policy 3.1.6 to "Compatibility with Hazardous Materials Facilities".)
362	8/29/08	Mod	LAFCO	Revise U 1.1.6 Growth and Level of Service as follows: The City shall require new development to provide adequate facilities or pay its fair share	2-210	**Recommended.**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				of the cost for facilities needed to provide services to accommodate growth without adversely impacting current service levels.		
363	8/20/08	Mod	Stoel Rives, LLC	Change U 5.1.3 as follows: Equitably Distributed and Compatible Facilities. To the extent feasible, ~~T~~the City shall ensure that new solid waste and recycling facilities are distributed equitably throughout the city, avoiding over-concentration in areas that are well-served, and shall ensure that facility location and design are compatible with surrounding land uses (e.g., by incorporating adequate buffers, siting facilities appropriately to maintain the integrity of surrounding development). Expansion of existing facilities should be given preference to development of new facilities.	2-221	**Not Recommended.** The merits of expanding an existing facility will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
364	8/20/08	Mod	Stoel Rives, LLC	Change U 5.1.10 as follows: Green Waste/Food Waste Recycling. The City shall develop green waste/~~a~~ food waste recycling programs.	2-222	**Not Recommended.** The City already has a green waste recycling program.
365	8/20/08	New	Stoel Rives, LLC	Add the following new policy to the end of U5 (Solid Waste): Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Benefits of Recycling. The City shall promote recycling of solid waste as a means to reduce GHG emissions and support the granting of GHG reduction credits to recyclers for use in trading programs.	2-223	**Comment Noted.** The City will add the following language to the introductory paragraph in U 5 (Solid Waste): "Policies in this section support a wide range of programs to reduce waste, use recycled building materials, and support the recycling of construction and landscaping waste. These

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						policies are consistent with Sacramento's desire to be a more sustainable community; ~~by generating less solid waste~~ recycling usually reduces greenhouse gas emissions through energy savings, and reduction in solid waste means less land needs to be devoted to landfills."
366	8/29/08	Mod	LAFCO	Revise Policy U 3.1.2 (New Developing Areas) as follows: The City shall ensure that public facilities and infrastructure are designed and constructed to meet ultimate capacity needs to avoid the need for future upsizing. For facilities subject to incremental upsizing, initial design shall include adequate land area and any other elements not easily expanded in the future. Infrastructure and facility planning should discourage over-sizing of infrastructure which may contribute to growth inducement.	2-217	**Recommended with Modifications.** This policy must allow for infrastructure designed to meet ultimate capacity needs for a phased development. Revise the policy to state: "The City shall ensure that public facilities and infrastructure are designed and constructed to meet ultimate capacity needs to avoid the need for future upsizing. For facilities subject to incremental upsizing, initial design shall include adequate land area and any other elements not easily expanded in the future. Infrastructure and facility planning should discourage over-sizing of infrastructure which could contribute to growth beyond what was

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						anticipated in the 2030 General Plan."

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: **PART 2, EDUCATION, RECREATION, AND CULTURE**

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
367	07/17/08	New	Jim Dobson, Sac. City Unified School District	ERC 1 (Education) Provide school financing by piggybacking on existing Mello-Roos for infrastructure. Do not approve development in an area until the school district has obtained the Mello-Roos fees.	2-235	**Recommended with Modifications.** Add the following new policy to ERC 1 Education: "The City shall assist school districts with school financing plans and methods to provide permanent schools in existing and newly developing areas in the City."
368	07/17/08	New	Jim Dobson, SCUSD	ERC 1 (Education) Add from 1988 GP to 2030 GP the following policy: "Assist school districts with school financing plans and methods to provide permanent schools in existing and newly developing areas of the city." Can modify it to show that the City's intent isn't to provide the financing directly.	2-235	**Recommended with Modifications.** Add the following new policy to ERC 1 Education: "The City shall assist school districts with school financing plans and methods to provide permanent schools in existing and newly developing areas in the City."
369	07/17/08	New	Jim Dobson, SCUSD	ERC 1 (Education) Add from 1988 GP to 2030 GP the following policy: "Involve school districts in the early stages of the land use planning process for the future growth of the City."	2-235	**Comment Noted.** This is already addressed by ERC 1.1.1 (School Locations) on page 2-235.
370	07/17/08	New	Jim Dobson, SCUSD, Tom Pace, LRP	ERC 1 (Education) Modify and add this policy from the 1988 GP: "Designate school sites on the General Plan and applicable specific plans of the City to accommodate school district needs." Modify to state that we can establish general areas where	2-235	**Comment Noted/Recommended to be Addressed Elsewhere** This is already addressed by Policy ERC 1.1.1 (School Locations) on page 2-235.

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				school sites are deficient. (We do not designate exact sites anymore in the GP because they change so often.)		Recommend adding a new implementation program to Table 4-8 Education, Recreation, and Culture Implementation Programs: "The City shall work with school districts to conduct a study in establishing general areas where school sites are deficient."
371	07/17/08	Edit	Jim Dobson, SCUSD	ERC 1.1.2 (Locational Criteria): Change to say that school sites should be consistent with the CA Dept. of Education's school siting guidelines.	2-235	**Recommended with the following modifications:** "ERC 1.1.2 Locational Criteria. The City shall continue to assist in reserving school sites based on each school district's criteria, the school siting guidelines of the California Department of Education, and on the City's following location criteria…"
372	07/17/08	New	Jim Dobson, SCUSD	ERC 1 (Education) Add from 1988 GP to 2030 GP the following policy: "Work with school districts to realign district boundaries to coincide with neighborhood and community boundaries".	2-235	**Recommended with the following modifications:** "Realignment of District Boundaries. The City shall work with school districts to realign district boundaries to coincide with neighborhood and community boundaries."
373	07/17/08	New	Jim Dobson, SCUSD	ERC 1 (Education) Add language addressing the following point:	2-235	**Not Recommended.**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				The City should not approve a project until all parties agree on school mitigation. (This is what Roseville does.) Mitigation could involve developers setting aside a school site for the school district to purchase, and the developers and the school district working together to cover the part of the purchase price that the district cannot pay. (It's often difficult for the school district to come up with the entire purchase price.)		
374	07/17/08	Other	Jim Dobson, SCUSD	ERC 1 (Education) One tool to help finance new schools is lease-leaseback. The school district leases land for a school site to a developer. The developer builds the school to the school district's standards. The developer then leases the land back to the school, and the school pays the developer back over 30 years. That way, the developer carries the financing. Some developers like this, too, because it guarantees that a school will get built, making their development more attractive to buyers.	2-235	**Recommended with Modifications.** Add the following new policy to ERC 1 Education: "The City shall assist school districts with school financing plans and methods to provide permanent schools in existing and newly developing areas in the City."
375	07/17/08	Other	Jim Dobson, SCUSD	ERC 1 (Education) Another tool to help finance new schools is for the school district to let the developer retain the school fees the district would normally collect so that the developer can build a school. It's cheaper for the developer than for the district to build the school, as it can be built concurrent with infrastructure installation, and the developer doesn't have to pay prevailing wages like the school district would.	2-235	**Recommended with Modifications.** Add the following new policy to ERC 1 Education: "The City shall assist school districts with school financing plans and methods to provide permanent schools in existing and newly developing areas in the City."

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
376	07/17/08	New	Jim Dobson, SCUSD	Section 15.132 of the Development Code puts the burden on the school district of bussing kids in impacted areas and of providing mitigation. Change.		**Recommended Elsewhere with Modifications:** Add an implementation program to Table 4.8 (Education, Recreation, and Culture Implementation Programs): "The City shall review Chapter 15.132 Building Permits for Dwelling Units in Impacted School Areas of the Sacramento City Code to determine if changes are required. Implements Which Policy(ies) ERC 1.1.1 Responsible Department Planning Supporting Department(s) Development Timeframe 2008-2010"
377	07/17/08	New	Jim Dobson, SCUSD, Tom Pace, Jim McDonald, LRP	ERC 1 (Education) Add a policy about exploring colocation of schools with parks. The City could help the school district with maintenance costs in this way.	2-235	**Comment Noted.** See ERC 1.1.4 (Joint-Use Development). Note that support of such costs by the City are subject to adequate funding first of such functions for City parks.

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
378	07/31/08	Mod	Rosemarie Ruggieri Natomas Park resident	ERC 2 (Parks and Recreation), Table ERC 1. The update now limits community centers to only 1 per 30,000 residents. That is only 2 community centers for a built-out North Natomas . The current North Natomas Community Plan and North Natomas Finance Plan say North and West Natomas need 4 community centers.	2-241	**Comment Noted.** The North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP) Area community center service level goal of 1:15,000 applies because the NNCP has been adopted. Therefore, the community service level goal in the North Natomas Community Plan will remain.
379	7/31/2008	Mod	Angelique Ashby Curtis Paullins Joan Toomire No Name B. Gleason Extremely Concerned Citizen Tristan Godt (Board of Dir Natomas Park Master Assoc) Nicole Hara	ERC 2 (Parks and Recreation), Table ERC 1. In North Natomas we do not want to be limited to one community center per 30,000 residents.	2-241	**Comment Noted.** The North Natomas Community Plan (NNCP) Area community center service level goal of 1:15,000 applies because the NNCP has been adopted. Therefore, the community service level goal in the North Natomas Community Plan will remain.
380	07/31/08	Mod	Dennis Rogers, North State BIA	ERC 2 (Parks and Recreation), Table ERC 1. Table ERC 1 lays out a standard of at least 13 acres per thousand for parks and .5 linear miles of parkways, trails/bikeways and linear parks per thousand. While the current General Plan of the City has these same standards, we would respectfully state that there is a strong possibility that this is in violation of the Quimby Act. While there is an ability for a	2-241	**Not Recommended.** The City's existing service level goal for neighborhood and community parks is 5 acres/1000 people under the Quimby Act. The existing service level goal for regional parks is 8 acres/1000 people achieved by funding mechanisms other than Quimby

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				local jurisdiction to go above the 3 acre per thousand limit established in Quimby, it does not allow for the standard to exceed five acres per thousand. We would respectfully request that the City amend this section to comply with state law.		or Park Development Impact Fees or land dedications.
381	07/31/08	Mod	Dennis Rogers, North State BIA	ERC 2 (Parks and Recreation), Table ERC 1. This section also seeks to put in place a standard for community and recreational facilities. The specificity in the proposed General Plan may run counter to current state mitigation fee act requirements. If the City is proposing to increase the standard, new development can only be held to the standard that exists today, not the increased standard. If the City chooses to go to a different standard, then a different source of funding would need to be identified.	2-241	**Comment Noted.** ERC 2.2.3 (Service Level Goals) and Table ERC 1 state that these are Service Level Goals; they are not standards. These goals are for the City to meet. Developers are only obligated to dedicate parkland and/or in lieu fees under Quimby and pay the Park Development Impact Fee. The City uses the Quimby in-lieu fees, Park Development Impact Fees, and other funding sources to meet the service level goals.
382	07/31/08	Mod	Dennis Rogers, North State BIA	ERC 2 (Parks and Recreation), Table ERC 1. It is our suggestion that Table ERC 1 be modified to remove the excess dedication requirements and all of the standards for community and recreation facilities. The standards for community and recreation facilities need to have a degree of flexibility afforded them as acknowledged in your current General Plan last updated in 2004. "Park standards or Service Level Goals are utilized as a guiding tool to determine	2-241	**Not Recommended.** See Policy ERC 2.2.4 (Meeting Service Level Goals).

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
				appropriate acreage and evaluate the adequacy of service to Community Planning Areas, neighborhoods and the City as a whole. The park Service Level Goals are considered to be goals and not minimum standards. Their application should allow for flexibility as areas change or the needs of residents change…"		
383	07/31/08	Other	Jodi Samuels, Planning Commissioner	ERC 1.1.2 – The City's recent decision on the siting of the school in Greenbriar directly contradicts the first bullet point in this policy about Locational Criteria.	2-235	**Comment Noted.** The overflight zone and 500 foot State Air Resources Board (ARB) recommendations were considered in determining the location of the school.
384	07/31/08	Mod	Jodi Samuels, Planning Commissioner	ERC 2.2.13 – One potential use for vacant land is "bag" gardens, in which large bags of soil are place on a parcel for people to use for gardening. This assures easy removal later and doesn't require the upfront investment of time or funds of a full-scale Community Garden. Another option for the City is to invite interested residents or neighborhood groups to "adopt" vacant sites or buildings in order to create a community-specific recreational space.	2-243	**Comment Noted.** The Parks Department's Master Plan encourages the development of community gardens. The City tries to maintain a minimum service level for community gardens, which includes providing water supply and fencing. The City cannot assume liability for any sites "adopted" that are in private property.
385	07/31/08	Mod	Jodi Samuels, Planning Commissioner	ERC 4.1.17, 4.4.18 – The verbs in these policies should be <u>require</u> rather than <u>encourage</u> to enhance the City's supply of public art.	2-255	**Not Recommended.** The issue of mandating public art on private development requires further discussion and evaluation.
386	07/31/08	Mod	Phil Garcia,	Change Policy ERC 1.1.4 Joint-Use	2-236	**Recommended.**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
			Sacramento State	Development to read: The City shall work with school districts and institutions of higher education to explore opportunities for joint-use development that integrates uses for recreation, cultural and non-school-related activities at new and existing facilities.		
387	7/31/2008	Other	Nicole Hara	ERC 2.2.2 I would like to see more work done in the North Natomas area. The City allowed for the development at an accelerated pace, and therefore cannot complain when residents expect that services keep up.	2-240	**Comment Noted.**
388	7/31/2008	Delete	Dana Allen, Parks Dept.	ERC 2, Table ERC 1 Modify as follows: (Under "Community Facilities" "~~Neighborhood Centers (Clubhouses)~~" Under "# of Units" "~~1 per neighborhood~~")	2-241	**Recommended.**
389	7/31/2008	Mod	Dana Allen, Parks Dept.	ERC 2, Table ERC 1 Modify as follows: Under "Community Facilities" "Multi-Use Recreation Complexes (must include a building over 10,000 sf ~~including Community Centers~~)" Under "# of Units" "1 per 50,000 ~~30,000~~ residents"	2-241	**Recommended.**

Edit: Modification to existing policy or text that will not change intent; **Mod:** Modification to existing policy or text that will change intent; **New:** Addition of a new goal, policy, or implementation program; **Delete:** Removal of a goal, policy, or implementation program; **Other:** miscellaneous comments, questions, or changes