

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
						also track progress on active projects on the City’s website: http://www.cityofsacramento.org/dsd/reference/maps/ActivePlanningProjects.cfm
195	7/31/2008	Delete	Chris Paros	We oppose allowing group homes by only special permit. Residents need to be notified and have an opportunity for public comment. These need Commission approval.	188	Addressed Elsewhere. Group homes under six units are allowed by right in all residential zones per California State Law (Welfare and Institutions Code, Sections 5115-5116). Group homes over six units require a special permit, which, consistent with Section 17.212 of the City Code, requires public notification to all residents within 100-500 feet of the property, depending on the level of approval. Approval of special permits is always subject to public review and comment.
196	7/31/2008	Delete/ Other	Chris Paros	Policy 3.2 Natomas residents ADAMANTLY OPPOSE any developer fee incentives to build medium or high density housing until our levees are fixed and our services can meet the need. We have an overabundance of unfilled apartments now, numerous homes in foreclosure, flood insurance	250	Comment Noted. This comment is referring to Program 3.2 from the previous Housing Element. This program will not be continued in the 2008-2013 Housing Element.

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
				risks and crime problems primarily from young people.		
197	7/31/2008	Mod	Joe Smith	<p>Please revise the plan so that inclusionary housing is spread throughout the entire city. It really is a joke to cram it all in the "New Growth Areas".</p> <p>Also, add some smaller units mixed in with homes, as well as more ownership opportunities. Building 3- story 100% low-income projects leads to crime.</p>		<p>Comment Noted. The City is currently developing a process and timeline for full review of the Mixed Income Housing (Inclusionary) Ordinance as part of the implementation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element. Also, Program 5 of the Draft Housing Element establishes a process and a timeline to determine the feasibility of expanding the inclusionary ordinance to other areas in the city in order to promote mixed-income development.</p>
198	7/31/2008	Other	<p>Chantha Trinh Natomas Park Chris Paros NPPC</p>	<p>When inclusionary housing units not in the City’s existing housing plan are proposed for development, the same number of units should be removed from another planned inclusionary project within the community (“off-site offset”). For example, the 240-unit Arena Seniors Apartments, P08-013, was approved in July 2008, so the inclusionary requirement in North Natomas should be reduced by 240.</p>		<p>Comment Noted. The Arena Seniors Apartments are not inclusionary housing units; they are being built and financed independent of the Mixed Income Housing (Inclusionary) Ordinance.</p>
199	7/31/08	Other	<p>Chantha Trinh Natomas Chris Paros NPPC Park</p>	<p>Require market-rate housing be built first before the inclusionary element. Per Sacramento City code, 15% of market rate housing development is to be inclusionary housing. Zero percent of zero = zero. Direct Staff to assess the economic impact of</p>		<p>Comment Noted. The City is currently developing a process and timeline for full review of the Mixed Income Housing (Inclusionary) Ordinance as part of the</p>

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
				building large numbers of low-income rental units prior to the market-rate element. Is this a smart economic strategy?		implementation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element.
200	7/31/2008	Other	<p>Chantha Trinh Natomas Park</p> <p>Chris Paros NPPC</p>	<p>Don't just develop inclusionary housing units in N. Natomas; make sure the entire city follows the 15% rule. These requests arise from our need to reverse two dangerous development precedents:</p> <p>1. Willow Glen inclusionary apartments are being constructed now in the Natomas Meadows PUD before any market rate housing construction has been built (and while single family home development has been mothballed). Zero % of zero should be zero.</p> <p>2. The Arena Seniors project has been allowed to go forward by Staff without a market-rate element. What has happened once will happen again. Our community needs to be economically compensated for the impact of inclusionary housing to our schools, our services and our economy. Natomas is having a tough enough time dealing with the economic impacts from flood insurance & home foreclosures. We emphasize that we are not opposed to inclusionary housing. But we want policy to be implemented in a true, mixed use manner with sufficient services to help compensate for the impacts. We are tired of seeing all affordable housing condensed into large, 3-story complexes with no ownership opportunities.</p> <p>For the Arena Seniors 240-unit offset, our preferred off-site location (where inclusionary housing is not required) is for any proposed project site located within ½ mi. of the Natomas Charter School (Del Paso Blvd & Blackrock Rd).</p>		<p>Comment Noted.</p> <p>1. The City is currently developing a process and timeline for full review of the Mixed Income Housing (Inclusionary) Ordinance as part of the implementation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element. Additionally, Program 5 of the Draft Housing Element establishes a process and a timeline to determine the feasibility of expanding the inclusionary ordinance to other areas in the city in order to promote mixed-income development.</p> <p>Also, the Draft 2008-2013 Housing Element includes policies and programs to encourage economic integration of neighborhoods and to encourage smaller scale apartments. Specifically, the Draft Housing Element includes the following policies and programs:</p> <p>Policy H-1.2.2: Encouraging a Variety of Housing Types</p>

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
				<p>This area is becoming a growing community concern for both traffic & crime due to the high concentration of existing and future apartments around the school, and the future Twin Rivers School District mega-school as well.</p>		<p>Policy H-1.3.2: Considering Economic Integration of Neighborhoods</p> <p>Program 9: Researching How to Better Incorporate Multifamily Developments</p> <p>Additionally, the Land Use and Urban Design Element addresses economic integration of neighborhoods and appropriate concentrations of housing types with the following policies: LU 4.1.1 Mixed Use Neighborhoods; LU 4.1.9 Residential Diversity; and LU 4.1.10 Balanced Neighborhoods.</p> <p>2. The Arena Seniors Apartments are not inclusionary housing units; they are being built and financed independent of the Mixed Income Housing (Inclusionary) Ordinance.</p>
201	7/31/2008	Other	Nicole Hara	<p>LU 2.8.4 Housing Type Distribution. The City shall promote an equitable distribution of housing types for all income groups throughout the city and promote mixed-income developments rather than creating concentrations of below-market-rate housing in certain areas. (RDR/ MPSP) **</p>		<p>Addressed Elsewhere. The Draft 2008-2013 Housing Element includes policies and programs to encourage economic integration of neighborhoods and to</p>

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
				<p>Please stop building the huge apartment complexes in North Natomas. Small dwellings with the option to buy would be ideal. Concentration of very low- and low-income residents into tightly packed apartment complexes surrounded by middle and upper middle income residents is a recipe for disaster. Integration of small 2-5 unit dwellings mixed is ideal.</p>		<p>encourage smaller scale apartments. Specifically, the Draft Housing Element includes the following policies and programs:</p> <p>Policy H-1.2.2: Encouraging a Variety of Housing Types</p> <p>Policy H-1.3.2: Considering Economic Integration of Neighborhoods</p> <p>Program 9: Researching How to Better Incorporate Multifamily Developments</p> <p>Additionally, the Land Use and Urban Design Element addresses economic integration of neighborhoods and appropriate concentrations of housing types with the following policies: LU 4.1.1 Mixed Use Neighborhoods; LU 4.1.9 Residential Diversity; and LU 4.1.10 Balanced Neighborhoods.</p>
202	7/31/2008	Other	Nicole Hara	<p>H 2-12, Program 3.2 H 2-16, Program 10.2 I am not sure if this means that the City will no longer follow the North Natomas Community Plan or if it just means that some of the goals have been met. I would hope that it is the latter.</p>		<p>Comment Noted. This comment refers to programs from the previous Housing Element. Program 3.2 called for educational workshops to identify</p>

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
				<p>The City has left us high and dry in North Natomas and after seeing all the money I paid in taxes on the house, and beyond, I would hope that this area would continue to be monitored to ensure that all the money and infrastructure investment in the area is not wasted.</p>		<p>incentives for promoting multi-family density in the North Natomas Community Plan Area. Program 10.2 called for preparing annual reports on compliance with jobs/housing balance, housing type and affordability objectives in the North Natomas Community Plan. These reports did not analyze infrastructure investment. Neither program is proposed for the new Housing Element because the North Natomas Community Area has largely been built out.</p> <p>The North Natomas Finance Plan is audited annually by the City's external auditors to account for the receipt and use of all funds. All funds are, and must be, used for the purposes set out in the North Natomas finance plan. The plan itself and all associated uses are approved by the City Council by resolution or ordinance.</p>
203	7/31/08	Other	Nicole Hara	<p>Is it a coincidence that the General Plan calls for the deletion of the Community Plan in the Housing Element?</p>		<p>Comment Noted. The City's existing community plans have been incorporated into the General Plan. No community plan has been</p>

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
204	7/31/08	Other	No Name	Inclusionary Housing: Build appropriate amounts of housing in varied settings, not huge ghettos likely to become master-planned slums.		<p>deleted.</p> <p>Comment Noted. The Draft 2008-2013 Housing Element includes policies and programs to encourage economic integration of neighborhoods and to encourage smaller scale apartments. Specifically, the Draft Housing Element includes the following policies and programs:</p> <p>Policy H-1.2.2: Encouraging a Variety of Housing Types</p> <p>Policy H-1.3.2: Considering Economic Integration of Neighborhoods</p> <p>Program 9: Researching How to Better Incorporate Multifamily Developments</p> <p>Additionally, the Land Use and Urban Design Element addresses economic integration of neighborhoods and appropriate concentrations of housing types with the following policies: LU 4.1.1 Mixed Use Neighborhoods; LU 4.1.9 Residential Diversity; and LU 4.1.10 Balanced</p>

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
						Neighborhoods.

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

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: PART 2, MOBILITY

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/Recommendation
205	7/31/2008	Endorsement	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	ECOS commends the City for a number of important and imaginative improvements in GP mobility policies. The Mobility Element describes mobility policies as subsidiary to land-use policies, saying they must “support increased densities and a mix of uses on multi-modal districts.” ECOS believes that the mobility policies in the GP set out realistic ways to support the City’s land use goals by restricting roadway capacities, reducing existing overcapacity in the roadway system, and by supporting alternative modes.	NA	Comment Noted.
206	7/31/2008	Endorsement	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	The Mobility Element also states that the transportation network must “conserve energy resources, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution.” We commend the City for identifying that increased roadway capacities create environmental damage and that reducing this damage is a primary social responsibility that needs to be reflected in the GP.	NA	Comment Noted.
207	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	Introduction: Remove the phrase “do so while preserving auto mobility.” This statement is inconsistent with the policies and goals of the Mobility Element because these goals will	2-159	Recommended with Modifications. Phrase will be modified as follows:

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
				necessarily involve a reduction in auto mobility to achieve the desired outcomes in terms of land use, pollution and encouragement of alternative modes.		“...and do so while preserving <u>continuing</u> to <u>accommodate</u> auto mobility.”
208	10/16/2008 Planning Commission	Mod	Commissioner Samuels	Referring to page 105 of the staff report and the comment from ECOS above: Should replace “do so while preserving auto mobility” with “do so while accommodating auto mobility.” Accommodating is a better term.	2-159	Recommended with Modifications. See Comment/Response #207 above.
209	7/31/2008	Other	Maggie O’Mara	M1, M4 Two-way streets should not have more than 2 through lanes in each direction. One-way streets should not have more than 2 lanes total. By the time left and right turn only lanes are added at intersections, streets with more than 2 lanes in each direction become difficult for pedestrians to cross, especially for people with limited mobility, children, and others. The street becomes an unpleasant place to walk, drive or ride a bicycle. Driver speeds increase and it's difficult to enforce the speed limit. The maximum speed limit on any city street should be 35 mph. 40 or 45 mph speed limits have no place in a city that wants to be "green" and encourage multi-modal travel. The intersection vehicle LOS at peak hours should be E, no higher.	2-161 2-179	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.
210	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein,	M 1.1.1 (Right-of-Ways)	2-161	Recommended with

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	Change “to best serve future travel demand” to “to best regulate future travel demand.” The rest of the language and policies in the Mobility Element are moving away from the old “predict and provide” approach toward addressing the role of the transportation network in creating and curtailing travel demand.		Modifications. Policy 1.1.1 to be modified as follows: “ M 1.1.1 Right-of-Ways. The City shall manage the use of transportation right-of-ways by all travel modes to best serve future travel demand <u>and consistent with the goal to provide Complete Streets as described in Goal 4.2. (SO)</u> ”
211	7/31/2008	New	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 1.2 New Standard for Transportation Impacts We recommend that, for this iteration of the GP, the City should adopt a new parallel standard for assessing transportation impacts, based perhaps on VMT (vehicle miles traveled) or some other more direct measure of environmental effects. Then, in the next iteration of the GP, the City may be able to drop the LOS approach altogether.	2-162	Comment Noted. New methods of assessing Level of Service may be considered in future updates of the General Plan. At present time the method described in the General Plan EIR is the method accepted and supported by City staff to measure and describe transportation impacts.
212	7/31/2008	Endorsement	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 1.2.2 In changing the vehicle LOS requirement from C to D or E, the City is acknowledging the present overcapacity in the roadway network and the consequent damage to the	2-162	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
				environment and the health and well-being of the City’s people. Policies like Complete Streets (and especially the policy to eliminate gaps in Complete Streets) are a good first step toward creating a roadway network that supports rather than hinders the City’s overall planning goals.		
197	6/18/2008	Mod	EIR Mitigation	M 1.2.2 EIR Mitigation Measure 6-12-c) must be added to the GP in order for the plan to be internally consistent.	2-162	<p>Recommended. Add the following text bullets under M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard):</p> <p><u>“a. Core Area Level of Service Exemption—LOS F conditions are acceptable during peak hours in the Core Area bounded by C Street, the Sacramento River, 30th Street, and X Street. If a Traffic Study is prepared and identifies a LOS impact that would otherwise be considered significant to a roadway or intersection that is in the Core Area as described above, the project would not be required in that particular instance to provide further vehicular capacity-enhancing improvements to that road segment or intersection in order for the City to find project</u></p>

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
						<p>conformance with the General Plan. Instead, General Plan conformance could still be found if the project provides improvements to other parts of the citywide transportation system in order to improve transportation-system-wide roadway capacity or to enhance non-auto travel modes in furtherance of the General Plan goals. The improvements would be required within the project site vicinity or within the area affected by the project's vehicular traffic impacts. With the provision of such other transportation infrastructure improvements, the project would not be required to provide any mitigation for vehicular traffic impacts to road segments or intersections in order to conform to the General Plan. This exemption does not affect the implementation of previously approved roadway and intersection improvements identified for</p>

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
						<p><u>the Railyards or River District planning areas.”</u></p> <p>Former a. becomes b. and former b. becomes c. after the above insertion. Afterward, insert the following:</p> <p><u>“d. Roadways Exempt from Level of Service Standard—</u>The above LOS standards shall apply to all roads, intersections or interchanges within the City except as specified below. If a Traffic Study is prepared and identifies a significant LOS impact to a roadway or intersection that is located within one of the roadway corridors described below, the project would not be required in that particular instance to provide further vehicular capacity-enhancing improvements to that roadway or intersection in order for the City to find project conformance with the General Plan. Instead, General Plan conformance could still be found if the project provides</p>

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
						<p><u>improvements to other parts of the city wide transportation system in order to improve transportation-system-wide roadway capacity or to enhance non-auto travel modes in furtherance of the General Plan goals. The improvements would be required within the project site vicinity or within the area affected by the project’s vehicular traffic impacts. With the provision of such other transportation infrastructure improvements, the project would not be required to provide any mitigation for vehicular traffic impacts to the listed road segment or intersection in order to conform to the General Plan.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>12th/14th Avenue: State Route 99 to 36th Street</u> • <u>65th Street: Folsom Boulevard to 14th Avenue</u> • <u>Alhambra Boulevard: Folsom Boulevard to P Street</u> • <u>Arcade Boulevard: Marysville Boulevard to Del Paso Boulevard</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
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Arden Way: Capital City Freeway to Ethan Way</u> • <u>Blair Avenue/47th Avenue: S. Land Park Drive to Freeport Boulevard</u> • <u>Broadway: 15th Street to Franklin Boulevard</u> • <u>Broadway: 58th to 65th Streets</u> • <u>El Camino Avenue: Stonecreek Drive to Marysville Boulevard</u> • <u>El Camino Avenue: Capitol City Freeway to Howe Avenue</u> • <u>Elder Creek Road: 65th Street to Power Inn Road</u> • <u>Florin Perkins Road: 14th Avenue to Elder Creek Road</u> • <u>Florin Road: Greenhaven Drive to I-5; 24th Street to Franklin Boulevard</u> • <u>Folsom Boulevard:65th Street to Watt Avenue</u> • <u>Freeport Boulevard: Broadway to Seamas Avenue</u> • <u>Fruitridge Road: Franklin Boulevard to SR 99</u> • <u>Howe Avenue: American River Drive to Folsom Boulevard</u> • <u>Mack Road: Meadowview</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
						<p><u>Road to Stockton Boulevard</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Martin Luther King Boulevard: Broadway to 12th Avenue</u> • <u>Marysville Boulevard: I-80 to Arcade Boulevard</u> • <u>Northgate Boulevard: Del Paso Road to SR 160</u> • <u>Raley Boulevard: Bell Avenue to I-80</u> • <u>Roseville Road: Marconi Avenue to I-80</u> • <u>Royal Oaks Drive: SR 160 to Arden Way</u> • <u>Truxel Road: I-80 to Gateway Park</u> <p><u>e. Modify LOS Policies for Special Study Segments—</u> <u>The City shall exempt the following special study segments, in the event that the Street Classification diagram is modified to reduce the number of lanes on those segments from four lanes to two lanes.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>24th Street: Meadowview Road to Cosumnes River Boulevard</u> • <u>Capitol Mall: 3rd Street to 5th Street</u> <p>a. <u>Elvas Avenue: C</u></p>

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
						<p><u>Street to H Street</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Folsom Boulevard: 34th Street to 47th Street</u> b. <u>Folsom Boulevard: 59th Street to 65th Street</u> • <u>Garden Highway: Truxel Road to Northgate Boulevard</u> • <u>J Street: 43rd Street to 56th Street</u>
198	6/19/2008	Other	Jodi Samuels, Planning Commission	M 1.2.2 Consider using alternative measurements (other than traditional LOS) approach for neighborhood traffic impacts.	2-162	<p>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:</p> <p><u>“The City shall prepare and adopt a methodology to measure neighborhood level of service.”</u></p>
199	7/24/2008	Other	Steve Pyburn, Kimley-Horn & Associates	M 1.2.2 Define “multi-modal districts”.	2-162	<p>Recommended. Text in M 1.2.2 will be revised as follows:</p> <p>“The City shall seek to maintain the following standards in multi modal districts including the Central Business District, <u>in</u></p>

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
						areas within ½ mile walking distance of light rail stations, and mixed use corridors as designated by the City in <u>areas designated for urban scale development (Urban Centers, Urban Corridors, and Urban Neighborhoods as designated in the Land Use Diagram)</u> . These areas are characterized by frequent transit service, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle systems, a mix of uses, and higher-density development.”
200	7/31/2008	Other	Steve Pyburn, Kimley-Horn & Associates	M 1.2.2, LU2 The Mobility section, Policy 1.2.2 allows LOS E in "mixed use corridors." However, the Land Use and Urban Design Element does not directly indicate where those corridors are. The land use descriptions require some interpretation to determine if a parcel is truly within a mixed use corridor. For example, Broadway is designated as Urban Corridor Low. By reading the land use descriptions, it is possible to deduce Broadway is a mixed use corridor, and thus subject to LOS E. I have worked on many city land use entitlement projects where such determinations are left to staff's	2-162	Recommended. Text in M 1.2.2 will be revised as follows: “The City shall seek to maintain the following standards in multi-modal districts including the Central Business District, <u>in</u> areas within ½ mile walking distance of light rail stations, and mixed use corridors as designated by the City in <u>areas designated for urban scale development (Urban Centers, Urban Corridors, and Urban Neighborhoods as</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
				interpretation. Such interpretations can extend the project approval process. It would be beneficial if the Mobility element included a map of where the LOS D and LOS E standards will apply.		<u>designated in the Land Use Diagram</u>). These areas are characterized by frequent transit service, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle systems, a mix of uses, and higher-density development.”
201	7/31/2008	Other	Ed Cox, DOT	M1.2.2a How will the public know where the City has designated these mixed-use corridors? Will a map be provided?	2-162	Recommended. Text in M 1.2.2 will be revised as follows: “The City shall seek to maintain the following standards in multi-modal districts including the Central Business District, <u>in</u> areas within ½ mile walking distance of light rail stations, and mixed-use corridors as designated by the City in <u>areas designated for urban scale development (Urban Centers, Urban Corridors, and Urban Neighborhoods as designated in the Land Use Diagram)</u> . These areas are characterized by frequent transit service, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle systems, a mix of uses, and higher-density 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
202	7/25/2008	Edit	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) SABA strongly supports the change of LOS standards from C to D and from C to E in Multi-Modal Districts. However, the language in this section should be modified from a value-tinged to a factual description of LOS. A higher LOS is not necessarily “better” than a lower LOS, so that term (“better”) should be avoided. “LOS E or better” should be changed to “LOS A-E” and “LOS D or better” should be changed to “LOS A-D.”	2-162	Recommended. Text in M 1.2.2 modified as follows: “b. Level of Service Standard for Multi-Modal Districts- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain operations on all roadways and intersections at LOS A-E or better at all times, including peak travel times, unless maintaining this LOS would, in the City’s judgment, be infeasible and/or conflict with the achievement of other goals. Congestion in excess of LOS F conditions E may be acceptable, provided that provisions are made to improve the overall system and/or promote non-vehicular transportation <u>and transit</u> as part of a development project or a City-initiated project. c. Base Level of Service Standard- The City shall seek to maintain the following standards 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
						<p>areas outside of multi-modal districts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain operations on all roadways and intersections at Level of Service <u>LOS A-D or better</u> at all times, including peak travel times, unless maintaining this LOS would, in the City’s judgment, be infeasible and/or conflict with the achievement of other goals. Congestion in excess of Level of Service <u>LOS D E or F conditions</u> may be acceptable, provided that provisions are made to improve the overall system and/or promote non-vehicular transportation as part of a development project or a City-initiated project.
203	7/31/2008	Edit	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	<p>M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) SABA strongly supports the change of LOS standards from C to D and from C to E in Multi-Modal Districts. However, the language in this section should be modified from a value-tinged to a factual description of LOS. A higher LOS is not necessarily “better” than a lower LOS, so that term (“better”) should be avoided. “LOS E</p>	2-162	<p>Recommended. Text in M 1.2.2 modified as follows:</p> <p>“b. Level of Service Standard for Multi-Modal Districts- • Maintain operations on</p>

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
				<p>or better” should be changed to “LOS A-E” and “LOS D or better” should be changed to “LOS A-D.”</p>		<p>all roadways and intersections at LOS A-E or better at all times, including peak travel times, unless maintaining this LOS would, in the City’s judgment, be infeasible and/or conflict with the achievement of other goals. Congestion in excess of LOS F conditions E may be acceptable, provided that...</p> <p>c. Base Level of Service Standard-The City shall seek to maintain the following standards for all areas outside of multi-modal districts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain operations on all roadways and intersections at Level of Service <u>LOS A-D</u> or better at all times, including peak travel times, unless maintaining this LOS would, in the City’s judgment, be infeasible and/or conflict with the achievement of other goals. Congestion in excess of Level of Service <u>LOS D E or F conditions</u> may be

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
						acceptable, provided that provisions are made to improve the overall system and/or promote non-vehicular transportation as part of a development project or a City-initiated project.
204	7/31/2008	Edit	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) In terms of the current policies, we believe that this section contains a lot of residual language from previous GPs, much of which is outdated. For instance, it describes a higher vehicular LOS as being “better” despite the fact that higher vehicular LOS values usually create more challenging conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians. We recommend that the phrase “LOS E or better” be changed to “LOS A-E”, etc.	2-162	Recommended. Text in M 1.2.2 modified as follows: “b. Level of Service Standard for Multi-Modal Districts- • Maintain operations on all roadways and intersections at LOS <u>A-E</u> or better at all times, including peak travel times, unless maintaining this LOS would, in the City’s judgment, be infeasible and/or conflict with the achievement of other goals. Congestion in excess of LOS F conditions E may be acceptable, provided that... c. Base Level of Service Standard- The City shall seek to maintain the following standards 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
						<p>areas outside of multi-modal districts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain operations on all roadways and intersections at Level of Service <u>LOS A-D or better</u> at all times, including peak travel times, unless maintaining this LOS would, in the City’s judgment, be infeasible and/or conflict with the achievement of other goals. Congestion in excess of Level of Service <u>LOS D E or F conditions</u> may be acceptable, provided that provisions are made to improve the overall system and/or promote non-vehicular transportation as part of a development project or a City-initiated project.
205	7/25/2008	Mod	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) SABA strongly recommends never allowing LOS standards to drive construction or expansion of roads to more than four lanes.	2-162	<p>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 that no road will be widened beyond four lanes.</p>

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
206	7/31/2008	Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) The Sacramento TMA strongly recommends never allowing LOS standards to drive construction or expansion of roads to more than four lanes.	2-162	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.
207	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) ECOS is particularly concerned with the language of M 1.2.2 stating that LOS D or E will be preserved “unless maintaining this LOS would ... conflict with the achievement of other goals.” ECOS would like to remind the City that widening roadways always conflicts with the following key goals: promoting mixed-use development, promoting higher densities, promoting alternative modes, and reducing pollution and greenhouse gases. This policy is in specific conflict with the Complete Streets policy in section M 4.2. Therefore, we recommend that the City add language to this section stating: “The need to maintain a vehicular LOS standard should never lead to the construction or expansion of roadways to more than four lanes.”	2-162	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 that no road will be widened beyond four lanes.

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
208	7/25/2008	Mod	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) M 4.2 (Complete Streets) Roads of four lanes or more are inherently undesirable for pedestrians and bicyclists. Having roads wider than four lanes conflicts with the intent of Complete Streets policy M 4.2 (which in M 4.2.6, for example, suggests lane reductions as a way of achieving Complete Streets). It should be clear that Complete Streets policy should take precedence over LOS policy.	2-162 2-180	Comment Noted. The City cannot absolutely prioritize some goals and policies over others; it is left to decision makers to weigh each case. The General Plan provides numerous policies to weigh when making LOS decisions on a case-by-case basis, and it is possible to waive the LOS standard due to overriding concerns.
209	7/31/2008	Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) M 4.2 (Complete Streets) Roads of four lanes or more are inherently undesirable for pedestrians and bicyclists. Having roads wider than four lanes conflicts with the intent of Complete Streets policy M 4.2 (which in M 4.2.6, for example, suggests lane reductions as a way of achieving Complete Streets). It should be clear that Complete Streets policy should take precedence over LOS policy.	2-162 2-180	Comment Noted. The City cannot absolutely prioritize some goals and policies over others; it is left to decision makers to weigh each case. The General Plan provides numerous policies to weigh when making LOS decisions on a case-by-case basis, and it is possible to waive the LOS standard due to overriding concerns.
210	7/25/2008	Other	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) Peak hour automobile LOS should not be the sole criterion when making decisions on transportation and land use projects. Peak hour LOS should be balanced by the consideration of bicycle and pedestrian impacts, average	2-162	Comment Noted. The City cannot absolutely prioritize some goals and policies over others; it is left to decision makers to weigh each case. The General Plan provides numerous policies

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
				LOS, quality of life effects, safety, costs, aesthetics and other factors. Having flexible LOS standards is desirable for pedestrians and bicyclists. Lower LOS standards in multi-modal areas encourage road users to use modes of transport besides their automobiles. M 1.2.2 a. and b. “[...] unless maintaining this LOS would, in the City’s judgment, be infeasible and/or conflict with the achievement of other goals.” This is a key statement of this section, and must be enforced. Only if the safety, comfort and convenience of pedestrians and bicyclists will not be sacrificed should the LOS be maintained or raised to the minimum level.		to weigh when making LOS decisions on a case-by-case basis, and it is possible to waive the LOS standard due to overriding concerns.
211	7/31/2008	Other	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) Peak hour automobile LOS should not be the sole criteria for making decisions on transportation and land use projects. Peak hour LOS should be balanced by the consideration of bicycle and pedestrian impacts, average LOS, quality of life effects, safety, costs, aesthetics and other factors. Having flexible LOS standards is desirable for pedestrians and bicyclists. Lower LOS standards in multi-modal areas encourage road users to use modes of transport besides their automobiles. M 1.2.2 a. and b. is a key statement of this section: “[...] unless maintaining	2-162	Comment Noted. The City cannot absolutely prioritize some goals and policies over others; it is left to decision makers to weigh each case. The General Plan provides numerous policies to weigh when making LOS decisions on a case-by-case basis, and it is possible to waive the LOS standard due to overriding concerns.

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
				this LOS would, in the City's judgment, be infeasible and/or conflict with the achievement of other goals."		
212	7/25/2008	New/Mod	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) As LOS on major roads goes down, more drivers will use parallel streets as alternative routes. The LOS of the neighborhood must therefore be taken into account – if a decrease in the LOS on one street causes a real or perceived danger to residents living in the neighborhood, this change creates a conflict with the vision of being a livable city. Traffic calming measures should be implemented in these areas to discourage these detours and encourage walking and bicycling.	2-162	Addressed Elsewhere. This is already addressed under Goal M 4.3 (Neighborhood Traffic).
213	7/31/2008	New/Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) As LOS on major roads goes down, more drivers will use parallel streets as alternative routes. The LOS of the neighborhood must therefore be taken into account – if a decrease in the LOS on one street causes a real or perceived danger to residents living in the neighborhood, this change creates a conflict with the vision of being a livable city. Traffic calming measures should be implemented in these areas to discourage these detours and encourage walking and bicycling.	2-162	Addressed Elsewhere. This is already addressed under Goal M 4.3 (Neighborhood Traffic).
214	7/31/2008	Edit	Traci Canfield, RT	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standards), Bullet under	2-162	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
				a): Suggest revising to "...promote non-vehicular transportation <u>and transit</u> as part of a development project or City-initiated project".		Modify text as proposed.
215	7/31/2008	Mod	Jodi Samuels, Planning Commissioner	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standards) – This policy declares that the City “shall allow for flexible Level of Service standards” but then the bullet points definite certain standards. Why can’t these standards be evaluated on a project-level basis rather than set at a particular level based on different areas or districts?	2-162	Addressed Elsewhere. We want to set standards as a baseline for project evaluation rather than relying solely on case-by-case evaluation starting from the ground up. However, the policies of the Mobility Element will give direction to evaluate each project and potentially waive the LOS standard in case of overriding concerns.
216	7/31/2008	Other	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) ECOS strongly supports the change of LOS standards from C to D (E in Multi-Modal Districts). We are, however, concerned with the implication that “congestion” is acceptable only if alternatives are in place. We believe that “congestion” is necessary in many instances to move the general plan goals forward and its presence may be necessary to provide for the essential push to alternative movement implementation. Over the longer term we encourage the City to adopt a new approach to assessing transportation impacts — one that	2-162	Comment Noted. New methods of assessing Level of Service may be considered in future updates of the General Plan. At present time the method described in the General Plan EIR is the method accepted and supported by City staff to measure and describe transportation impacts.

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
				avoids the fundamental contradictions of the vehicular LOS standard. LOS is contradictory because it identifies vehicle delay as a negative environmental impact, which creates the necessity to reduce vehicle delay to mitigate the effect. This typically leads to the widening of roadways. The net effect is that using LOS as a standard forces the City to increase pollution to meet the requirements of CEQA, which is the exact opposite of what CEQA is intended to achieve, and the exact opposite of the City’s goals.		
217	7/31/2008	Other/Mod/New?	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) Diversion of Developer Fees to Alternative Modes The language of M 1.2.2 a and b seems to indicate that if developments push LOS from D to E (or E to F), this could be acceptable if developers pay for improvements to alternative modes. If so, the fees should be commensurate with what the developer would have paid to improve roadway facilities. If improvements to alternative modes are not feasible within the immediate vicinity of the development, fees should pay for alternative modes improvements elsewhere in the City.	2-162	Addressed Elsewhere. An implementation measure with the following language will be added: “ <u>The City shall prepare and adopt a level of service methodology that defines the process for determining which non-vehicular transportation and transit improvements will be implemented where the LOS standard is not accomplished.</u> ”
218	7/31/2008	New	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	LOS for Alternative Modes ECOS notes that the City has not yet adopted LOS standards for pedestrians	2-162	Addressed Elsewhere. A new implementation measure will be added:

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
				or bicyclists. We encourage the City to adopt LOS standards for these modes that, when adopted, can be implemented under the current GP language.		<u>“The City shall prepare and adopt multi-modal LOS standards.”</u>
219	7/31/2008	Endorsement	Sue Teranishi	M 1.2.2 (LOS Standard) I support the change of LOS E in the CBD and D in general. We need to make it safer for pedestrians and bicyclists in the Central Business District!	2-162	Comment Noted.
220	7/31/2008	Edit	Traci Canfield, RT	M 1.2.3 (Multimodal Access): Add transit stops/stations to list of activity centers	2-162	Recommended. Revised policy: “The City shall promote the provision of multimodal access to activity centers such as commercial centers and corridors, employment centers, <u>transit stops/stations</u> , airports, schools, parks, recreation areas, and tourist attractions.”
221	7/31/2008	Other	Sue Teranishi	M 1.3 (Barrier Removal) Remove barriers and gaps to encourage bicycling.	2-163	Comment Noted.
222	7/25/2008	New/Mod	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 1.3.1 (Grid Network) Define or clarify “well-connected” by establishing connectivity standards.	2-163	Recommended with Modifications. New implementation measure will be added: <u>“The City shall prepare and adopt connectivity standards based on a review of</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
						<u>standard applied by other municipalities with similar policy goals.”</u>
223	7/31/2008	Endorsement	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 1.3.1 (Grid Network) The Sacramento TMA supports a grid network of streets. Grids are vital elements in connectivity.	2-163	Comment Noted.
224	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 1.3.1 (Grid Network) ECOS supports the use of grid networks for new developments. We commend the city for adopting this policy. We recommend that the policy language drop the word “preferably.”	2-163	Addressed Elsewhere. "Preferable" allows flexibility to deal with situations that do not lend themselves to the grid pattern. Connectivity standards will create more certainty in the implementation of this policy. The City will be adding a new implementation measure: <u>“The City shall prepare and adopt connectivity standards based on a review of standard applied by other municipalities with similar policy goals.”</u>
225	8/5/2008	Mod	Larry Greene, SMAQMD	M 1.3.1 (Grid Network) The District recommends that the City rephrase this measure to require that new streets be developed along a grid, with blocks no larger than 400 feet, unless this would in the City’s	2-163	Addressed Elsewhere. See Comment/Response # 224.

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
				judgement, be infeasible and/or conflict with the achievement of other goals.		
226	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 1.3.2 (Private Complete Streets) We support this policy and would like to see the language strengthened so that developers are required to connect not only to the “existing roadway system” but specifically to all existing residential streets and collectors that adjoin their development as well as to all existing bikeways and pedestrian paths. Where no existing residential streets or collectors exist, developers should be required to provide frequent access to surrounding arterials from within the development.	2-163	Recommended with Modifications. New implementation measure will be added: <u>“The City shall prepare and adopt connectivity standards based on a review of standard applied by other municipalities with similar policy goals.”</u>
227	7/25/2008	Mod	Walt Seifert, SABA	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, <u>canals, creeks, and other barriers</u> 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,

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
						<u>canals, creeks, and other barriers</u> 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, <u>canals, creeks, and other barriers</u> 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: “ <u>The City shall prepare and adopt connectivity standards based on a review of standard applied by other municipalities with similar policy goals.</u> ”
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

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
						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 <u>the Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT)</u> 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.
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)	2-164	Addressed Elsewhere. We are using this as an

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
				Recommend adding a goal to decrease Vehicle Miles Traveled.		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 agencies (e.g., SACOG, SMAQMD, <u>Sacramento Regional Transit District</u> , Caltrans) to encourage and support programs...”
239	7/25/2008	Mod	Walt Seifert, SABA	M 1.4.2. (Commuter Trip Reduction) Retitle to “Automobile Commuter Trip Reduction”. Recommend adding parking cash-out	2-164	Recommended with Modifications. New policy title:

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
				programs and spelling out that bicycle facilities include bike parking, clothing lockers and showers.		<p>“M 1.4.2 Automobile Commute Trip Reduction”</p> <p>Parking cash-out is addressed by Policy M 6.1.8.</p> <p>Bicycle facilities are addressed by Policy M 5.1.11.</p>
240	7/31/2008	Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	<p>M 1.4.2. (Commute Trip Reduction) Retitle to “Automobile Commute Trip Reduction”.</p> <p>Recommend adding parking cash-out programs and specifying that bicycle facilities include bike parking, clothing lockers and showers.</p>	2-164	<p>Recommended with Modifications.</p> <p>New policy title: M 1.4.2 Automobile Commute Trip Reduction</p> <p>Parking cash-out is addressed by Policy M 6.1.8.</p> <p>Bicycle facilities are addressed by Policy M 5.1.11.</p>
241	7/31/2008	Mod	Jodi Samuels, Planning Commissioner	M 1.4.2, 1.4.3 – Why are these policies for Transportation Demand Management written as “encourage” instead of “require”? The language used here should be stronger.	2-164	<p>Not Recommended.</p> <p>The current language is consistent with California state law.</p>
242	7/25/2008	Other	Walt Seifert, SABA	<p>M 1.5.5 (Neighborhood Electric Vehicles)</p> <p>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</p>	2-165	<p>Addressed Elsewhere.</p> <p>See Goal M 4.2 (Complete Streets) which directs the provision of streets that meet the diverse needs of diverse users. Also see Mobility</p>

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
				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.		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 helps assure that we have Complete Streets, provided that they are not separate facilities for the NEVs.	2-165	Comment Noted.
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:		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
				<p>“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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Interstate 5 – Arena Boulevard to I-80</u> • <u>Interstate 5 – I-80 to West El Camino Avenue</u> • <u>State Route 50 – Freeport Boulevard to State Route 99</u> • <u>State Route 50 – 59th Street to 65th Street</u> • <u>State Route 50 – Howe Avenue to Watt Avenue</u> • <u>State Route 51 (Capital City Freeway) – Watt Avenue to I-80</u> • <u>State Route 51 (Capital City Freeway) – Arden Way to El Camino Avenue</u> • <u>State Route 99 – Broadway to 12th Avenue”</u> 		
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,	M 1.7 (Equity of Access)		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	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.”		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): <u>“M 1.3.7 Barrier Removal 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.”</u>
250	7/31/2008	Other	Anonymous	M2 It is important to improve pedestrian	2-167	Comment Noted. Goal M 2.1 addresses

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
				accessibility and safety, especially in the downtown.		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	<p>Recommended with Modifications. Will address by adding language on complete streets to M 1.3.4 as follows:</p> <p>“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. <u>Transportation improvements in the vicinity of major transit stations shall emphasize the development of complete streets.</u>”</p> <p>The City cannot guarantee access improvements to all transit stations because the 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.</p>

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
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 <u>type and location</u> 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 <u>carries out the goals and policies of the General Plan and defines; the type and location</u> of pedestrian-oriented streets and pathways; standards for sidewalk width, improvements, amenities, and street crossings; the schedule for public improvements; and developer responsibilities. <u>All new development shall be consistent with the applicable provisions of the Pedestrian Master Plan.</u> (MPSP)"
254	7/31/2008	Mod	City Staff, Department of	M 2.1.1 The Pedestrian Corridors and Nodes	2-167	Recommended. Map will be added to

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
			Transportation	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.		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 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.

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
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 <u>wherever possible</u> 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 including shade trees; plantings; well-designed benches, trash receptacles, news racks, and other furniture; pedestrian-scaled lighting fixtures; wayfinding signage; <u>integrated transit shelters</u> ; public art; and other amenities.”

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
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 network.”	2-168	Not Recommended. The recommended language is too absolute and cannot be included due to the lack of 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 <u>engage the street and</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
						encourage walking <u>through design features such as placing the building with entrances facing the street and providing connections to sidewalks.</u> ”
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 <u>engage the street and encourage walking through design features such as placing the building with entrances facing the street and providing connections to sidewalks.</u> ”
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. 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 <u>transit stops and stations</u> , schools, parks, 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
						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 7 th 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: 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	2-173	Recommended. Further clarification of map will be provided in introduction to M 3: “ <u>Figure M1 shows transit corridors including existing and future light rail routes, the Capitol Corridor rail line, the proposed high speed rail</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
				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?		<u>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.</u>
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. 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	2-171	Recommended with Modifications. 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
				any new transit options will include these accommodations in the future.		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., electricity, fiberoptic cable, etc.).</u> 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	2-171	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
				safe areas for waiting.		
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. <u>The City shall enhance bicycle and pedestrian access to stations.</u> ”
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. See Comment/Response # 276.
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

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
						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. 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> ”
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	2-172	Comment Noted. The City cannot guarantee improvements around all major transit stops. The policy directs the City to extract transit benefits from

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
				safe, easy walking and biking to transit.		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 65 th St. stations)." Suggest adding a similar policy to support transit centers.	2-175	Recommended. New policy language: " <u>M 3.1.13 Light Rail Extensions and Enhancements</u> to Airport and South Sacramento . The City shall support the extension of light rail service to Sacramento International Airport, and further extension in South Sacramento <u>and other improvements to facilities such as the 65th Street, Royal Oaks, and Swanston stations.</u> "
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.	2-175	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
				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.		
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 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.	2-176	Comment Noted.
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

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 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 <u>safe, clean, comfortable, and rider-friendly waiting environment</u> near transit stations <u>at all transit stops within the city.</u> ”
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

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
						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, <u>incremental improvements in gas mileage, and improved access for passengers with disabilities.</u> ”
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. See Comment/Response #290.
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. <u>Roundabouts, as an intersection traffic control option with demonstrated air quality and safety benefits, shall be considered where</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
						<u>deemed feasible and appropriate.</u>
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 motorists and can be safer and more convenient for bicyclists.		Recommended with Modifications. <u>See Comment/Response #292.</u>
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		Mod	EIR Mitigation	Modify the Street Classification diagram (Figure M2) to show the following future road widenings: Elkhorn Boulevard from SR 99 to E. Commerce Parkway (from 6 to 8 lanes); Rio Linda Boulevard from	2-183	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
				<p>Grand Avenue to the north city limits (from 2 to 4 lanes); and Silver Eagle Road from Northgate Boulevard to Norwood Avenue (from 2 to 4 lanes).</p> <p>The City could instead modify the proposed Level of Service (LOS) policy to exempt these roadways from the proposed LOS DE goal; however, instead of amending the LOS policy, the City has chosen to modify the Street Classification diagram to show an increased number of through lanes for these three specific roadway segments.</p>		
297	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).
298	7/31/2008	Other	City Staff, Department of Transportation	MAPS: “Special Study Segment” What does this mean?	2-183	Comment Noted. Will clarify in legend on map.
299	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	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

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 are the main determinants of all transportation outcomes.		communities <u>and reduces air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.</u> ”
300	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 <u>and the environment</u> with economic development goals when adding or modifying roads and bridges.”
301	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 Goals. The City shall evaluate and strive to balance impacts to the community <u>and the environment</u> with economic development goals when adding or modifying roads and bridges.”
302	7/31/2008	Endorsement	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 4.2 (Complete Streets) The Sacramento TMA supports the	2-180	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
				concept of Complete Streets.		
303	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.
304	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.
305	8/5/2008	Endorsement	Larry Greene, SMAQMD	M 4.2 The District endorses.	2-180	Comment Noted.
306	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 removed, because if the arterials are bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly there should be no need for frontage roads.	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. 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,

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/or grade-separated crossings.”
307	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	<p>M 4.2.6 (Identify Gaps in Complete Streets).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 facilities, and the degree of overcapacity of the existing roadway.”</p>	2-181	<p>Addressed Elsewhere. Prioritization of transportation improvements is addressed in the Transportation Programming Guide.</p>
308	7/31/2008	Other	Traci Canfield, RT	<p>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-</p>	2-182	<p>Recommended with Modifications. New language for Goal:</p> <p>“Goal M 4.3 Neighborhood Traffic. Enhance the quality of life within existing</p>

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
				calming where there are over 3,000 ADT to facilitate continued or improved neighborhood service.		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> "
309	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>
310	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. 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	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
				this section is vague (“Enhance the quality of life within existing neighborhoods...”).		
311	9/29/08	Mod	EIR Mitigation	<p>Make the following changes to M 4.3.1 as part of project mitigation:</p> <p>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). <u>The City shall continue wherever possible to design streets and approve development applications in such as manner as to reduce high traffic flows and parking problems within residential neighborhoods.</u></p>	2-182	Recommended.
312	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	<p>Recommended.</p> <p>The three policies will be combined into one policy.</p> <p>New policy language:</p> <p>“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). <u>The City</u></p>

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
						<p><u>shall continue wherever possible to design streets and approve development applications in such a manner as to reduce high traffic flows and parking problems within residential neighborhoods.”</u></p>
313	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	<p>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.</p> <p>Also, revise Goal M 4.3 as follows: “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></p>

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
314	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.
315	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: <u>"The City shall prepare and adopt a methodology to measure neighborhood level of service."</u>
316	7/31/2008	New	Ron Maertz, MENA	M 4.3.2 Neighborhood Traffic 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.	2-182	Not Recommended. This recommendation is too specific for 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
317	7/25/2008	Mod	Walt Seifert, SABA	<p>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.</p> <p>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 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.</p>	2-187-188	Recommended. Remove "Main Street" and "Mixed Use Street" from the typology "Major Arterial" in Table M1.
318	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	2-187	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
				<p>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.</p> <p>We recommend the city not construct or widen streets to more than four lanes.</p>		
319	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	<p>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 be re-designated as minor arterials to receive this treatment.</p> <p>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</p>	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
				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).		
320	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.
321	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 roadways in order to meet the LOS D-E threshold. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	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
322	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.
323	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 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.	2-189	Recommended with Modifications. New policy: <u>"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."</u>
324	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	2-191	Addressed Elsewhere. This would be more appropriate as an Indicator in the Livability Index (See

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
				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.		Part 4 Administration and Implementation, page 4-3) rather than as a Policy.
325	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.
326	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 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	7/31/2008	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	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
				parking for employees and short-term bicycle racks for visitors.		
328	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).
329	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. See Comment/Response #328.
330	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 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.	2-193	Addressed Elsewhere See Comment/Response #328.
331	7/31/2008	Mod	Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA	M 5.1.11. (Bike Facilities in New Development) Change “bicycle racks” to the more	2-192	Recommended 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
				inclusive term bicycle parking and distinguish between long-term bicycle parking for employees and short-term parking for visitors.		“The City shall require that larger new development projects... provide bicycle racks parking (i.e., <u>short-term bicycle parking for visitors and long-term bicycle parking for residents or employees</u>), personal lockers, showers, and other bicycle-support facilities.”
332	7/31/2008	Other/Endorsement	Sue Teranishi	M 5.1.11 Require bike facilities in new developments.	2-192	Comment Noted
333	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).
334	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
335	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)
336	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	2-191	Addressed Elsewhere This will be addressed in the update of the Bicycle Master Plan (Mobility

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
				boulevards.		Implementation Measure # 14).
337	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).
338	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 sidewalks.</u> ”
339	7/31/2008	Other	Sue Teranishi	M 5.1.4 More effort should go into reducing bike and vehicle conflicts.	2-191	Comment Noted
340	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 5.1.7 (Class II Bikeway 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.”	2-192	Addressed Elsewhere Bike lane widths can be addressed in the update of the Bicycle Master Plan (Mobility Implementation Measure # 14).
341	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein,	ECOS recommends that, following the	2-192	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
			ECOS	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.		
342	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 to residential developments.	2-192	Recommended New policy language: “The City shall ensure that new <u>commercial and residential</u> development projects provide <u>a frequent and direct connections</u> to the nearest bikeways along an arterial or collector. ”
343	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.
344	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
345	7/25/2008	New/Mod	Walt Seifert, SABA	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
				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.		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	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.
347	7/31/2008	Mod	Graham Brownstein, ECOS	M 6.1.2 (Reduce Minimum Parking Standards) 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	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.

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
				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.		
348	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.
349	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 and encourage the use of shared parking to achieve that laudable goal. We would respectfully request that the reference to structured parking be removed.	2-195	Not Recommended
350	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	2-196	Recommended Elsewhere This will be added as a new implementation measure: <u>“The City shall investigate alternatives to the current</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
				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.		<u>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.”</u>
351	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.
352	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 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.	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 draft of General Plan.
353	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	2-199	Not Recommended Grade separations have been deemed infeasible.

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
				service (not just peak hours).		
354	7/31/2008	Mod	Traci Canfield, RT	M 9.1.2: Add transit facilities	2-205	<p>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.</p> <p>To clarify, M 9.1.3 will be edited as follows:</p> <p>“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 continuing maintenance, operation, and management of the city’s transportation network.”</p>
355	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,	2-205	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
				not just roads and expanded transit. Pedestrian and bike improvements are cheaper to provide and yet we're way behind on making them.		
356	11/20/08	Other	EIR	Figure M2 should be updated to reflect changes to MEIR's Street Classification Diagram (Figure 6.12-9)	page 2-183	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

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: PART 2, UTILITIES

#	Date	Type	Source	Comment	Page	Staff Comments/ Recommendation
357	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: <u>“The City shall continue to expand its voluntary containerized program.”</u> (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.)
358	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.
359	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.
360	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: <u>“Recycled water. The City shall continue to investigate the feasibility of utilizing recycled water where appropriate, cost effective, safe and environmentally sustainable.”</u>
361	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: <u>“Recycled water. The City shall continue to investigate the feasibility of utilizing recycled water where appropriate, cost effective, safe and environmentally sustainable.”</u> (See above.) <u>“Emergency Water Conservation. The City shall develop a response plan to assist citizens in reducing water use during periods of water shortages and emergencies.”</u> <u>“Water Conservation Enforcement. The City shall continue to enforce City</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
						<u>ordinances that prohibit the waste or runoff of water, establish limits on outdoor water use, and specify applicable penalties.”</u>
362	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: <u>“Zero Waste. The City shall achieve zero waste to landfills by 2040 through conversion technology.”</u> <u>“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.”</u> <u>“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.”</u>
363	10/16/2008 Planning	Mod	Commissioner Bartholomy	Referring to page 178 of the staff report: There should be a higher level of recycling called for	2-221 through	Recommended with Modifications.

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
	Commission			in the General Plan. Calling for 100% waste conversion (i.e., waste to energy) by 2040 is of concern. The General Plan should first promote programs involving the 3Rs (reduce, reuse, and recycle) before looking at conversion technology.	2-2-223	<p>Modify new policy (recommended above) for U 5 Solid Waste:</p> <p><u>“Zero Waste. The City shall achieve zero waste to landfills by 2040 through reusing, reducing, and recycling solid waste, and using conversion technology if appropriate.”</u></p> <p>It should be noted that most of the existing policies in U 5 Solid Waste require the City to reduce, reuse, and recycle solid waste.</p>
364	8/21/08	New	Sarah Ropelato, Legal Services of Northern California	U 1.1.11 Compatibility with Natural Gas Facilities. The City shall ensure, wherever 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.	2-211	<p>Recommended to be Addressed Elsewhere Add new policy to PHS 3-Hazardous Materials after PHS 3.1.6:</p> <p><u>“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</u></p>

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
						<p><u>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)”</u></p> <p>(Also, change the title of Policy 3.1.6 to “Compatibility with <u>Hazardous Materials Facilities</u>”.)</p>
365	11/13/08 Planning Commission	Delete	Planning Commission	The Planning Commission recommended removal of the proposed new “Risks from Hazardous Materials Facilities” policy (above). It is duplicative of review that occurs under State law.		<p>Recommended. Delete as follows: “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)”</p>

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
366	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 of the cost for facilities needed to provide services to accommodate growth <u>without adversely impacting current service levels.</u>	2-210	Recommended.
367	8/20/08	Mod	Stoel Rives, LLC	Change U 5.1.3 as follows: Equitably Distributed and Compatible Facilities. <u>To the extent feasible,</u> the City shall ensure that <u>new</u> 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). <u>Expansion of existing facilities should be given preference to development of new facilities.</u>	2-221	Not Recommended. The merits of expanding an existing facility will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
368	9/8/08	Other	Power Inn Alliance	Stoel Rives' above change is an attempt to circumvent the policies of the City's Solid Waste Restricted (SWR) Overlay Zone.	2-221	Comment Noted. See Comment/Response # 366.
369	9/14/08	Other	Annette Deglow for the College-Glen Neighborhood Association	We do not support Stoel Rives' suggested additional verbage to the first sentence in section U.5.1.3. (See Comment # 366 for the suggested language.) The phrase "to the extent feasible" weakens the intent of the paragraph. We strongly object to the added sentence "Expansion of existing facilities should be given	2-221	Comment Noted. See Comment/Response # 366.

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