

Attachment 9-Table of Comments and Responses for the Public Review Draft 2040 General Plan

This attachment is a spreadsheet that shows responses to comments on the Public Review Draft (PRD) 2040 General Plan, collected from the Self-Guided Online Workshop (hosted on the Konveio platform) and comment letters received during the public comment period (April 28, 2023-October 10, 2023). This spreadsheet also includes responses to Councilmember and Commissioner comments, in addition to staff-initiated revisions collected during the same timeframe. **Please note that revisions to photos, captions, and maps (with the exception of Maps LUP-5 and LUP-6) will not be reflected in the redlined draft; these technical revisions will be reflected in the hearing draft which will be prepared in early 2024.**

Please use the first three pages to understand the organization of this attachment. Note that all page, map, figure, goal, policy, action references are from PRD General Plan. Some may have shifted as a result of new additions and name modifications.

Organization

This attachment is organized by chapter/element. The beginning of each chapter/element will be labeled in the header. The lower left corner of each page also names the chapter/element. The following table provides descriptions of column headings.

Column Heading	Description
Comment	Shows the comment received.
Goal/Policy/Action	If applicable, identifies the goal/policy/action/figure/photo referenced in the comment.
Response/Revision	Shows the staff response to the comment and/or redline changes made in response to comment.
Commenter/Organization	Identifies the name of the commenter or organization that provided the comment. See "Key" below for additional details.

Key

Use key to read the "Commenter/Organization" column. These identify where the comment came from.

Key	Description
[#]	Comment letters and emails from public, referenced by letter number. See "Comment Letters" below for a list.
[K-Element-#]	Konveio public comments, referenced by Element and page number
[CC]	Comment from City Councilmember
[ACCE]	Comment from Arts and Creative Economy Commissioner
Staff	Staff-initiated revisions
CAAP	Revisions as a result of response to CAAP comment

Comment Letters

Listed in order received.

Letter #	Description
01	2023 05 22_Email_David Morro
02	2023 06 07_SACOG_Comment Letter SacGPU Public Review Draft
03	2023 06 08_Alyssa and Troy_Sac 2040 General Plan Summary
04	2023 06 12_Email_Steve Rosen
05	2023 06 15_House Sac_General Plan Comments for ATC mtg
06	2023 06 22_Email_Matt Anderson
07	2023 07 10_BIA_Letter re General Plan LUP 3.1 FAR Cap
08	2023 08 02_Email_Matthew Gerkin

09 2023 08 07_Email_Thomas Smith
10 2023 08 07_Email_John Hodgson
11 2023 08 07_Email_Francesca Reitano-Elmhurst Neighborhood Association
12 2023 08 07_Email_Maggie Coulter-Elmurst Neighborhood Association
13 2023 08 07_Email_Sam Keshavarz
14 2023 08 07_Email_Eric Ball-Elmhurst Neighborhood Association
15 2023 08 07_Email_Debra van Hulsteyn
16 2023 08 07_Email_Michael Silver and Chris Ratekin
17 2023 08 08_Email_Kevin McRae
18 2023 08 08_Email_Karen Jacques
19 2023 08 08_Email_Cresleigh Homes Corporation-Deana Ellis
20 2023 08 08_Development Representatives_Community Benefits Letter
21 2023 08 08_House Sac_Draft GPU Comments
22 2023 08 08_Mohanna Development-Nikky Mohanna_2040 General Plan comment letter
23 2023 08 08_Maria Kelly_City Council Meeting Tuesday August 8
24 2023 08 09_Email_Lucinda Seaton
25 2023 08 12_Email_Melissa Mourkas-Preservation Sacramento
26 2023 08 17_Active Transportation Commission_Staff Report Comments on the Draft 2040 General Plan Update
27 2023 08 19_Email_Terry OBrien
28 2023 08 19_Email_Zoe and Read Harrison-GP Feedback
29 2023 08 19_Email_Zoe and Read Harrison-GP Feedback-housing densification
30 2023 08 19_Email_Zoe and Read Harrison-GP Feedback-affordable housing
31 2023 08 20_Email_Raeann Sarti
32 2023 08 21_Email_Christie Munson
33 2023 08 21_Email_Rev J Patrick Kelly
34 2023 08 21_Email_Angie Smith
35 2023 08 21_Email_Charles Conner
36 2023 08 21_Email_Ilsa Louise Hess
37 2023 08 21_Email_Suzy Wahlborg
38 2023 08 21_Citizens Climate Lobby_CCL Response-2040 GP and CAAP
39 2023 08 21_ESCA_comments General Plan Update
40 2023 08 21_KayCrumb_GP comment
41 2023 08 22_Email_James Falcone
42 2023 08 23_ECOS_LETTER re City of Sacramento Draft GPU
43 2023 08 23_Email_assignees of Kern Schumacher
44 2023 08 23_Email_Chris Holm
45 2023 08 23_Email_Deb Lebish
46 2023 08 23_Email_Jeff Solomon
47 2023 08 23_Jeff Solomon_Comment for Sac City Council Meeting on 08-08-23
48 2023 08 23_Email_Lynn Orion-Save Sacramento
49 2023 08 23_Kaiser Permanente_Sacramento GP Update_GP 2040 Comment Letter
50 2023 08 23_Preservation Sacramento_2040 General Plan Comments
51 2023 08 23_Trees for Sacramento_Final LETTER T4S ON DRAFT GP
52 2023 08 24_Email_Karen Jacques
53 2023 08 24_North Natomas Community Coalition_Comments on GPU 2040
54 2023 08 25_Email_Kevin and Anne Higgins-Save Sacramento
55 2023 08 25_Email_Muriel Strand

56 2023 08 28_Email_Six Bar C LLC-Bob Cook
57 2023 08 30_Blue Diamond_Sacramento 2040 General Plan - Blue Diamond Growers Policy Suggestions
58 2023 08 31_SMAQMD_Public Review Draft of the Sacramento 2040 General Plan
59 2023 09 11_Tiffany Clark_The City of Sacramento's Unconstitutional Home Occupation Code Sections
60 2023 09 13_Email_Dennis Palmquist
61 2023 09 13_Email_Susan Boone-Rowan
62 2023 09 13_Email_Peter Budge
63 2023 09 13_Email_Tristan Albor
64 2023 09 13_Email_Joshua Everett
65 2023 09 14_Email_Klynton Kammerer
66 2023 09 14_Email_Melissa Wharton
67 2023 09 15_Email_Michael Corley
68 2023 09 15_Email_Cole Trouberman
69 2023 09 16_Email_Caley Smith
70 2023 09 16_Email_Matthew King
71 2023 09 16_Email_Kevin DiLoreto
72 2023 09 17_Email_Jon Feenstra
73 2023 09 21_Email_Barbara Graichen
74 2023 09 23_SacRT_Sac2040 General Plan and CAAP_Comment Letter
75 2023 09 25_Email_Barbara Graichen
76 2023 10 01_Howard Levine_Campus Commons as SSA
77 2023 10 05_Howard Levine_2040 General Plan Comments
78 2023 10 09_Email_Barbara Graichen
79 2023 10 09_Email_Ann Alter
80 2023 10 10_Barbara Graichen_General Plan comments 202310-10
80a 2023 10 10_Barbara Graichen_Steelhead Creek in the Ueda Parkwaypublished in Natomas Journal
81 2023 10 10_Sacramento Sierra Club_2040 Sac GP Comment Letter
82 2023 10 10_Email_rwhgeo
83 2023 10 10_Email_Elizabeth Georgis
84 2023 10 10_Email_Nancy Comstock
85 2023 10 10_California Compost Coalition_Letter of Support - Draft EIR Report for 2030 Climate Action Plan (002)
86 2023 10 10_Email_Barbara Graichen
87 2023 10 10_Email_Carr Kunze
88 2023 10 10_Email_Inderjit Rye
89 2023 10 10_Email_MK Hickox
90 2023 10 10_Email_Brenda Nasser and Ed Cline
91 2023 10 12_Civic Thread_City of Sac GP 2040 Civic Thread Comment Letter

INTRODUCTION

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Introduction			
<p>I think the focus on growing density, rather than sprawl, is a great goal to start off with, but the language used doesn't give the reader a good idea of what will change in the city to accommodate all these extra homes and jobs. This statement could be adjusted to explicitly state what is being planned. For example, "Our goal is to reduce sprawl and gently increase density within our existing neighborhoods to accommodate anticipate growth of our City." This would better set the expectations that neighborhoods will change. Any neighborhood shouldn't experience change too quickly, but no neighborhood is exempt from change.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	ew [K-Intro-1]
<p>I completely agree with the priority to focus on sustainable and climate-friendly growth patterns that provide alternatives to the use of cars. Increasing density in already developed communities, especially along transit corridors, is an especially important strategy to reduce GHG emissions and provide a greater choice of housing types for Sacramento residents.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-Intro-1]
<p>Community needs include socially oriented businesses that don't require driving to get there. We as a community need to think beyond just compact housing with groceries stores a short drive away and think more of small businesses encouraged to build within the neighborhoods within walking distance. This will build community connections while also making it possible to reduce driving.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Christina Parker [K-Intro-1]
<p>Predictions of increasing heat/drought alternating with episodes of extreme rain events make it critical that the City consider resilience and the safety of residents during extreme weather events in all the planning and work that it does and it must build neighborhood trust by working with and listening to neighborhood residents in all that it does. The City must especially prioritize resiliency in Sacramento's poorest neighborhoods where residents have fewer resources and are, therefore, likely to be more at risk.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-Intro-1]
<p>I've made several critical comments below, because I believe Sacramento is in danger of becoming a failed city and is at risk at entering what is now called a "doom loop." You have a vastly overpaid City Manager and a Mayor who have both presided over a worsening climate. But this does not have to be. Sacramento's greatest assets are its river ways and creeks. Early City leaders had the vision to buy up land and create the American River Parkway which is now threatened thanks to misguided legal advice (see my comment about Martin v. Boise), and "leaders" who choose to use the Parkway as a dumping ground to hide their inability to accomplish meaningful change. Name any other industry where the more you spend, the worse the problem...</p> <p>The City and County have an opportunity to reverse this trend, and the lower American River is the place to accomplish such a revitalization. Imagine reclaiming the area of both sides of the river from Watt Avenue to Discovery Park for the public. There are so many stunning environmental resources in this stretch of the river. What about an arboretum, a haven for butterflies and birds, interpretive nature trails, protected areas for wildlife, beautiful picnic areas for families, safe hiking and biking trails, a pedestrian bridge from Township 9 to the other side of the river linking together a vast network of trails where educational programs can be advanced? What about a National Park or similar designation for a unique riparian environment? Think of the resulting economic benefits.</p> <p>This is the moment the City and County can protect and enhance the lower Parkway and create something that really enhances the quality of life and improves our rivers and creeks.</p> <p>See this link which evidences the destruction and the doom loop the Parkway has been in for twenty years:</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/@rivercitywaterwayalliance4646</p> <p>Now is the time to achieve great things!</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Richard Watson [K-Intro-1]
Sacramento Profile			
<p>We became State Capital in 1854 not 1858 as your paper states.</p>		Text revised to say 1854.	Dan Dillon [K-Intro-2]
<p>The age demographtics have to have increased in Sacramento as our Baby Boomer generation as aged.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Emily Battin [K-Intro-2]
<p>The age demographic of Sacramento has changed dramatically. The folks 50+ is growing quickly and the under 18 is slowing. The number of kids 0-4 has shrunk. This has significant policy and program impacts on our city and should be accurately reported in order to address this change. Please amend this to reflect our cities changing demographic.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	PATTY WAIT [K-Intro-2]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The background information does not address the aging of our population. The data collectors for Ca. DOF, SACOG, even NOAA all describe an ever growing older adult cohort. Yet this says the age profile remains the same. It is important that our plans for the future address this first ever shift in age, and plan for it. Where is this taken into account in this document?		Please see the forthcoming Age-Friendly Action Plan.	Anonymous [K-Intro-2]
The City should ensure that the historic look of Midtown is protected when reviewing development applications. While we need to add new housing including multi-family housing that will increase average building heights, the design of those buildings should add to and not detract from the historic look of the Midtown neighborhoods. And buildings taller than 3 stories should be limited to transit corridors where residents have alternatives to the use of automobiles for daily commutes and to access services. The City should ensure that the historic design requirements for development meet the "objective standards" requirements set out in SB 35 and other state housing legislation.		Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-Intro-2]
What is a General Plan			
What happens if the city and region don't develop as forecast? Does our general plan lock us into a development pattern that no longer works for our community? How do we address sudden changes and accept quick solutions if it is not 100% in line with the general plan?		The City undergoes a general plan update every five years. With each update, there is opportunity to adjust policies based on new legislation and evolving needs.	ew [K-Intro-3]
Particularly, conservation of urban farms within food deserts (areas experiencing food insecurity).		Please see policies in goal section EJ-2 for policies on healthy food access and awareness.	kculbert [K-Intro-3]
Including production of affordable housing.		The development standards in the 2040 General Plan aim to create opportunities for developers to build more affordable housing types. Please see Goal 2 of the 2021-2029 Housing Element for policies on increasing affordable housing. Link to the Housing Element: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Long-Range/Housing-Element/00_Sac-HE_-AdoptionDft_Aug2021.pdf?la=en	kculbert [K-Intro-3]
General Plan Requirements			
The state is limiting the ability of local governments to make land use decisions in each legislative session. (Ex. - SB 8 and SB 9.) The state is mandating ministerial approvals (Ex. SB 9, SB-35, ADU laws), zoning (such as setbacks), housing types and housing density. The state is removing CEQA protection for certain types of projects. The state is making rules on parking spaces required. In short, every session the state is narrowing and eliminating local discretion.		Thank you for your comment.	Francesca Reitano [K-Intro-4]
What does the Housing Element say? It should at least be summarized or have bullet points - so we can judge if the GP is 'vertically consistent'.		Link to the Housing Element: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Long-Range/Housing-Element/00_Sac-HE_-AdoptionDft_Aug2021.pdf?la=en	Laurie Heller [K-Intro-4]
Regional Location			
Amtrak provides vital service but is not well supported and doesn't come close to the potential passenger rail can play in serving region transportation needs. More trains, routes, increased frequency and improved infrastructure are all necessary and should be a priority for support in Sacramento		Please see goal section M-5 for policies on connecting the regional transportation network to move people and goods.	Dale Steele [K-Intro-6]
"Amtrak serves Sacramento's passenger rail needs" is not a truthful statement. It only serves some rail needs and otherwise costs too much and takes too much time for many others to use. An equitable rail system would be more efficient, faster, and much more affordable.		Thank you for your comment.	Katie McCammon [K-Intro-6]
This isn't an accurate statement when considering the challenges of taking the train (i.e. it's only reasonable to drive to it unless you already live along the light rail line or in downtown or are within biking and safe trail distance - which is essentially the same).		Thank you for your comment.	Christina Parker [K-Intro-6]
Sphere of Influence			
I would like to see analysis and discussion about the effectiveness of the SOI to date in limiting sprawl as well as recommendations for how this can be improved to lessen health and environmental impacts.		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-Intro-6]
Map I-2: Planning Area			
<i>Natomas area</i>			
Why isn't this a special study area as well?		Thank you for your comment.	Anonymous [K-Intro-8]
Many maps throughout the general plan do not show the planned Green Line station at Greenbriar/North Lake.		Proposed stations as adopted by SacRT Board of Directors are included in 2040 General Plan maps. SacRT also identified optional stations which are not reflected in 2040 General Plan maps.	Kevin Dumler [K-Intro-8]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Considering this light rail line is just unidirectional and will only be useful to a small portion of residents commuting Natomas to downtown (and visa versa) and airport travel, it would be helpful to move this along sooner and get a portion of current residents transitioned to using light rail before building more housing in Natomas. Traffic on I-5 has already slowed down significantly and gotten more congested in the last few years (even with a portion of workers in hybrid work) and it is unlikely all new residents in Natomas will be able to use it considering it's limited to just North and South. And if Sacramento intends to make a "truck corridor" between the airport and downtown through this area, it really needs to consider the needs of current traffic before expanding even more. The current expansion on I-5 planned for this area is a short term fix and public transit -through- downtown even on this new rail line to other locations is impractical for daily commutes.		Thank you for your comment.	Christina Parker [K-Intro-8]
Keep the existing farmland under the USFWS Habitat Conservation plan intact. Do not allow development in the are below Fisherman's Lake and Garden Hwy.		Thank you for your comment.	Deborah Condon [K-Intro-8]
Fruitridge/Broadway area			
Tahoe Park/South Tahoe Park is an old neighborhood. It seems it has been forgotten by the city. The streets are in bad need of help, the Teen Center in the Park has not been available to Teen activities in decades, the shopping center in Tallac Village is in disrepair and nothing seems to help. We have limited to none bus services. We have no police presence and crime is quickly invading the neighborhood. Your plan wants more housing, but this neighborhood cannot sustain more. Where does the water come from for all the building the city wants? Where do the services come from when it is hard to get services now? When does the city get to reality?		Thank you for your comment.	Kathleen E Winkelman [K-Intro-8]
Historical Development Pattern			
The documented mistreatment of Native Americans by Sutter has been well documented and should be acknowledged wherever his name is used now.		Please see policy HCR-1.13 (Indigenous Cultures), which includes "naming of parks and places that reflects local Native American heritage and/or restores tribal names."	Dale Steele [K-Intro-9]
Let's hold a moment of silence for the streetcar lines that were ripped out to prioritize space for cars.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-Intro-9]
Local ecology was also destroyed in this process.		Thank you for your comment.	Katie McCammon [K-Intro-10]
And now Sacramento and the state of California want to eliminate parking spaces for housing and businesses? This area has been built out, the freeways exist as arteries. There is interconnectedness between these communities, including the need to get to jobs. We are going to have to deal with what has been created with practical realities, not pie in the sky ideas about ditching cars and riding public transit, which is woefully inadequate. I cannot drive and know only too well what you are asking the average citizen to do.		Thank you for your comment.	Francesca Reitano [K-Intro-10]
These concerns need to be addressed front and center in the introduction. The goals of the general plan assume that everyone is starting out with the assumption that cars are bad and neighborhoods get ruined because of them. A lot of people have enjoyed great personal success due to personal cars and all of the subsidized roads that are driven on that have allowed them to move to a location where they can afford a house and still access jobs. Just suggesting that there are other patterns of development that use cars less (not eliminate them) is a culture shock for a lot of people. This is why goals like eliminating parking minimums (not parking) can elicit weirdly emotional reactions (weird in the sense that people will get mad over a little rectangle of asphalt). Before we can set the very realistic goals of reducing our dependence on cars, the case of why and how an over dependence on cars is actually bad for us needs to be laid out and laid out honestly (take your pick on what to start with: construction + maintenance costs, pollution in noise, air, water, etc., health impacts and the cost we pay in medical bills to subsidize a dependence on cars, social impacts of segregation caused by roads).		Thank you for your comment.	ew [K-Intro-10]
Sacramento is following a nation-wide trend where suburban shopping centers are closing. What does the city plan to do with this land? Florin Town Center is notoriously barren.		Please see LUP-5.1 (Evolving Regional Commercial Centers).	Ian Treat [K-Intro-10]
We need to build housing to co-exist with retail and amenities in abandoned or struggling shopping centers and strip malls, with access to transit and adequate parking. It is hopeful that the state is passing laws to facilitate this process.		Please see LUP-5.1 (Evolving Regional Commercial Centers).	Francesca Reitano [K-Intro-10]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Thank you for acknowledging the role of historic urban renewal projects in contributing to racial/socioeconomic segregation in our communities. Please also include more information about the role of 1930's-era redlining, which contributes to current racial and socioeconomic discrepancies: https://www.capradio.org/news/insight/2018/05/22/insight-052218a/		Please see Race & Place in Sacramento Report, which was written for the City of Sacramento to support preparation of the Environmental Justice Element for the Sacramento 2040 General Plan. Report link here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Major-Projects/General-Plan/About-The-Project/Environmental-Justice	kculbert [K-Intro-10]
This is a shameful period in Sacramento history. Vital and vibrant areas condemned as "blighted" to move people of color out of the West End.		Thank you for your comment.	Francesca Reitano [K-Intro-10]
With the city's push for denser and more mixed used neighborhoods and the higher tax return on such projects, please consider pushing policy forward which could truly allow residents and developers the chance to reimagine older shopping centers and larger properties into high density, mixed used communities.		Please see LUP-5.1 (Evolving Regional Commercial Centers).	GA [K-Intro-10]
General Plan Evolution			
Does the city track GP adherence by some sort of scorecard measure?		City staff provides a General Plan Annual Report to City Council every year. Please also see the sustainability and equity indicators in the Sustainability and Equity Chapter.	Ian Treat [K-Intro-10]
Annexing large swathes of land that are primarily single-family zoned is creating a massive infrastructure cost burden on cities. Will Sacramento be prioritizing infrastructure upgrades and maintenance in denser areas where the land is more valuable to the city?		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-Intro-10]
The adaptive reuse of buildings, particularly in the central city, is a much more green and sustainable way to give new life to the building and the community, while aiding in revitalizing key city cores. Enacting policy that supports and encourages this type of development is suggested.		Please see policies LUP-10.1 (Existing Structure Reuse), LUP-A.7 (Net-Zero Energy or Net-Positive Design), HCR-1.10 (Demolition), HCR-1.12 (Incentives for Rehabilitation and Adaptive Reuse of Historic Resources), and HCR-2.7 (Funding and Financing Mechanisms).	Kevin Concolino [K-Intro-10]
General Plan Process			
A statement should be included as to why EJ was now being included in the GP.		Text updated to include "...as required by California Government Code 65302(h)..."	Dale Steele [K-Intro-11]
The CAAP by itself isn't capable of "establishing" Sacramento as a climate action leader. That must come from the timely implementation of effective measures to meet critical climate action goals.		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-Intro-11]
The introduction should also include a reference to the 10 Key Strategies adopted by the City Council in the 01/19/2021 City Council Meeting. It should list all 10 key strategies (permit a greater array of housing types, facilitate compact development, right size our streets, eliminate parking minimums, etc).		Thank you for your comment.	Kevin Dumler [K-Intro-11]
Include a reference to the 10 Key Strategies adopted by the City Council in the 01/19/2021 City Council Meeting. It should list all 10 key strategies.		Key strategies will be identified in the staff report for adoption hearing.	House Sacramento [21]
Milestone Documents			
Is there a environmental subcommittee that is able to review and provide feedback on the plan? May members of the public join the environmental subcommittee?		The City did not establish an environmental subcommittee, however the City did establish an Environmental Justice Working Group to support and inform the development of the 2040 General Plan.	kculbert [K-Intro-11]
"implications" is double speak for negative environmental impacts to health, environment, and natural resources. What are the existing conditions of these resources and their trends resulting from ongoing city operations and expansion?		Please see the Sacramento 2040 MEIR.	Dale Steele [K-Intro-11]
In many cases the negative impacts to health, environment and natural resources from approved projects and programs are felt long before implementation of avoidance measures and mitigation. To better avoid and lessen such impacts the city must be proactive rather than prioritizing "streamlining" and "compliance".		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-Intro-11]
Community Involvement			
change to "is" and integral...		Thank you for your comment.	Katie McCammon [K-Intro-12]
The word "stakeholder" is used multiple times. As described in this paragraph it does not include renters, students, low wage workers, unhoused, and others with a valid stake in the City and General Plan. Stakeholders must include these other groups.		Thank you for your comment.	Douglas Surber [K-Intro-12]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
If you want equitability please do not take input from those in positions of power (property owners, developers, business owners) as equal to those without (low income, renters, homeless, labor workers, minorities). Those in power will always be able to voice their opinions louder because of money. Please take that into account.		Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-Intro-12]
This document is exceedingly long and complex. I worry that, despite the City's workshops and such, an insufficient number of Sacramentans are even aware of it much less understand the ramifications of its contents. Did the City attempt to contact residents by way of neighborhood associations?		The City has communicated and met with neighborhood associations at multiple phases throughout the project. Neighborhood associations also received updates and information on the project and have been involved in various meetings.	Zoe Harrsion [K-Intro-12]
As noted by prior commenters, it is surprising to see the groups missing from this list of stakeholder categories. Residents (including renters, students, and those without a permanent address) must be interviewed, well beyond those who also fall under property owners, business owners, and advocacy groups.		Thank you for your comment.	Sam Greenlee [K-Intro-12]
Following the comment on stakeholder interviews: this was good work, but should also be supplemented by stakeholder interviews of residents beyond community meetings.		Thank you for your comment.	Sam Greenlee [K-Intro-12]
I would like to know how many neighborhood associations the city reached out to for interest-based focus groups and in what parts of the city they were located. I'm on the board of a neighborhood association and I don't recall that we were contacted for input for Phase 2.		The City has communicated and met with neighborhood associations at multiple phases throughout the project. Neighborhood associations also received updates and information on the project and have been involved in various meetings.	Francesca Reitano [K-Intro-12]
I would like to see food justice/food security issues included as a core topic.		Please see goal section EJ-2 for policies related to healthy food access and awareness.	Sam Greenlee [K-Intro-12]
Tagalog, Hmong, Russian, and Vietnamese are all spoken by significant percentages of Sacramento residents as well.		Thank you for your comment.	Sam Greenlee [K-Intro-12]
What made the survey scientific? Statistical sampling is only part of the scientific method which must include experimental design and testing.		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-Intro-13]
Vision			
"National model" for the US is a low standard compared to international sustainable and equitable development.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-Intro-14]
Other commenters in the GP have noted that the authors use car-centric language throughout the plan. Please review the documents to remove such language when talking about other transportation options.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-Intro-14]
For the elderly and disabled, it is important that transit options be prioritized, as many members of these populations cannot walk or bike to their destinations. Right now public transit is woefully inadequate, and I don't see that becoming adequate in my lifetime.		Please see policies M-1.21 (Extension of Transit Service), M-2.7 (Free or Discounted Transit Passes), and M-2.8 (Micro-Transit Service).	Francesca Reitano [K-Intro-14]
"freedom" might be better explained as able to access the features and services described above.		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-Intro-14]
I recognize that wheelchair access is likely intended to be included under "walk" but believe it deserves specific language, as there continues to be a need to prioritize accessible pathways and sidewalks with appropriate curb cuts, ramps, and clearance without telephone and sign poles blocking passage.		Thank you for your comment.	Sam Greenlee [K-Intro-14]
Each COP meeting and IPCC report gets more dire each edition. Carbon neutrality by 2045 doesn't feel ambitious. How can the city go above and beyond this goal, or reach it sooner?		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-Intro-14]
The preservation and creation of tree canopies should be a priority. This has many benefits for the city, including carbon sequestering, reducing urban heat island effect, and creating better environments for people through biophilia.		Please see goal section ERC-3 for policies related to tree canopy. Please also see the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan.	Kevin Concolino [K-Intro-14]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The City must, in consultation with the community, develop an Urban Forest Master Plan that is equitable and assures that all neighborhoods have public (city owned and maintained) canopy street trees in either parkway strips or, where there are no parkway strips, in front yards. This is critical to addressing heat island effect, including making it possible for people to walk and bike on hot days and to absorbing water in heavy rains. Currently some neighborhoods have almost no trees. Members of the public have been raising this issue for a long time and we need plans, goals and timelines for getting this done		Please see ERC-A.1 (Urban Forest Plan). The Urban Forest Plan is currently underway.	Karen Jacques [K-Intro-14]
The city is cutting down its existing tree canopy in order to create buildings, including housing, and the housing element proposes to allow increased urban density. Unless the city can limit the size of structures and leave green space, many parts of this city will become urban heat islands - sadly, some parts already are.		Thank you for your comment.	Francesca Reitano [K-Intro-14]
Please invest in green infrastructure (GIN), which produces many benefits for people, urban creeks, and ecosystems. GIN projects improve the aesthetics of our neighborhoods, provide shade and evaporative cooling (saving property owners and residents money otherwise spent on air conditioning), provides habitat for birds and pollinators, improves stormwater/localized flood control and minimizes sewage overflow during storm events, improves water quality in streams and rivers, and recharges groundwater for drinking water and agricultural activity in drought years. GIN can also provide recreational opportunities, opportunities for placemaking, belonging, and help residents connect to the natural and cultural history of the city and surrounding areas. Additionally, GIN projects may unlock multiple sources of grant funding as they have the potential to provide many community benefits and/or complement existing funding sources, such as funds for affordable housing, transportation, and water management. Examples of urban green infrastructure projects include: restoration and daylighting of urban creeks, infiltration basins planted with native plants, or a curb cuts in a concrete divider along the edge of a bike lane. More information here: https://www.americanrivers.org/what-is-green-infrastructure/#:~:text=Green%20infrastructure%20is%20an%20approach,costly%20new%20water%20treatment%20plant		Please see goal sections LUP-10 and LUP-11 for policies on sustainable building, "green" design practices, and creating built environments that prioritize, support, promote, and embrace ecological regeneration and responsible resource stewardship.	kculbert [K-Intro-14]
Much of the plan appears to call for EV infrastructure, which is understandable given that it is the most immediate alternative to internal combustion engines for autos. It seems like a long-term mistake to neglect hydrogen infrastructure, which seems likely to be more sustainable, environmentally friendly, and realistic over the long term.		Thank you for your comment.	Sam Greenlee [K-Intro-14]
Part of this needs to be planning and permitting for mixed use developments where small businesses can be within short walking distances -inside- residential areas. We need to move away from the idea that only cars can get people to local entertainment, restaurants, and shopping. Even bikes have gotten expensive and theft is high. We need these things to be in- residential areas instead of next to sprawling neighborhoods so they're accessible outside of car use. Studies have shown this type of mixed use development will also build more inclusive communities where neighbors can and are encouraged to actually interact with each other and combat many of the other problems our communities are dealing with stemming from lack of social infrastructure and the "Loneliness Epidemic" (poorer health, increasing crime vs neighbors who know and support each other during the everyday let alone emergencies, disasters, etc).		Please see the Land Use and Placemaking Element for a description of all land use designations. Nearly all allow for a mix of uses.	Christina Parker [K-Intro-14]
Very good overall vision statement!		Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-Intro-14]
We are pleased that the Vision Statement approved by the City Council in 2018 acknowledges the key role of Sacramento's urban forest.		Thank you for your comment.	Trees for Sacramento [51]
General Plan Organization			
This photograph show an excessively wide street with on street parking and no bicycle infrastructure or alternative transport. It is clearly a car-centric design. Car-centric design is not sustainable nor just. Instead show a sustainable street that is suitable in scale and design for pedestrians and cyclists.	on photo	Thank you for your comment.	Douglas Surber [K-Intro-15]

Part 1

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
"satisfies" does not address the need to sustainably conserve and manage health, environment and natural resources. The city needs to consider whether existing laws and regulations are adequate for this purpose and if not take action beyond what is "required".		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-Intro-15]
I oppose the densification of Sacramento's existing diverse single family neighborhoods. Densification will lead to reduction of our mature tree canopy. Densification reduces open space available for trees and plants that are critical summer cooling, reducing air pollution and promoting habitat for birds and insects. Densification also creates congestion on narrow streets not designed for high densities. It promotes urban sprawl by reducing and eliminating the option for single family homes inside the city. Densification also does not result in affordable housing.		Thank you for your comment.	Read Harrsion [K-Intro-15]
Part 2			
I support policies that will actually create more affordable housing, especially for lower income households, not false claims that affordable housing will result from more Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) or densification of existing single family neighborhoods. One meaningful action the city can take is to prohibit non-owner occupied housing, including ADUs, from being used as short-term rentals, which are defacto hotel rooms and reduce our housing stock.		Thank you for your comment.	Zoe Harrsion [K-Intro-15]
Land use heavily affects Mobility. As a simple example setbacks influence the distance between destinations and hence the need for longer range transportation. Small setbacks put destinations close together enabling walking between destinations. Large setbacks move destinations further apart requiring bicycles or transit.		Thank you for your comment.	Douglas Surber [K-Intro-15]
Will the city make requirements for building integrity, long-lasting, and green construction? People marvel at old architecture and buildings, but we're building cheap, timber and tilt-up buildings that are not meant to last more than 30 years.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-Intro-15]
An effective commercial vacancy tax is needed to incentivize the use of existing buildings which are otherwise often left vacant and prone to degradation, leading to their eventual demolition.		Thank you for your comment.	Sam Greenlee [K-Intro-15]
Economic development must consider the needs of the vast majority of citizens who are not wealthy, who work for minimum wage, have no health insurance, need affordable child care, cannot afford a car, etc. The City can mandate a livable minimum wage, provide or mandate affordable child care, and definitely affordable (non-car) transportation.		Thank you for your comment.	Douglas Surber [K-Intro-15]
I appreciate the inclusion of "inclusive economic development". *Inclusive* economic development needs to be inherent to economic development plans in order to ensure that the benefits are broadly shared rather than leading to the creation of low-wage jobs that subsidize the increased accumulation of wealth among those who are well-capitalized. We must ensure that the most vulnerable Sacramento residents have the resources they need to flourish and thrive.		Please see goal section E-2 which includes policies that aim to generate long-term, shared value in the community and creates economic opportunities for all residents.	Sam Greenlee [K-Intro-15]
"satisfies" does not address the need to sustainably conserve and manage existing health, environment and natural resources. The city needs to consider whether existing laws and regulations are adequate for this purpose and if not be prepared to take action beyond what is "required".		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-Intro-15]
I support the importance of Sacramento's Urban Forest and our established neighborhoods – in the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan, the 2040 General Plan, and all the accompanying documents. I ask the City Council and city staff to keep the importance of the Urban Forest and our neighborhoods at the forefront. There are virtually no provisions in GP 2040 or the CAAP to protect our existing, mature tree canopy – 80% of which is on private property, much of it in residential front and back yards slated for upzoning and increased density.		Thank you for your comment.	Read Harrsion [K-Intro-15]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The General Plan must address sea level rise as well as the greatly increased risk of flooding from extreme weather events.		Thank you for your comment.	Douglas Surber [K-Intro-15]
Please consider the proposed redevelopment of 707 Commons Drive from a sleepy lowrise 2 story office building that was originally built as an example of how the Bay Area tradition designed office building (architect Charles Warren Callister) compliments, enhances and integrates with the existing residential low density housing. To replace this cornerstone building with super high density 3 story high sbuildings each with 3 to 4 modern townhouses and the complete removal of all trees is an act of destruction, lunacy and ignorance.		Thank you for your comment.	MK Hickox [K-Intro-15]
"satisfies" does not address the need to effectively address environmental justice issues. The city needs to consider whether existing laws and regulations are adequate for this purpose and if not be prepared to take action beyond what is "required".		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-Intro-16]
The word "thoroughfare" is car-centric. It's specific use as well as it's position before "transportation routes" suggests an emphasis on car-centric transportation.		Text revised to say: "...city's major transportation routes and thoroughfares as well as..."	Douglas Surber [K-Intro-16]
"seeks to balance" doesn't solve existing transportation and GHG emission problems by prioritizing active and public transportation solutions.		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-Intro-16]
We should be specifically identifying a need to close some roads to auto traffic in order to create safe pedestrian/cycle corridors. Many Sacramentans report that they would bike more often if it was safer, as collisions are a constant threat. Every fifth street in the grid could be closed to cars, creating a network of safe routes.		Please see policies M-1.2 (User Prioritization), M-1.4 (Designing to Move People), M-1.5 (Street Design Standards), M-1.8 (Vacation of Public Right-of-Way), M-1.13 (Walkability), M-1.18 (Bicycling Safety), M-1.19 (Walking Safety), and M-3.5 (Open Street Event).	Sam Greenlee [K-Intro-16]
In areas of new development on greenfields (such as Natomas in recent decades), new libraries and schools have been part and parcel with new housing development. What are the plans for dense urban infill development? Sacramento's River District and Railyards may be growing by 20,000 in population in the next decade. Are libraries, public pools, or schools planned to meet the needs of these new neighborhoods?		Thank you for your comment.	Sam Greenlee [K-Intro-16]
The fastest growing part of Sacramentos population are the Older Adults. The numbers will exceed the number of folks under 18 in just a few years. I recommend the city begin to include consideration of that group in the planning and development of the Parks, Recreation and open spaces. Increased access and involvement of this group will help to reduce isolation and ageism. A multigenerational approach will benefit all.		Please see the forthcoming Age-Friendly Action Plan.	PATTY WAIT [K-Intro-16]
Part 3			
Why is the studying communities that are not in the city limits? Let the county worry about that.		The City has defined Special Study Areas that are adjacent to existing city limits. These unincorporated areas are of interest to the City, as the planning of the areas necessitates a coordinated effort by the City and County (Map SSA-1).	Ian Treat [K-Intro-16]
How to Use the General Plan			
Caltrans is spending close to \$1Billion on Highway 50 and I-5 widening and rehabilitation projects, which will cause more pollution, safety incidents, and traffic congestion. This statement in the plan looks to prevent Caltrans from future road infrastructure projects. How will the city make sure that Caltrans is held accountable to the GP's goals?		Please see policy M-5.1 (Regional Mobility System).	Ian Treat [K-Intro-18]
Policy Index			
I found this index very helpful		Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-Intro-18]
<i>Table 1-2: Policy Index</i>			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
For navigability purposes, it would be really helpful if the numbers and/or descriptions in the Policy Index linked directly to the chapters/sections in which they appear. Thank you!		Policy Index updated to include direct links.	Jordan Grimaldi [K-Intro-19]
Water efficiency will be crucial. The water meters have helped however, people still waste a lot of water. Maybe more public service reminders or clever emails to water customers would help.		Thank you for your comment.	Roger Haynes [K-Intro-24]
Focus on more or better Bike routes with an eye toward E-Bikes in the future.	M-1.18 (Bicycling Safety)	Please see policies M-1.17 (Improve Bicycling Connectivity), M-1.33 (Electric Vehicle (EV) Car Share and Electric Bike Share), and M-1.34 (Electric Mobility (E-Mobility) Hubs).	Roger Haynes [K-Intro-24]
Allow by right the construction of housing along alleys, empty lots and in all zoning especially in the Central City. Reduce fees for housing plan checks and lot splits to encourage more infill housing.. Provide help in planning not just for ADUs but for single family housing, duplex and fourplexes for family unit ownership.	LUP-1.1 (Compact Urban Footprint)	Development standards in the 2040 General Plan aim to create more opportunities to build a variety of housing types including duplexes and four-plexes which are typically more affordable housing types than a traditional single-family home.	Deborah Condon [K-Intro-25]
Conservation of Open space - retain opened farmland in Natomas covered under USFWS Habitat Conservation Plan by prohibiting conversion to other uses and honoring the HCP.	ERC-2.1 (Conservation of Open Space Areas)	Thank you for your comment.	Deborah Condon [K-Intro-30]
Older adults have been surveyed extensively on what living arrangements they prefer. The response is resounding they would like to live in their own homes. Rather than focus on assertive living, let's support continuing to live in their communities in their homes. Suggestions would be low cost home improvements loans, volunteer groups available for simple home repairs and community strengthening events that encourage intergenerational support.		Development standards in the 2040 General Plan aim to create more opportunities to build a variety of housing types including duplexes and four-plexes which are typically more affordable housing types than a traditional single-family home.	PATTY WAIT [K-Intro-30]
Seniors could also make a difference with the general community at large by volunteering at schools, recreation parks to help provide on demand mentoring. Volunteer activities would help seniors feel more integrated with the community at large.		Please see the forthcoming Age-Friendly Action Plan.	MK Hickox [K-Intro-30]
Incentivize infill by expanding the current ADU focus to more homeownership with more planning support, reduced fees and outreach especially in the Central City and surrounding areas.	LUP-4.2 (Incentivizing Infill)	Thank you for your comment.	Deborah Condon [K-Intro-35]

SUSTAINABILITY AND EQUITY CHAPTER

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
ESCA supports other key concepts in the General Plan that promote sustainability, equity, urban tree canopy, and mobility that focuses on pedestrian and bicycle use.		Thank you for your comment.	ESCA [39]
I applaud having a discussion of equity as the first chapter of the 2040 General Plan. Equity was key to all the proceedings of the Mayors' Climate Commission and it is good to have the emphasis on equity continue.		Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [52]
The must focus on two main themes: Equity and Safety. The City must prioritize these in every development moving forward, and general funds need to be set aside to achieve these goals.		Thank you for your comment.	Kay Crumb [40]
SacRT supports the City's recent initiatives to demonstrate its commitment to sustainability and equity. SacRT appreciates the indicators (mode share, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita, infill development in corridors and centers) as they support public transit use over single-occupant vehicle use, as well as laying an appropriate foundation for reliable, high-frequency transit.		Thank you for your comment.	SacRT [74]
Indicators			
<i>Mode Share Indicators</i>			
<i>Why it Matters</i>			
I am a high school student who lives downtown and takes public transit, specifically the light rail, to school daily. I have found that the buses, at least in downtown, are unreliable enough, coming very late or not at all, that I cannot use them for any consistent or time-sensitive transit. I think that providing more funding to ensure that the city's buses are consistent would both expand the userbase and increase ridership.		Please see policy M-1.41 (Funding).	Melia Coleman [K-S&E-3]
Walking and biking need to be made safer as well. As an occasional bike commuter who lives downtown and works at various SCUSD schools, I know that as you get further from the central city, biking becomes much harder to do safely without significant planning and biking between destination far from the city center is often either dangerous or requires a much longer route than taking a car would.		Please see goal section M-1, which aims to foster a multi-modal transportation system. Please also see policy EJ-5.5 (Investment Prioritization).	Lamaia Coleman [K-S&E-3]
Have you lived or visited a city where residents actually rely on public transit for mobility? The next bus or train arrives WITHIN MINUTES of the prior one leaving. If you really want people out of their cars the city will have to commit to MUCH FASTER service.		Please see policies M-1.20 (High-Frequency Transit Service), M-1.21 (Extension of Transit Service), and M-1.24 (Transit-Only Lanes).	Laurie Heller [K-S&E-3]
How is the city going to make transit service more frequent and reliable without money that it doesn't have? I rode public transit all my working years (I can't drive). When the price of gas went up, more people rode light rail and buses, some for the FIRST time. Then when the price of gas went down, they were back in their cars, often driving solo. RT has been cutting bus lines in my neighborhood (Elmhurst). Most of the signs say peak hours only. That's fine for workers, and people who are able to walk to the light rail station. What about the rest of the time, without a car to do errands, buy groceries, bring children home from childcare, visit friends in this sprawled out metro? Electric cars are going to solve much of this problem as well.		Please see policies M-1.20 (High-Frequency Transit Service), M-1.21 (Extension of Transit Service), M-1.24 (Transit-Only Lanes), M-1.41 (Funding), M-1.27 (Electric Vehicle (EV) Strategy), M-1.28 (Zero-Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Capital), M-1.33 (Electric Vehicle (EV) Car Share and Electric Bike Share), and M-1.35 (Zero-Emission Vehicle (ZEV) First).	Francesca Reitano [K-S&E-3]
<i>Baseline Data Source</i>			
Utilize a more recent data source for baseline data on mode share, VMT per capita, and share of residents spending more than 30% of income on housing. For all sources, pandemic-driven changes are unaccounted for and may drastically alter the present baseline. Adjustments may be necessary when data catches up to the present timelines.		Thank you for your comment. The data referenced was used to set baseline conditions, linked to the technical modeling that underpins the General Plan, CAAP, and MEIR. The purpose of the sustainability and equity indicators is to measure progress and if/when conditions shift; these shifts will be picked up in the regular progress reports called for in the 2040 General Plan.	Sacramento County Public Health [K-S&E-3]
<i>Target</i>			
For all indicators, prioritize implementation of all measures in DAC neighborhoods first and ensure that resources are allocated properly.		Please see policy EJ-5.5 (Investment Prioritization).	Sacramento County Public Health [K-S&E-3]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
"Active Transportation Mode" should probably be defined somewhere since the goal is the first time the term is used. Why is there no carpool goal?		"Active Transportation" definition added to glossary: "Active Transportation includes a variety of non-vehicle modes of transportation including pedestrians, bikes, wheelchairs, walkers, and other assisted movement devices." Text update to page 2-3, Mode Share, "Why It Matters": "...and make active transportation modes like walking and bicycling more convenient..." Please see goal section M-2 for policies on reducing reliance on single-occupant vehicles.	Tyson Underwood [K-S&E-3]
VMT Per Capita			
<i>Target</i>			
VMT reduction objectives should be to reduce total VMT, not just VMT per capita.		VMT per capita is useful for implementation, tracking, and annual progress reporting.	Teri Duarte [K-S&E-3]
Indicators should focus on all trips rather than commute trips		Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
Households with ZEVs			
<i>Why it Matters</i>			
This should be the lowest priority on this list. Using your car until it dies is better for the environment than getting a new one. It also mostly benefits those in positions of privilege already. More important is making places more accessible to other forms of transit.		Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-S&E-3]
I completely agree it should be the lowest priority.		Thank you for your comment.	Lamaia Coleman [K-S&E-3]
Number of Public EV Chargers			
<i>Why it Matters</i>			
Eliminating parking for new, denser construction in neighborhoods is going to mean EVs with nowhere to charge them except for public charging stations, as parking near one's residence will be scarce. Bear in mind that currently, rapid charging technology is a lot less energy efficient than trickle charging overnight at one's residence. Is this going to change in coming years?		Please see policies M-1.32 (Supportive Infrastructure in the Public Right-of-Way) and M-1.38 (Electric Vehicles (EVs), and Energy Resiliency).	Francesca Reitano [K-S&E-4]
There is a great opportunity to add EV charging tied to the solar farm and Sutter's Landing Park. New EV chargers there could be powered by existing solar and new battery storage under the solar panel canopy parking lot. Educational materials could be included to show how solar, batteries and EVs can reduce GHG emission from transportation. SMUD and others have expressed support for this proposal but the city has yet to take action.		Please see policies M-1.27 (Electric Vehicle (EV) Strategy), M-1.30 (Public Electric Vehicle (EV) Infrastructure Deployment), and M-1.32 (Supportive Infrastructure in the Public Right-of-Way).	Dale Steele [K-S&E-4]
I agree that public charging stations need to be developed. But, there should also be some incentives to retro fit existing construction and provide for future construction. Require all new home construction to have sufficient electrical power to charge an EV quickly. Require all new apartment and condo construction to have an area with chargers for residents or require SMUD to install meters at carports. Require all workplaces to have electrical charging stations. Provide subsidies to lower income households in the form of credit cards for example to use to charge their vehicles. Provide subsidies, low interest loans, or tax credits for retrofitting homes to increase electrical capability to charge cars or create charging stations in apartments and condos. I know the City is not in the financial business but work with SMUD to do this.			Kathy Styc [K-S&E-4]
Percent Urban Tree Canopy in DACs			
<i>Why it Matters</i>			
There are also important wildlife habitat values in urban forests which also provide health, education and enjoyment values for residents. These values need better documentation, conservation and management.		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-S&E-4]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
I've heard this promise for decades. Other cities have public/private partnerships - and actively seek grants to make this happen. But that requires a current URBAN FOREST MASTER PLAN. There is really no excuse for not having a one.		Please see policy ERC-3.1 (Urban Forest Plan). The Urban Forest Plan is underway.	Laurie Heller [K-S&E-4]
This comment perhaps has less to do with tree canopy in DACs, but California's mandate for new homes to have rooftop solar forecloses on the potential for new, large trees to be planted, or for large existing trees to be left in tact. When there is a conflict between a neighbor's tree blocking sunlight from another neighbor's solar panels, the courts side with the solar owning neighbor. The mandate does allow alternatives to rooftop solar such as; "building developers are welcome to pursue and build community solar projects, as opposed to rooftop solar panel systems for each property, so long as they receive approval from both the California Clean Energy Commission (CEC) and the local utility company." If the city is able to encourage this type of alternative, we could have the benefit of the solar energy generation and the cooling, beauty, and natural habitat large trees provide.		Thank you for your comment.	Michael T Hutnick [K-S&E-4]
Tree canopy maintenance is also critical. Planting trees is quick and easy. Maintaining them over decades takes a dedication of resources and focus.		Please see policy ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) and ERC-3.9 (Watering and Irrigation).	Lamaia Coleman [K-S&E-4]
Many low-income neighborhoods in Sacramento lack planting strips for the city to plant trees. Many years ago the city planted approximately 59,000 trees in front yards in these neighborhoods. In the early 90s the city abandoned these trees and left it to the homeowners to maintain. Approximately half the homeowners in our neighborhoods are renters. And low-income homeowners lack the maintenance resources and arborists that are provided by the city for city trees. The city's Housing Element plan for increased urban density is going to eliminate space for trees in all neighborhoods, and is going to lead to the removal of private trees to make way for construction. What is the city going to do to preserve our existing trees? Where is the money going to come from to plant and maintain new plantings in neighborhoods lacking a right of way for city trees?		Please see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets; policy also stipulates that existing street trees should be maintained and replaced, new trees installed where feasible, and street trees should be incorporated into new neighborhood streets.	Francesca Reitano [K-S&E-4]
These objectives reflect TOTAL city tree canopy goals and do not reflect that action is needed to increase tree canopy most in certain areas of the city. To clarify that the differences in tree canopy among neighborhoods will be reduced to an acceptable level, such as five percentage points, add: "all neighborhoods have tree canopy minimum of X"		Please see policy ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion).	Teri Duarte [K-S&E-4]
I absolutely agree with increasing the tree canopy particularly in disadvantage communities where trees are generally lacking. I would also comment that the existing tree canopy be protected. The areas of concern here are that new housing and business development not be done at a cost of cutting down trees, and that the City adequately maintain trees that are along streets that are designated at "City trees". This includes spraying, pruning and replacing trees.		Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on preserving and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	Kathy Styc [K-S&E-4]
Tree Canopy Cover in Disadvantaged communities should focus on tree cover on public right-of-way		Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
Percent Urban Tree Canopy in Disadvantaged Communities (DACs): Many low-income neighborhoods in Sacramento lack planting strips for the city to plant City trees. Low-income homeowners lack the maintenance resources and funds to pay arborists. Arborists are provided without cost by the city for city trees. Increased urban density is going to eliminate space for trees in all neighborhoods, and will lead to the removal of private trees to make way for construction. What is the city going to do to preserve our existing trees? Where is the money going to come from to plant and maintain new plantings in neighborhoods lacking a right of way for trees?		See policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets; policy also stipulates that existing street trees should be maintained and replaced, new trees installed where feasible, and street trees should be incorporated into new neighborhood streets.	Trees for Sacramento [51]
<i>Baseline Data Source</i>			
The evaluation data should also include some measure of tree health since trees are a long term investment.		Thank you for your comment.	Lamaia Coleman [K-S&E-4]
<i>Healthy Food Access in DACs</i>			
<i>Why it Matters</i>			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Not one building or redevelopment project should be permitted without requiring healthy food sources WITHIN WALKING DISTANCE. This should be the standard for any residential urban neighborhood. Remember corner markets? You can still see them in Midtown, Curtis Park, Land Park and East Sacramento. They were identified and zoned appropriately when the tracts were laid out. The very definition of 'livable neighborhoods'. Where you can send your teen out for milk or eggs without driving twenty minutes to Costco. Why would we do less today?		Please see policies EJ-2.2 (Grocery Access), EJ-2.3 (Open Air Food Sales), and EJ-2.8 (Community and Home Gardening).	Laurie Heller [K-S&E-4]
expanded use of community gardens and home food gardening should be included in the tools used to solve these important problems.		Please see policies EJ-2.8 (Community and Home Gardening), EJ-2.9 (Urban Agriculture in New Development), EJ-2.11 (Home-Based Food Enterprises), EJ-2.13 (Public-Private Partnerships).	Dale Steele [K-S&E-4]
Maybe the city could reduce fee/taxes for small local markets to uncar people.		Please see policy EJ-2.1 (New Healthy Food Grocers) and implementing action EJ-A.1 (Retailer Incentive Program).	BPat [K-S&E-4]
ParkScore Rating			
<i>Why it Matters</i>			
enjoyment of nature is an important component and should be included in all park management.		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-S&E-5]
Small local parks with play (don't forget adult sized swings) and fitness equipment, especially in low-income neighborhoods, would help reduce the effects of the variety of stressors and assist people in being healthier.		Please see policies YPRO-1.22 (Community Input) and YPRO-1.24 (Welcoming Amenities).	BPat [K-S&E-5]
Infill Development in Corridors and Centers			
<i>Why it Matters</i>			
I'd like you to include a map with at least the high priority corridors identified.		Please see Maps LUP-3 (Opportunity Areas) and LUP-4 (Land Use Concept).	Laurie Heller [K-S&E-5]
The range of housing should be mixed income housing. There should be higher income housing AND lower income housing together so that the corridors aren't just focused on low income people (and the dis-investment that often follows).		Please see policies LUP-6.2 (Range of Residential Development Intensities) and LUP-6.3 (Variety of Housing Types).	Lamaia Coleman [K-S&E-5]
While this goal is a critical one, it's worth noting that in the current plan most of the wealthiest and highest-opportunity corridors in the city (Land Park, Curtis Park, Elmhurst, East Sacramento) are largely exempted from this goal. An equitable city requires more than just infill development in corridors — it requires *equitable* development in corridors. This goal should be amended to note that this development must be equitable.		Please see policy EJ-5.5 (Investment Prioritization).	Ben Raderstorf [K-S&E-5]
The Infill development in corridors and centers should specifically address the need to increase affordable housing options in these areas. Especially since lower income families and individuals are heavier users of transit and buses. Its not enough to just build more housing in these corridors, the highest priority must be to build regulated affordable housing which will benefit lower income families, increase mobility and reduce GHG. For section on Share of Residents spending more than 30% of income on housing. I would again say the City should prioritize the most vulnerable populations, those spending more than 30% on housing AND prioritize those with low incomes and especially very low and extremely low income households (those at risk of losing their homes). Targeting those individuals and families is a critical anti-displacement strategy.		Please see policies LUP-6.2 (Range of Residential Development Intensities), LUP-6.3 (Variety of Housing Types), and EJ-5.5 (Investment Prioritization).	Cathy Creswell [K-S&E-5]
It is important to consider if infill development appears as if it fits into the surrounding area. Sacramento currently has established neighborhoods that have certain vibes. Sacramento will become a less appealing place to live or visit if established areas lose their vibe.		Please see policy LUP-8.10 (Responsiveness to Context).	Inderjit K Rye [K-S&E-5]
Share of Residents Spending More Than 30 Percent of Income on Housing			
<i>Why it Matters</i>			
One piece of this strategy needs to be to bring back inclusionary housing so the segregation does not continue to increase.		Per the City's adopted 2021-2029 Housing Element, the City is in the process of updating the Mixed Income Housing Ordinance which could include a inclusionary housing component.	Lamaia Coleman [K-S&E-5]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
This states a problem without stating an answer. What's the plan?		Please refer to Table 2-1 (Policy Index), categories "Housing Availability, Affordability, and Preservation" and "Investments in Equity". Please also see policies in the Economic Development Element.	Laurie Heller [K-S&E-5]
Also suggest targeting assistance to neighborhoods that have suffered from disinvestment and redlining is important to address lingering impacts of historic discriminatory lending and land use practices.		Please see policy EJ-5.5 (Investment Prioritization).	Cathy Creswell [K-S&E-5]
<p>The city should not allow short-term rentals (ex. Airbnb, VRBO) in housing that is not the owner's primary residence. Building ADUs and turning them into short-term rentals, developers and investors buying entire homes and turning them into short-term rentals, takes away from our city's housing stock. In addition, the investors are competing with home buyers, thus driving up the cost of housing.</p> <p>Currently, the city is allowing homes, ADUs and other housing units that are not primary residences to be used as short-term rentals for 90 days per calendar year. However, the city does not appear to be monitoring the 90-day requirement, or the owners are not telling the truth with their self-reporting (honor system) logs that are due quarterly. One short-term rental around the corner from us is occupied by short-term renters virtually 365 days per year, and I believe it is not the exception.</p> <p>Shut down this program for homes, ADUs, duplexes and other units that are not primary residences and allow them to be bought by homeowners or used as rentals by landlords.</p> <p>The city talks about affordable housing in desirable or amenity-rich areas - including in GP 2040 - but this is exactly where the short-term rentals are. This program is working at cross-purposes with the city's housing goals, and raising housing prices in these areas.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Francesca Reitano [K-S&E-5]
Without subsidized, affordable housing, this need will not be met. It will take federal, state and local money, creative solutions, and community will. Salaries do not equal housing costs for many. In our capitalistic economy, this will probably get worse, not better, as real estate is an investment and Wall Street is involved in housing. Building more housing, by itself, will not solve this problem. Does NYC or Vancouver, BC get any more affordable as they build, build, build?		Goal 2 of the 2021-2029 Housing Element includes a series of policies that increase affordable housing. Please see the 2021-2029 Housing Element here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Long-Range/Housing-Element/00_Sac-HE_-AdoptionDft_Aug2021.pdf?la=en	Francesca Reitano [K-S&E-5]
Lack of housing and food insecurity are ruining Sacramento now! I have lived here for 34 years and I now want to leave. \$1000/mo is NOT affordable housing as stated by the mayor; not to the many people living on social security and disability income. Waiting lists have been closed for years for senior apartments! We must have housing that seniors and disabled people can afford. The current state of Sacramento with so many people on the street makes it difficult to discuss all this future planning when the now is not being dealt with. The empty lots/buildings, hotels, and malls must be put to use to improve conditions for all of us in getting people off the streets.		Thank you for your comment.	BPat [K-S&E-5]
<p>I work with individuals who are experiencing homelessness. The sadest part of my job is that income is not the barrier to stable housing for most of my folks, the barriers are there is not enough housing that those individuals on SSI/SSDI could afford, or their credit hinders them from accessing stable housing. Our city NEEDS more affordable housing, get rid of these Bay Area prices! It is ridiculous that even a studio is up to 1300 (the cheapest I have been able to find) when less than 10 years ago, they were under 900 a month.</p> <p>The other barrier I find is that clients have no income and no natural resources like friends or family that they can live within the immediate area, and the shelters are all overflowing. Our city needs more shelter options, especially for single adult males. PLEASE!! BUILD MORE SHELTERS/ FUND MORE RAPID REHOUSING PROJECTS/ TRANSITIONAL HOUSING TO GET OUR CITIZENS OFF THE STREETS</p>		Goal 7 of the 2021-2029 Housing Element includes a series of policies that focus on housing for people experiencing homelessness. Please see the 2021-2029 Housing Element here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Long-Range/Housing-Element/00_Sac-HE_-AdoptionDft_Aug2021.pdf?la=en	AMANDA OSTERHOUT [K-S&E-5]
Share of residents that are cost burdened (goal = 30%). How was this selected? Why not select a more ambitious goal or seek to eliminate cost burden for low-income renters?		Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
<p><i>Baseline</i></p> <p>the target and indicator should be focused on lower income individuals and families paying more than 50% of their income for housing. That is the highest need and the most vulnerable populations. Reducing the number of lower income families paying more than 50% of their income for housing will improve the health, educational outcomes for children and stability of these families. It would also prevent homelessness and should be a critical component of the City's Anti-Displacement goals.</p>		Please see policies LUP-6.2 (Range of Residential Development Intensities), LUP-6.3 (Variety of Housing Types), and EJ-5.5 (Investment Prioritization). Additionally, Goal 2 of the 2021-2029 Housing Element includes a series of policies that focus on increasing affordable housing production. Please see the 2021-2029 Housing Element here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Long-Range/Housing-Element/00_Sac-HE_-AdoptionDft_Aug2021.pdf?la=en	Cathy Creswell [K-S&E-5]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Do these initiatives and indicators align with the vision of Sacramento as a national model of sustainable, equitable growth and community development?			
All new development should be high density, we are in a housing and climate crisis.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
What about the food trucks? Solar powered generators or solar powered batteries.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
Yes!!! You guys are doing a great job with all of this. This exactly what we should be focusing on.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
Yes if you can provide better public transit throughout the entire region, including branching out to the suburbs.		Please see policies M-1.20 (High-Frequency Transit Service), M-1.21 (Extension of Transit Service), and M-1.24 (Transit-Only Lanes).	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
Yes. Happy to see a focus on parks and multi modal transportation and the metrics of increased parks scores.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
Yes. Multi-income & generational housing. housing coops, cohousing initiatives supported. Downtown needs more families.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
A better indicator would be mode share across all trips rather than focusing on commute trips		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
tree cover should focus on high priority trees with the greatest benefit - street trees in/adjacent to sidewalks		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
These goals are 100%, but I don't know how we get there without stronger language abolishing parking mins & adding parking maxs		New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces. This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "...Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City mandated parking minimums; ..."	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
I know how to reduce auto emissions. Reduce the number of automobiles on the road. Don't make them electric.		Please see goal section M-2 for policies on reducing reliance on single-occupant vehicles.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
Sustainability and Equity statement is very good. Please add "and access to nature" in the first sentence in the Park Score para		Table 2-1 (Indicators) revised, ParkScore Rating, Why It Matters, first line: "Regular physical activity and access to nature , leisure, and cultural options..."	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
Sure		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
The tree canopy and housing cost goals are great. The public/active transit goals are weak and not a national model.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
The City should specifically identify a priority of closing roads to automobile traffic to create safe routes for ped/cycle		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
The City should establish a permanent annual budget item to fund healthy food access projects and programs.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
It would be a mistake to plan only for EV infrastructure, when hydrogen is likely to be the long-term replacement to ICE autos		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
They are good concepts but must go much further, faster and need specifics.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
In addition to a per-capita VMT goal, we should create a citywide total VMT goal to mitigate population growth.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
Active transportation mode share is listed as 2% in 2045. Please correct.		Thank you for your comment. Active transportation mode share target for 2045 is 12%. This has been checked in the full General Plan document.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
Mostly, except over-emphasis on electric vehicles / infrastructure. Transit & active transportation should be emphasized.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
Campus Commons has natural air quality control- trees! Development for sustainability cannot take trees from the city of trees.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]
701 Commons development removes important trees from Campus Commons.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-S&E-1]

LAND USE AND PLACEMAKING ELEMENT

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Introduction			
While the Central Valley seems to be immune from the California exodus, does the new GP take into account the possibility of population stagnation or decline?		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-LUP-1]
Support considering this. Either way, more housing will be a benefit to the people of Sacramento. Please increase housing ambitions and actions of this plan. (higher FAR, eliminate parking minimums, etc.)		Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-LUP-1]
More housing will be a benefit to all people in Sacramento. Please increase housing ambitions and actions of this section/plan. (FAR 4.0 1/2 mile of transit, eliminate parking minimums, FAR 2.0 high opportunity areas, etc.)		Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-LUP-1]
"Sacramento is projected to see significant growth in the coming years" This may be true, but population forecasting must be accounted for. Sacramento's population has declined since its 2020 maximum. ³ The city of Sacramento may be more susceptible to population decline as residents move to the outer reaches of the Sacramento metropolitan statistical area. Any projections made regarding land use must account for at best, a diminished growth in population by 2045 according to projections from the California Department of Finance (county only). ⁴ Similarly, how can we use urban planning and the built environment to accommodate an aging population?		Thank you for your comment. The General Plan is updated regularly and can reassess population projections. An Age-Friendly Action Plan is anticipated for public release in the near future.	Sacramento County Public Health [K-LUP-1]
Growth and Change			
Very good to see preserving these resources as a priority.		Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-LUP-2]
First maximize avoidance of new sprawl and pollution impacts.		Policies under goal LUP-4 incentivize infill development. Policies under goal ERC-4 support collaborative action to address air pollution.	Dale Steele [K-LUP-2]
The map should be updated to include in green the additional areas the City has acquired that are now part of Sutter's Landing Park.	Map LUP-1	Map updated to reflect West Sutter's Landing Park.	Corey Brown [K-LUP-3]
Start removing the highways that segregated communities and historically effected minority communities. The highways should go around the city! I don't need to run across the entrance and exit ramps from CSUS to get to target! It makes the city more dangerous. Also less freeways could promote more biking and public transportation.		Thank you for your comment.	Zane Whitcomb [K-LUP-3]
Goal LUP 1 (compact footprint)			
These goals are really important and impressive but underscore the importance of a fair and sustainable approach to infill that prioritizes higher FARs in neighborhoods with good transit and high opportunity. The only way to avoid sprawl is to build inwards	Goal LUP-1	Please see policies under goal LUP-4 which incentivize infill development.	Ben Raderstorf [K-LUP-4]
LUP 1: It is much more sustainable to incentivize the retention and adaptive reuse of existing buildings than to allow them to be torn down. The 2040 GP calls for incentivizing the adaptive reuse of historic buildings and it should also call for the adaptive reuse of other existing buildings, unless their condition precludes it. Adaptive reuse requires only a fraction of the materials required for new construction and retains the embodied energy that went into their construction. Demolition results in massive piles of waste going to the landfill. When I served on the Preservation Commission in the early 2000's we began seriously discussing the need for a Deconstruction Ordinance to save valuable materials (e.g. old growth lumber, historic elements that could be used in rehab projects), but that discussion stopped with the 2008 financial crisis. It should be looked at again.	Goal LUP-1	Please see policies LUP-10.1 (Existing Structure Reuse), LUP-A.7 (Net-Zero Energy or Net-Positive Design), HCR-1.10 (Demolition), HCR-1.12 (Incentives for Rehabilitation and Adaptive Reuse of Historic Resources), and HCR-2.7 (Funding and Financing Mechanisms).	Karen Jacques [52]
LUP 1: Developers and property owners should not be allowed to assemble adjacent parcels to build a larger project. Such assembly of parcels will make it harder to preserve trees, could encourage land speculation and could also drive up rents. Additionally, if the goal is to keep neighborhood "sense of place", which many neighborhood residents want, these larger projects would not do that.	Goal LUP-1	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [52]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
LUP 1: "Encouraging" developers and property owners to find ways to design their projects so as to keep as many trees as possible has not worked. The City must develop objective, mandatory standards for preserving trees that a project must meet in order to be approved. These could include things like establishing a maximum foot print size for a new unit or units, which would, in turn, depend on the size of the lot (building square footage could be doubled by building a second story). It could also include requiring a plot plan that leaves room for an existing back yard tree or trees or, if there are no trees, leaves a specified minimum amount of open space with the requirement that a tree or trees be planted there. Design guidelines that call for step backs and set backs to accommodate trees would also help. Some trees may be in front yards and maintaining existing front yard set backs could be a way to preserve these trees. Maintaining the existing set back is also a way to preserve the 'sense of place' that the General Plan talks about.	Goal LUP-1	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see policy ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection) and City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Karen Jacques [52]
LUP 1: It is important that strong safeguards be in place to avoid displacement of existing neighborhood residents. Additionally there should be a regulation that owners cannot use the new units for short term rentals (AirBnB's or equivalent) These uses have resulted in the loss of housing units and helped drive up rents. Owners who wish to participate in the short term rental business should be allowed to do so in their own homes with proper City approval, but should not be allowed to do it in infill units that they own.	Goal LUP-1	Goal 5 of the 2021-2029 Housing Element includes a series of policies that aim to protect residents from displacement. Please see the 2021-2029 Housing Element here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Long-Range/Housing-Element/00_Sac-HE_-AdoptionDft_Aug2021.pdf?la=en	Karen Jacques [52]
LUP 1: Some currently affordable housing units, typically larger, older apartment buildings of one, two or three stories are located along corridors or other mixed use areas where the 2040 General Plan allows significantly higher density. There will likely be developer/investor pressure to demolish them and build bigger, taller, more lucrative projects. Care must be taken to preserve these buildings so as not to loose affordable housing in order to build something bigger and more profitable. An example of an area where older, affordable apartments are at risk is the area between the CBD and the R Street Corridor west of 19th Street where there are several such apartments.	Goal LUP-1	Goal 5 of the 2021-2029 Housing Element includes a series of policies that aim to protect residents from displacement. Please see the 2021-2029 Housing Element here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Long-Range/Housing-Element/00_Sac-HE_-AdoptionDft_Aug2021.pdf?la=en	Karen Jacques [52]
<i>Tree Canopy</i>			
A compact urban footprint must not allow for the destruction of our existing tree canopy. Otherwise we will have more housing in an unlivable and unattractive city and our climate goals will not be reached. Conserving open space is laudable, but what can the city do to keep developers from creating more and more urban sprawl outside the city limits? We must allow for open space WITHIN our neighborhoods and on all R-1 and multi-family lots.	Goal LUP-1	Thank you for your comment.	Francesca Reitano [K-LUP-4]
Put trees in the streets. Turn excess width into green space. A majority of the streets in Sacramento are far to wide	Goal LUP-1	See policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets; policy also stiuplates that existing street trees should be maintained and replaced, new trees installed where feasible, and street trees should be incorporated into new neighborhood streets.	Austin [K-LUP-4]
<i>Mixed Use</i>			
Add specific language about promoting infill to goal 1. And increased density should be accompanied by promoting mixed use zoning and actively disincentivizing driving while promoting other more efficient transportation like biking, bus, and light rail.	LUP 1.1 (Compact Urban Footprint)	Goal section LUP-4 includes several policies that incentivize infill development.	Jenny [K-LUP-4]
As we do infill and increase density, it is imperative that we also improve or replace the unseen infrastructure (sewer, ect) with adequate infrastructure for the increased load.	LUP 1.1 (Compact Urban Footprint)	Please see PFS-3.1 (Provision of Adequate Utilities).	Lamaia Coleman [K-LUP-4]
include connectivity between open spaces	LUP 1.1 (Compact Urban Footprint)	Please see goal section M-1 for policies on improving connectivity between destination within the city.	Dale Steele [K-LUP-4]
Agree	LUP 1.1 (Compact Urban Footprint)	Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-LUP-4]
<i>Discourage Annexation</i>			
Just like how this document encourages infill development within pre-existing corridors, it should simultaneously discourage annexation for the purpose of new growth. Evaluations for new growth in annexed areas should heavily weigh the cost of providing transportation and other services, including the long-term maintenance liability that infrastructure creates. Our efforts for managing growth should be focused internally.	LUP 1.3 (New Growth Annexation)	Thank you for your comment.	Troy [K-LUP-4]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
How does the city "strategically plan for the annexation of new growth areas" and how can the current residents of these areas become involved?	LUP 1.3 (New Growth Annexation)	The City strategically plans for annexation through the proactive creation of Special Study Areas and awareness of planning needs and challenges within the City's Sphere of Influence. Annexation is not always initiated by the City but at the request of a private landowner. All proposed annexations go through a noticing period to receive public comment and input prior to consideration by the City Council. The annexation process provides multiple opportunities for public participation. For all annexations, only the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) has the ultimate authority to change the City's boundary.	Kim Fuller [K-LUP-4]
<i>More Community-Serving Uses: Parks, Affordable Housing, Community Gardens</i>			
also consider park expansion and connectivity	LUP 1.5 (Surplus Land Disposition)	Revision to Policy LUP-1.5 (Surplus Land Disposition): "...business operations, opportunities to create more park space or park connections , and applicable federal..."	Dale Steele [K-LUP-4]
And PARKS! We will need more large, regional parks to service the growing population you've identified. Where will these parks go? The need for open space and recreational opportunities are not mentioned! A livable city has LOTS of neighborhood green spaces -- and sufficient regional open space - for families to gather and citizens to recreate.	LUP 1.5 (Surplus Land Disposition)	Revision to Policy LUP-1.5 (Surplus Land Disposition): "...business operations, opportunities to create more park space or park connections , and applicable federal..."	Laurie Heller [K-LUP-4]
Would like to see priority given to affordable housing. Land acquisition can be extremely expensive. Gifting or selling land at below market rate to affordable housing developers can make the difference between an affordable housing developer being able to build or not being able to build. Also would like to see such lands used for open space in the form of parks and/or community gardens. The more Sacramento densifies, the more important access to open space becomes. Community gardens can be an important source of healthy food and also a source of enjoyment for people who live in housing where there is no outdoor space to garden	LUP 1.5 (Surplus Land Disposition)	Affordable housing is included in LUP-1.5 (Surplus Land Disposition).	Karen Jacques [K-LUP-4]
<i>More Specifics on Regional Efforts</i>			
This says nothing about what the City will do regarding its use of SACOG programs such as Green Means Go. Please be more specific.	LUP-1.7 (Regional Growth Strategy)	Thank you for your comment.	Francois Kaepelin [K-LUP-4]
Allowing short-term rentals that are not primary residences to deplete our housing stock in the amenity-rich and desirable parts of town where they are prevalent, is at cross purposes with the goals of "economic prosperity, and social equity." Housing stock is depleted in neighborhoods where the city is encouraging growth in the form of "missing middle housing," and driving up the cost of housing.	LUP 1.7 (Regional Growth Strategy)	Thank you for your comment.	Francesca Reitano [K-LUP-4]
Support, but would like to see stronger language than "advocate". At least attempt to achieve the RTP/SCS targets.	LUP 1.9 (Advocacy)	Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-LUP-5]
<i>Misc</i>			
Make every new building mixed use for example Sac State's "American River Courtyard" housing building. Students in that building have access to a market so there is no need to drive and pollute the air. Also helps minimize discriminatory practices that have historically separated minority communities from commercial areas for the sake of "highway construction."	image, page 3-4	Thank you for your comment.	Zane Whitcomb [K-LUP-4]
Love this!	LUP 1.8 (Jobs/Housing Balance)	Thank you for your comment.	AMANDA OSTERHOUT [K-LUP-5]
What does it mean to just "review new development proposals?" There need to be requirements that will reduce conflicts with open space, density, historic character, and other aspects of livability in adjacent neighborhoods.	LUP-1.10 (Adjacent Development)	All developments are held to the City's development standards and design guidelines.	Mary Ann [K-LUP-5]
include sensitive species	LUP-1.11 (Coordinate to Protect Farmland)	Please see policies ERC 2.2 (Biological Resources) and 2.3 (Onsite Preservation).	Dale Steele [K-LUP-5]
Very good policy. Efforts to protect habitat should expressly indicate both within and outside of the City boundaries.	LUP-1.11 (Coordinate to Protect Farmland)	Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-LUP-5]
What if deed notices included noise near freeways? I have lived near both Hwy-50 and Hwy-99, where road noise is 24/7.	LUP 1.14 (Deed Notice)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-LUP-5]
What is the vicinity? What are the impacts needing to be disclosed? How are these impacts not mitigated with the request for buffers under LUP-1.12	LUP 1.15 (Homeowner Notification)	Thank you for your comment.	Garrett Norman [K-LUP-5]
<i>Existing Land Use and City Structure</i>			
Reduce the width of wide local streets to accommodate small parklets. Insert small parks in the middle of streets to prevent cars from going through but still allow people and bikes. Even make some one ways to gain even more space for parks. Imagine walking outside to a park instead of a wide sea of asphalt.		To be addressed in Street Design Standards Update, found in Mobility Element and Implementation Chapter.	Austin Wilmoth [K-LUP-6]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
This is giving american suburbs that do not efficiently use land and house less people per square mile then style types in europe. We also need to mix income levels in each building as rich people have the recourse to advocate for healthier living situations like updated water pipes that prevent lead poisoning a problem poor communities burden do to the fact richer areas produce more tax revenue to afford these upgrades. Mixing income levels will insure the rich with power and money create change for poorer and middle income people as well!		Addressed in Housing Element.	Zane Whitcomb [K-LUP-6]
Second. Chicanes, trees in bulbouts, etc. Makes wide roads much nicer and allows for neighborhood uses when canopy is covered & has green space (see: 21st St above E)		To be addressed in Street Design Standards Update, found in Mobility Element and Implementation Chapter.	Matt A [K-LUP-6]
Agree, there is a lot of public street area reserved for parking and moving cars, especially where parking lines both sides of the street, and where there are turning lanes/multiple travel lanes per direction, wide lanes, etc. We should de-prioritize traffic capacity and focus more on allocating space for trees and green space. I would just caution against creating one-ways that are also one-way for cyclists. This can be accomplished using contra-flow bike lanes.		Addressed in Mobility Element and forthcoming Streets for People Plan.	Troy [K-LUP-6]
Map LUP-2: City Structure			
As a resident of the Pocket, this area could a lot more mixed-use and "third places". Maybe add mixed-use developments close to commercial spaces?		Map LUP-2 shows existing uses and land use types. See Map LUP-5 for new Commercial Mixed-Use land use designation.	Francois Kaepelin [K-LUP-7]
Designation Office: on this land use map it calls out office. There is no definition for offic. There is a designation for office mixed use. Office mixed use does not include housing. Office does not include housing. The 2040 general plan is represented as not a change from the 2035 in the zoning and this is different than how it is being interpreted now and allowing housing to be built in office.		The Campus Commons area land use designations (Neighborhood (N) and Office Mixed Use (OMU)), as shown in Map LUP-5 (Land Use Diagram), reflect existing uses. In the 2040 General Plan, both designations allow for a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses.	hOward levine [K-LUP-7]
I can't believe I missed this. My historic neighborhood can be threatened by a developer and planning department who choose to overlook the land use map and zoning restrictions!		All developments are held to the City's development standards and design guidelines. The Campus Commons area land use designations (Neighborhood (N) and Office Mixed Use (OMU)), as shown in Map LUP-5 (Land Use Diagram), reflect existing uses. In the 2040 General Plan, both designations allow for a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses.	Mary Ann Robinson [K-LUP-7]
This area is designated as residential. Campus Commons is a custard housing development with higher density's allowing for raider open space and is he need to Sacramento and should be Designated a special study area.		The Campus Commons area land use designations (Neighborhood (N) and Office Mixed Use (OMU)), as shown in Map LUP-5 (Land Use Diagram), reflect existing uses. In the 2040 General Plan, both designations allow for a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses. Additionally, Special Study Areas are areas outside of the city. Beyond the boundaries of the 2040 General Plan, the City has identified five Special Study Areas that are adjacent to existing city limits and are of interest to the City of Sacramento (Map SSA 1 in the 2040 General Plan). Planning for the future of these unincorporated areas necessitates coordination between the City and County.	hOward levine [K-LUP-7]
clustered housing development...greater open space...		Thank you for your comment.	Mary Ann Robinson [K-LUP-7]
Figure LUP-2: Housing Types			
Need more multi-units!		The 2040 development standards will allow for more multi-units. Please also see policies LUP-6.2 (Range of Residential Development Intensities) and LUP-6.3 (Variety of Housing Types).	Zane Whitcomb [K-LUP-8]
Do not think it is reasonable to compare an inland town to coastal towns.		Thank you for your comment.	I Rye [K-LUP-8]
Development Potential			
wish this number of housing units was higher		Thank you for your comment.	Michael Nerby [K-LUP-9]
Why are we limiting the GP to targeting this many homes? Shouldn't we promote/allow more infill homes and units if the market will bear it? More housing, fewer problems.		69,000 new homes represents a projected value based on land use analysis.	Matt A [K-LUP-9]
Map LUP-3: Opportunity Areas			
<i>Why (not) here?</i>			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Why is the land next to the proposed light rail extension to Natomas not marked as an opportunity area for mixed-use development?		Using County Tax Assessor data from 2019, vacant and underutilized parcels were identified as opportunity sites, or places where change (i.e., new development or redevelopment) is most likely to occur. Underutilized sites were defined as parcels with low assessor value (AV) ratio, low FAR, or both. Properties under City ownership were also taken into consideration. Using these criteria, approximately 5,900 parcels were flagged as opportunity sites on this basis. A majority—3,900 parcels (approximately 6,000 acres)— are within the current 60 identified opportunity areas, which were updated and modified from the 2035 General Plan to reflect presence of opportunity sites, strong transit access, proximity to downtown, and general potential for infill development. Approximately 92% of new housing units are anticipated to be built in the opportunity areas such as the Central City, along commercial corridors, and near transit.	Cassie Mancini [K-LUP-10]
Similarly, why isn't land by the existing rail lines coded as opportunity zones? That would make the most of the city's prior investment in transit.		Using County Tax Assessor data from 2019, vacant and underutilized parcels were identified as opportunity sites, or places where change (i.e., new development or redevelopment) is most likely to occur. Underutilized sites were defined as parcels with low assessor value (AV) ratio, low FAR, or both. Properties under City ownership were also taken into consideration. Using these criteria, approximately 5,900 parcels were flagged as opportunity sites on this basis. A majority—3,900 parcels (approximately 6,000 acres)— are within the current 60 identified opportunity areas, which were updated and modified from the 2035 General Plan to reflect presence of opportunity sites, strong transit access, proximity to downtown, and general potential for infill development. Approximately 92% of new housing units are anticipated to be built in the opportunity areas such as the Central City, along commercial corridors, and near transit.	Jenny [K-LUP-10]
Could Little Italy be potentially considered an opportunity area? I feel like this area has so much potential, especially with more mixed-use developments here		Using County Tax Assessor data from 2019, vacant and underutilized parcels were identified as opportunity sites, or places where change (i.e., new development or redevelopment) is most likely to occur. Underutilized sites were defined as parcels with low assessor value (AV) ratio, low FAR, or both. Properties under City ownership were also taken into consideration. Using these criteria, approximately 5,900 parcels were flagged as opportunity sites on this basis. A majority—3,900 parcels (approximately 6,000 acres)— are within the current 60 identified opportunity areas, which were updated and modified from the 2035 General Plan to reflect presence of opportunity sites, strong transit access, proximity to downtown, and general potential for infill development. Approximately 92% of new housing units are anticipated to be built in the opportunity areas such as the Central City, along commercial corridors, and near transit.	Francois Kaepelin [K-LUP-10]
Why are so many light rail stations outside of the central city not considered not highlighted as opportunities for growth and evolution? No neighborhood should experience radical change, but also no neighborhood should be exempt from change.		Using County Tax Assessor data from 2019, vacant and underutilized parcels were identified as opportunity sites, or places where change (i.e., new development or redevelopment) is most likely to occur. Underutilized sites were defined as parcels with low assessor value (AV) ratio, low FAR, or both. Properties under City ownership were also taken into consideration. Using these criteria, approximately 5,900 parcels were flagged as opportunity sites on this basis. A majority—3,900 parcels (approximately 6,000 acres)— are within the current 60 identified opportunity areas, which were updated and modified from the 2035 General Plan to reflect presence of opportunity sites, strong transit access, proximity to downtown, and general potential for infill development. Approximately 92% of new housing units are anticipated to be built in the opportunity areas such as the Central City, along commercial corridors, and near transit.	Troy [K-LUP-10]
Some clarity regarding opportunity areas is needed. Vacant lots and industrial parks could probably be color coded differently than higher FAR areas, including Broadway, Stockton Blvd, UCD med center, downtown/midtown, etc).		Using County Tax Assessor data from 2019, vacant and underutilized parcels were identified as opportunity sites, or places where change (i.e., new development or redevelopment) is most likely to occur. Underutilized sites were defined as parcels with low assessor value (AV) ratio, low FAR, or both. Properties under City ownership were also taken into consideration. Using these criteria, approximately 5,900 parcels were flagged as opportunity sites on this basis. A majority—3,900 parcels (approximately 6,000 acres)— are within the current 60 identified opportunity areas, which were updated and modified from the 2035 General Plan to reflect presence of opportunity sites, strong transit access, proximity to downtown, and general potential for infill development. Approximately 92% of new housing units are anticipated to be built in the opportunity areas such as the Central City, along commercial corridors, and near transit.	Sacramento County Public Health [K-LUP-10]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
What makes the central city an opportunity area? Is it due to change in need for office buildings? Obviously there are some buildings besides offices that are vacant, etc, but it seems there are many more underutilized areas (like the strip mall example) in other parts of town. If resources are steered towards opportunity areas, then I think we need to look closely at where will benefit most heavily low income people and people of color.		Using County Tax Assessor data from 2019, vacant and underutilized parcels were identified as opportunity sites, or places where change (i.e., new development or redevelopment) is most likely to occur. Underutilized sites were defined as parcels with low assessor value (AV) ratio, low FAR, or both. Properties under City ownership were also taken into consideration. Using these criteria, approximately 5,900 parcels were flagged as opportunity sites on this basis. A majority—3,900 parcels (approximately 6,000 acres)— are within the current 60 identified opportunity areas, which were updated and modified from the 2035 General Plan to reflect presence of opportunity sites, strong transit access, proximity to downtown, and general potential for infill development. Approximately 92% of new housing units are anticipated to be built in the opportunity areas such as the Central City, along commercial corridors, and near transit.	Lamaia Coleman [K-LUP-10]
Why is UCD Med Center an opportunity area in this general plan?		Using County Tax Assessor data from 2019, vacant and underutilized parcels were identified as opportunity sites, or places where change (i.e., new development or redevelopment) is most likely to occur. Underutilized sites were defined as parcels with low assessor value (AV) ratio, low FAR, or both. Properties under City ownership were also taken into consideration. Using these criteria, approximately 5,900 parcels were flagged as opportunity sites on this basis. A majority—3,900 parcels (approximately 6,000 acres)— are within the current 60 identified opportunity areas, which were updated and modified from the 2035 General Plan to reflect presence of opportunity sites, strong transit access, proximity to downtown, and general potential for infill development. Approximately 92% of new housing units are anticipated to be built in the opportunity areas such as the Central City, along commercial corridors, and near transit.	Lamaia Coleman [K-LUP-10]
Increase FAR			
Increase the FAR to 4.0 within a 10 minute of all transit stations.		Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods." For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Jenny [K-LUP-10]
Buffer Sensitive Uses			
adequate buffering of sensitive American river parkway natural resources and recreation activities needs to be included.		Please see policy ERC-2.1 (Conservation of Open Space Areas).	Dale Steele [K-LUP-10]
Map LUP-4: Land Use Concept			
Center Designation Change			
Please consider designating this area of Campus Commons as an "Urban Center". It has great access to parks, river views, and is close to major employment centers (Sac State). This would be a great spot for a more urban environment. The existing density is pretty low with way too much surface parking.		Thank you for your comment.	Kevin Dumler [K-LUP-11]
Mobility			
Map LUP-4: SacRT would like to suggest that Cosumnes River Boulevard be represented as a corridor in the concept diagram, as it currently provides an east-west connection between urban centers and will continue to grow with the expansion of the Delta Shores community. Additionally, the corridor is a major arterial that serves the Morrison Creek light rail station and is expected to be an important part of future connectivity between nearby bus routes and light rail service.		Map LUP-4 revised per comment suggestion.	SacRT [74]
Traffic Concerns			
Locating many offices in one location will create commuting gridlock without investment in transit. Why not locate offices interspersed throughout the community with access to the existing transit links?		Thank you for your comment.	Jenny [K-LUP-11]
I'm a bit nervous for traffic here with the new apartments. I hope the city has some sort of rapid transit plan in the works since at the moment, there's only the bike trail in progress.		Thank you for your comment.	Chris Wong [K-LUP-11]
It looks like most of the Employment centers - office are placed along the freeway. That seems counterproductive to decreasing vehicle miles driven.		Thank you for your comment.	Lamaia Coleman [K-LUP-11]
Land Use Vision and Concept			
I love this intent statement and this vision for the Land Use. Especially the point about "make it easier to get around without a car." This is what excites me a lot about this General Plan and I fully support the goals and priorities to get toward this!		Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-9]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Again, thoroughfare implies car-centric mobility. Reiterating that to make the city's carbon neutral goal within the next 20 years, automobile emissions needs to drastically reduce.		Please see goal sections M-1 and M-2, which includes policies that aim to improve multi-modal access and infrastructure as well as reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles.	Ian Treat [K-LUP-12]
Buss lines should be circular, I have no phone service and many times I have gotten on the wrong bus and was dropped off at the last stop to then walk back over an hour in rainy weather. Busses should loop so you can always end up where you were if a "transit mistake" ever were to happen.		Thank you for your comment.	Zane Whitcomb [K-LUP-12]
Hope to see empty office buildings in the Central City transitioned to housing or a mix of housing and commercial with commercial on the lower floors. Such buildings could provide an opportunity for affordable housing, including some buildings or portions of buildings that are SROs. The Central City used to have a number of SROs bringing back this type of housing could provide an affordable housing opportunity, particularly for some of Sacramento's homeless people and extremely poor residents and, if run well, could also provide an opportunity for residents to build a sense of community. Similar opportunities might be possible along some of the mixed use corridors. I also want to strongly plug the adaptive re-use of existing office buildings which has a much lower carbon footprint and is a more sustainable approach than tearing down and building new.		Please see policy LUP-2.7 (Evolving Office Needs).	Karen Jacques [K-LUP-12]
Broadway is finally getting some significant traffic calming. Other corridors will need the same so that they are welcoming and safe for pedestrians and bicyclists. As climate change makes Sacramento hotter, those corridors will also need tree canopy.		Please see M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds) and M-3.2 (Street Design) for policies on safer streets and goal section M-1 for policies on multi-mobility. Also see policies M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets; policy also stipulates that existing street trees should be maintained and replaced, new trees installed where feasible, and street trees should be incorporated into new neighborhood streets.	Karen Jacques [K-LUP-12]
This urban center definition does not have a colored land-use designation on any map. It is also in conflict with some of what might be considered urban centers but one cannot tell. Therefore, it is hard to identify inconsistencies with this definition.		Map LUP-5 (General Plan Land Use Diagram) shows and 2040 General Plan land use designations. Map LUP-6 through Map LUP-8 show allowable development intensity throughout the city.	hOward levine [K-LUP-12]
Corridors should be the focus of transportation improvements. We need to acknowledge that our existing corridors are often terrible places to live. They are polluted, noisy, lack shade, and unsafe for walking and biking. If we want these areas to be the focus of our housing investments, they should also be the focus of our transportation investments. Areas where we are proposing the highest density should be among our best places to live, not the polluted, leftover places.		Please see policies LUP-8.9 (People-Friendly Design), LUP-8.14 (Streetscape Beautification), E-2.3 (Neighborhood Development Action Team), and EJ-5.5 (Investment Prioritization).	House Sacramento [5]
Land Use Designations			
<i>Neighborhood</i>			
Consider new requirements for corner markets to discourage liquor, snack, soda, and cigarette sales and encourage greengrocer shops that sell mostly fruit and vegetables.		Please see EJ-2.1 (New Healthy Food Grocers), EJ-2.15 (Limit Food Swamps), EJ-2.16 (Discourage Unhealthy Uses), EJ-2.17 (Healthy Food Promotion), and EJ-A.6 (Healthy Food Zoning).	Michelle Reynolds [K-LUP-13]
Absolutely love this idea.		Please see EJ-2.1 (New Healthy Food Grocers), EJ-2.15 (Limit Food Swamps), EJ-2.16 (Discourage Unhealthy Uses), EJ-2.17 (Healthy Food Promotion), and EJ-A.6 (Healthy Food Zoning).	Ian Treat [K-LUP-13]
A neighborhood that's primarily residential with very limited commercial space is NOT the best way to "enhance livability". This type of neighborhood, for a family, requires parents to chauffeur kids around everywhere they go. It is rarely practical for kids to leave the home without being driven somewhere because the distances are usually too far, and the prevalence of cars (usually on streets designed for high speeds) makes doing so unsafe. For others unable to drive, they are forced to be dependent on a very infrequent public transit system or asking others for rides to go about their daily affairs. This is "livable" for those with a variety of privileges...the financial means, plus the physical and legal ability to drive everywhere they go. The RMU designation seems best designed to "enhance livability".		Although predominantly residential, the Neighborhood designation does still allow some mixed-use, including neighborhood-serving commercial and employment uses like corner markets, coffee shops, hair salons, shops, gyms, and fitness centers.	Devin Martin [K-LUP-13]
Agreed. Mixed use please. Being able to walk to the store, coffee shop, kid's sport practice, dentist, etc is much better quality of life.		Although predominantly residential, the Neighborhood designation does still allow some mixed-use, including neighborhood-serving commercial and employment uses like corner markets, coffee shops, hair salons, shops, gyms, and fitness centers.	Jenny [K-LUP-13]
Agree in principle, but the second half of the Neighborhood definition is at the top right of this page which includes many examples of daily necessities, including corner makets, shops, offices, assembly facilities, etc. I can see how a lot of parents will find their chauffeur duties somewhat mitigated by these things.		Thank you for your comment.	Troy [K-LUP-13]
I am glad to see that the Neighborhood (the primarily residential designation) includes neighborhood-serving commercial.		Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-13]


Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Definitely love that this land use designation now includes corner stores by-right!		Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-13]
The Neighborhood designation should be deprecated in favor of the RMU designation in almost every case, and maintained only in exceptional circumstances. The default use of Neighborhood zoning, which encourages low-density sprawl and unsustainable development, is one of the principal causes of the issues Sacramento is trying to address through this general plan.		Thank you for your comment.	Max Cassell [K-LUP-13]
<i>Residential Mixed-Use</i>			
this type of use and zoning should be very prevalent throughout the city		Thank you for your comment.	Michael Nerby [K-LUP-14]
100% agree. RMU should be the default neighborhood pattern. People shouldn't be expected to live in isolated zones that they must leave every time they go to work, school, or wish to enjoy "a full range of (...) retail, employment, entertainment, cultural (...etc)" shops and services. These things should all be integrated into neighborhood spaces allowing people to meet most of their shopping needs and satisfy the desire for culture, socializing, and entertainment within walking distance of their home.		Thank you for your comment.	Devin Martin [K-LUP-14]
Amen. Recommend consolidating with N designation or updating N designation with additional specific commercial public-serving uses.		Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-LUP-14]
I agree, RMU allows for a more fiscally and environmentally sustainable development pattern.		Thank you for your comment.	Troy [K-LUP-14]
<i>Employment Mixed-Use</i>			
We recommend the following changes to the land use description to further reduce unintended residential and industrial conflicts: The Employment Mixed-Use (EMU) designation is intended to buffer residential uses from more intense industrial and service commercial activities, and to provide compatible employment uses near in proximity to higher density and mixed-use housing. This designation provides for a range of light industrial and high technology uses. Generally the EMU designation applies to industrial areas that are next to residential neighborhoods, including McClellan Airfield, Pell-Main Industrial Park, Cannon Industrial Park, and portions of the Sacramento Railyards, River District , and the Power Inn Business Improvement District. Allowable uses include the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Light/advanced manufacturing, production, distribution, repair, testing, printing, research, and development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service commercial uses that do not generate substantial noise or odors <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accessory office uses <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Retail and service uses that provide support to employees <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compatible residential uses such as live-work spaces or employee housing that are designed to reduce noise, odor, and safety conflicts <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Care facilities <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assembly facilities <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compatible public and quasi-public uses		Employment Mixed-Use designation description updated to say: The Employment Mixed-Use (EMU) designation is intended to buffer residential uses from more intense industrial and service commercial activities, and to provide compatible employment uses near in proximity to higher density and mixed-use housing. This designation provides for a range of light industrial and high technology uses. Generally the EMU designation applies to industrial areas that are next to residential neighborhoods, including McClellan Airfield, Pell-Main Industrial Park, Cannon Industrial Park, and portions of the Sacramento Railyards, River District , and the Power Inn Business Improvement District. Allowable uses include the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Light/advanced manufacturing, production, distribution, repair, testing, printing, research, and development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service commercial uses that do not generate substantial noise or odors <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accessory office uses <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Retail and service uses that provide support to employees <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compatible residential uses such as live-work spaces or employee housing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Care facilities <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assembly facilities <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Compatible public and quasi-public uses	Blue Diamond [57]
<i>Open Space</i>			
The Open Space designation should also be used to preserve quality of living environments in existing neighborhoods. Open space in front of a historic building that buffers a neighborhood from a business corridor should be protected from conversion into stacked housing for housing's sake and for tax income to the City.		Thank you for your comment.	Mary Ann [K-LUP-16]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>Either the Open Space (OS) designation needs to be strengthened and upgraded into a "Natural Areas" (NA) designation, or a third, stand-alone Natural Areas (NA) designation should be derived from the proposed designations for Open Space (OS) and Parks and Recreation (PR). This would be consistent with nationwide trends and municipal natural area programs nationwide.</p> <p>A Natural Areas (NA) designation should describe parcels and landscapes that are legally protected in perpetuity (e.g., conservation easements), and where the City collaborates with land trusts, academic institutions, and the environmental community to perform intensive stewardship. This stewardship should be designed to reverse the decades/centuries of degradation, restore native plant communities that are characteristic of the California Floristic Province, and manage fuel loads within a matrix of urban natural areas so these areas are beautiful, regenerative, and firesafe.</p> <p>The natural landscapes and plant communities native to Sacramento are essential to: (1) conserving biological diversity found nowhere else on Earth; (2) sequestering greenhouse gases and buffering the urban heat island effect; and (3) capturing, retaining, and filtering stormwater and re-charging local aquifers with cost-effective, and "nature-based" methods.</p> <p>The City of Sacramento could and should be the Central Valley's beacon for the stewardship of land and water resources, and not just another example of habitat fragmentation, contaminated water, and species extirpations. The Open Space (OS) designation is leader in stewarding aquatic and terrestrial habitats, and contributing to the solution of our dual crises of biodiversity loss and climate chaos.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment. At this time, the 2040 General Plan has no plans to include a Natural Area designation. Please follow updates for the forthcoming Parks Plan 2040 and Urban Forest Plan for additional details on how the City will plan for green areas and open space.</p>	<p>Tim Vendlinski [K-LUP-16]</p>
<p>(cont.) As written, the Open Space (OS) designation is too passive and fails to recognize the need for active stewardship and adaptive management of natural landscapes.</p> <p>As written, the Parks and Recreation (PR) designation is flawed in its grouping of "open turf and natural areas" when the City itself has never demonstrated the potential compatibility of these two land uses. In recent years, a pesticide company hired by the City's lessee for Haggin Oaks Golf Course was found to have placed numerous rodenticide boxes within the Arcade Creek Natural Area adjacent to the "open turfed" fairways. Rodenticides are known to be fatal to native species such as owls, raptors, yellow-billed magpies, foxes, bobcats, coyotes, etc.</p> <p>The City should do more to improved the compatibility of conventional recreational assets (e.g., golf courses, soccer fields, softball fields, disc golf courses) with non-consumptive recreational pursuits (e.g., cross-country trail running, hiking, bird watching). Further, the City should not use designated Natural Areas for the siting of active, consumptive recreation (e.g., disc golf courses, BMX pump tracks, skate parks), and should begin a process of de-commissioning those recreational assets that were added to already designated Natural Areas. A citywide master plan should be done for the siting of these type of high-intensity recreational elements in non-sensitive, under-utilized, and or blighted tracts where the recreational element can contribute to the economic and social recovery of a neglected urban zone.</p> <p>The City should establish a Natural Areas Program and establish a network of designated Natural Areas throughout the City that are connected by trails, waterways, pollinator corridors, and/or wildlife corridors.</p> <p>https://www.arborday.org/trees/bulletins/coordinators/resources/pdfs/027.pdf</p> <p>https://www.nature.org/content/dam/tnc/nature/en/documents/Outside_Our_Doors_report.pdf</p> <p>https://terrascope2024.mit.edu</p> <p>https://californiabiodiversityinitiative.org</p> <p>https://www.efi.org/news/press-and-bulletins/urban-landscapes-report-completed#the-city-of-sacramento</p>			<p>Tim Vendlinski [K-LUP-16] (cont.)</p>
<p><i>Parks and Recreation</i></p> <p>parks are huge, Sacramento needs to double down on the American river bike trail, cleaner, no homeless, create spaces, connect the trail better at old sac, and all the way down the sacramento north and south, this is our main attraction and amenity, major upgrades to waterfront will attract major visitors and locals, we should create a large "something" to attract folks, like "the USAs largest cherry blossom walkway" or "the USAs largest waterfront promenade"</p>		<p>Please see policies in goal section LUP-8, including policies LUP-8.1 (Unique Sense of Place), LUP-8.2 (River as Signature Feature), and LUP-8.3 (River Access and Ecology).</p>	<p>Michael Nerby [K-LUP-17]</p>
<p>Great idea!</p>		<p>Please see policies in goal section LUP-8, including policies LUP-8.1 (Unique Sense of Place), LUP-8.2 (River as Signature Feature), and LUP-8.3 (River Access and Ecology).</p>	<p>Jenny [K-LUP-17]</p>

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The Sacramento Riverfront has so much potential, but limited crossings over I-5 impede access. What if there was a lid over I-5 from J St south to Hwy-50?		Please see policies LUP-8.2 (River as Signature Feature) and LUP-8.3 (River Access and Ecology) for the city's commitment to improve access to the riverfronts.	Ian Treat [K-LUP-17]
It's extraordinarily hard to square golf courses with other state goals around sustainability, equity, and so forth. Massive expanses of grasses ill-suited to our climate to enable a game skewed heavily toward the affluent seems like an extremely poor use of public land and resources.		Thank you for your comment.	Devin Martin [K-LUP-17]
Yes, please convert golf courses to naturally landscaped areas with either entirely open space or dense development mixed with lots of greenspace.		Thank you for your comment.	Jenny [K-LUP-17]
I agree, golf courses always seem to get an exclusive pass in city codes and planning documents as allowed by-right, but other useful and more productive things like corner stores are not. It's seriously time to flip the script and make golf courses NOT allowed by-right.		Thank you for your comment.	Troy [K-LUP-17]
Special Study Area			
How can an established neighborhood become a Special Study Area?		Thank you for your comment. Special Study Areas are areas outside of the city. The City has identified five Special Study Areas that are adjacent to existing city limits and are of interest to the City of Sacramento (Map SSA 1 in the 2040 General Plan). Planning for the future of these unincorporated areas necessitates coordination between the City and County.	Mary Ann [K-LUP-17]
Building Intensity and Population Density			
Staff initiated revision to clarify what is counted towards FAR calculations		<p>Page 3-18, "Building Intensity" section revised to say: "FAR is calculated by dividing the net gross building area (NGBA) by the total net lot area (NLA) (both expressed in square feet). NGBA is the gross total building area of a site less the floor area of accessory dwelling units (ADUs), junior accessory dwelling units (JADUs), and structured parking structures areas and open space (common, public, and private). Net lot area is the total lot size, excluding publicly dedicated land: private streets which meet City standards, and other public use areas. (See Figure LUP-3).</p> <p>The formula for FAR is: FAR = NGBA / NLA Example: A NGBA of 3,000 43,560 square feet and NLA of 5,000 43,560 square feet would yield an FAR of 0.6 ±0. (3,000 43,560 / 5,000 43,560 = FAR 0.6 ±0)</p> <p>Building density for residential land uses is expressed as the number of permanent residential dwelling units per acre of land. Building intensity standards are shown on Maps LUP-6, LUP-7, and LUP-8, and Figure LUP-5. Map LUP-6 shows the maximum FAR allowable on a site inclusive of both residential and non-residential uses. Figure LUP-5 shows a sliding FAR scale, applicable to residential uses in the single-unit and duplex dwelling zones, which limits single-unit dwellings to a FAR of 0.4 and grants additional increments of building area that increase proportionally to the number of units proposed on a lot. Map LUP-7 shows the minimum required FAR throughout the city for mixed-use and non-residential development. Map LUP-8 shows the minimum required density for residential uses throughout the city. "</p>	Staff
Map LUP-5: Land Use Diagram			
Suggestion: re-zone or at least update definition section to be explicit about the commercial residential-serving land uses allowed in Neighborhood designation. Including corner-stores, cafes, coffee shops, etc.		Neighborhood designation description lists allowed uses which includes residential development as well as some mixed-use, including neighborhood-serving commercial and employment uses like corner markets, coffee shops, hair salons, shops, gyms, and fitness centers.	Matt A [K-LUP-19]
Neighborhood to Residential Mixed Use			
In general, there is far far far too much yellow on this map to meet the awesome goals of mixed-use density, walkability, reducing car dependency, and neighborhood-centricity laid out in this plan. The City should be far more ambitious in this 2040 Plan with land uses. Mixed Use development is a great feature that brings safety, community, incremental economic activity, walkability, to neighborhoods. We should be ambitious and willing to make way more of this map, ESPECIALLY around Light Rail, Proposed Light Rail, and other transit stations, all throughout the city. Otherwise, it's a waste of the huge investments we have made into public transit. If we want public transit to be successful, to be funded, to have high ridership, there needs to be more reasons for people to take it and more destinations (like shops, restaurants, employment areas) for them to go that are near their residences!		Most land use designations, including the yellow Neighborhood designation, allows for a mix of uses.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-19]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
all of midtown should be up zoned to residential mixed use, there is no case for neighborhood in midtown and downtown. additionally along broadway and Alhambra we should be building up, 7-8 stories, mixed use and residential. also along, J, 16, 15, L, and other main arteries in DT and midtown		Thank you for your comment.	Michael Nerby [K-LUP-19]
Same comment for east sac and along rail corridors. Really the whole city should allow mixed use. Please amend.		Thank you for your comment.	Jenny [K-LUP-19]
All of these areas in a 1/4-mile radius around transit should be upzoned from Neighborhood to Residential Mixed-Use. This would be in line with the Plan's previous stated goals around development intensity linked to transit, transit-supportive development, efficient parcel utilization, and mixed-use neighborhood centers. Notably, areas around Natomas High School and, El Camino should be upzoned to be Residential Mixed-Use. When I was in high school, I was lucky enough to be able to walk to a few restaurants and grocery stores in between the end of school and practice. I didn't own a car and I went to school very far from home. It was really important to be able to have this option, especially as a young person who didn't have the ability to own a car.		Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-19]
The Campus Commons area with multiple zonings should be considered as a total unit as a special study area and with the RMU zoning, land-use designation		Thank you for your comment. Special Study Areas are areas outside of the city. The City has identified five Special Study Areas that are adjacent to existing city limits and are of interest to the City of Sacramento (Map SSA 1 in the 2040 General Plan). Planning for the future of these unincorporated areas necessitates coordination between the City and County.	hOward levine [K-LUP-19]
Office Uses			
The post-covid world does not support office uses any longer. There is an impending office mortgage crisis. Please reconsider applying a different designation or expanding what is allowed in Office Mixed Use (making sure that Office is not the dominant use because it's no longer as viable in the foreseeable future), particularly on the vacant lots ripe for development and investment.		Thank you for your comment.	Anonymous [K-LUP-19]
Increase Intensity			
Please increase infill significantly in rich areas as well.		Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-LUP-19]
Sacramento planning staff and your consultants must know that mixed-use is the right longer term designation. If Sac is serious at all about climate goals and building a walkable/transit-friendly city, it's time to stop dilly-dallying around and end bad land use patterns (i.e., stop allowing single use/single family neighborhoods). Maybe that's an unpopular move with some on council or older homeowners, but at least try to make that happen on the plan that council hears.		Please see policies LUP-6.2 (Range of Residential Development Intensities) and LUP-6.3 (Variety of Housing Types), which, in combination with a shift to FAR-based development intensity maximum, effectively open up single-family neighborhoods to a greater array of housing types.	Jesse [K-LUP-19]
This should be a priority area for upzoning There is no reason for the land uses around the light rail stations here to be yellow ("Neighborhood"). Within a ¼ mile radius surrounding all transit stations, "Neighborhood" land uses should be changed to "Residential Mixed-Use" or higher development intensity. The current draft land use map conflicts with all of the following: * LUP-2.4 Development Intensity Linked to Transit * LUP-4.1 Transit-Supportive Development * LUP-4.4 Public Uses and Services * LUP-4.5 Efficient Parcel Utilization * LUP-5.3 Mixed-Use Neighborhood Centers		Development intensities do not correspond with land use designations in the 2040 General Plan. Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods." For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-19]
Agree, I think the development intensity near transit should be incrementally higher than that of surrounding areas. e.g., Neighborhood -> RMU and FAR 1.0 -> FA 4.0 within a half mile walk of all light rail stations outside the central city.		Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods." For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Troy [K-LUP-19]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>I agree, almost the entirety of Elmhurst is within a 10 minute walk of a light rail station, and at least 10% of east sac is also within a 10 minute walk. Way too much of it has land use and FAR capped too low. These are incompatible development intensities for transit.</p>		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Troy [K-LUP-19]
<i>Open Space/Park</i>			
<p>The City should look to exchange the City "Park" on 57th near the intersection with Broadway for a plot within the Fairgrounds development itself. The current park is a patch of grass nearly inaccessible to residents of the Fairgrounds development due to fencing and the location of the large multifamily facility adjacent and west of the park. Paying fees in lieu of developers including greenspace in new developments should not be allowed. The Fairgrounds development is quite isolated with only Fairgrounds Drive as access and egress and children have to cross Broadway and then several blocks to access the only neighborhood park, Tahoe Park. Per the General Plan, LUP-6.4 states that the City will require new development to consider the existing physical characteristics of a neighborhood, including open space. The entitlements for the existing private greenspace in the Fairgrounds Development does not take into consideration the existing greenspace and therefore the final design of the housing development should include greenspace for all residents in the Fairgrounds, existing and future.</p>		<p>Please see goal section YPRO-1 for policies related to the provision of parks, open space areas, and recreational facilities in the city.</p>	Trenton Wilson [K-LUP-19]
<p>There is great potential to increase open space, recreation/parks, and public access in this area adjacent to the American River Parkway and Sutter's Landing Park. This is one of the closest and easiest access points for the majority of the City's population in the City Center to access greenspace and the American River. These opportunities should be better reflected in the General Plan.</p>		<p>Please see policy YPRO-1.11 (Enhancing Access to Parks).</p>	Ellen Wehr [K-LUP-19]
<p>This map shows a green space in the middle of Campus Commons. The key states this is "Parks and Recreation" however it is not public use. It is totally within the private property of the Campus Commons PUD and is not maintained, managed or considered a City park. So, this should be considered separately when looking at parks for people in the surrounding area, such as how far a person has to go to get to a park. This would not be a park to consider for residents outside the Campus Commons PUD.</p> <p>As shown on the map, how does the City consider this area? Are there more areas like this that need special consideration so that neighborhoods aren't overlooked for when planning for PUBLIC park areas?</p>		<p>The area designated as Parks and Recreation has been re-designated as Neighborhood.</p>	Kathy Styc [K-LUP-19]
<i>Sutter's Landing Park - Various Properties</i>			
<p>This map and other maps should be updated to show the expanded Sutter's Landing Park boundaries that now include the property purchased from Blue Diamond in 2022, the property that SMUD will soon convey to the City of Sacramento, and other properties including the Canon and Scollan properties. These areas should be designated as OS since development is significantly restricted on these properties (alternatively, they could be designated as PR).</p>		<p>Maps will be updated to reflect West Sutter's Landing Park.</p>	Corey Brown [K-LUP-19]
<i>Land Use Designations</i>			
<p>Please consider designating the commercial area of Campus Commons as an "Urban Center". It has great access to parks, river views, and is close to major employment centers (Sac State). This would be a great spot for a more urban environment. The existing density is pretty low with far too much surface parking.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	House Sacramento [21]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>Our clients' properties are the subject of a Development Agreement (DA) with the City of Sacramento, City Agreement No. 99-162, which has an effective date of September 28, 1999. As such, we want the City to be aware that the General Plan land use designations, policies, and standards that apply to our clients' properties are those that were in effect at the time that the DA was approved, not those contained in proposed 2040 General Plan. These properties are:</p> <p>APN: 22500300580000 APN: 20103001390000 APN: 20103001530000 APN: 22500300570000 APN: 22523200010000 APN: 22523200020000 APN: 20103001390000 APN: 22500400570000 APN: 22500400590000 APN: 22500400290000 APN: 22500400550000 APN: 22500400320000 APN: 22500400300000</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Assignees of Kern Schumacher [43]
<p>North Natomas Area (Kaiser APNs: 225-3290-027 through -034 and -038 and -039): Kaiser Permanente is very concerned about the proposed loss of development potential at its Natomas property described above (northeast of San Juan Rd. and I-5). Given that Sacramento calculates FAR based on net lot area, this proposed change may significantly affect Kaiser Permanente's ability to fully buildout its entitled square footage at this location. As such, we are requesting that the FAR remain at 2.0 as is currently reflected in the 2035 General Plan and as is provided to other similarly designated Office Mixed-Use parcels in the Draft 2040 General Plan Update.</p>		Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR) updated per comment suggestion.	Kaiser Permanente [49]
<p>Railyards Medical Center Site (Kaiser APNs: 002-0270-001 through -008): As part of the Railyards entitlement process an Irrevocable Offer to Dedicate (IOD) was recorded in 2019 to dedicate an easement through the Kaiser Permanente future medical center parcels. For consistency and clarity, Kaiser Permanente requests that reference to this easement be revised and identified in the Draft 2040 General Plan Update as a "public access easement."</p>		The IOD is shown as a planned park in both Map CP-CC-7 (Central City Park Access) and the Map YPRO-1 (Walking Access to Parks and Open Space Facilities). The IOD removed from these maps.	Kaiser Permanente [49]
<p>6700 Mack Road (Kaiser APNs: 117-0170-062 and -064): The Draft 2040 General Plan Update proposes a different land use designation for the site than what is currently in effect, though "office" use is listed as a permitted use in each designation. However, medical and professional office uses are often considered to be distinct use types. Given Kaiser Permanente's intended medical office use for the site, Kaiser Permanente is requesting that the Draft 2040 General Plan Update expressly include "medical office" as a distinct permitted use in the full list of allowed uses for the new proposed Residential Mixed-Use designation.</p>		No change required. The following text includes medical office: "General offices and community institutional uses, such as banks, financial institutions, care facilities, and medical and professional offices"	Kaiser Permanente [49]
<p>Delta Shores Area (Kaiser APN: 053-0180-029): The Draft 2040 General Plan Update proposes a different land use designation for the site than what is currently in effect, though "office" use is listed as a permitted use in each designation. However, medical and professional office uses are often considered to be distinct use types. Given Kaiser Permanente's intended medical office use for the site, Kaiser Permanente is requesting that the Draft 2040 General Plan Update expressly include "medical office" as a distinct permitted use in the full list of allowed uses for the new proposed Residential Mixed-Use designation.</p> <p>The Draft 2040 General Plan Update also reduces the development intensity/potential of the site from FAR 3.0 to 2.0 and Kaiser Permanente requests that the City review this recommendation given that the subject site is at a major interchange with Interstate 5.</p>		Increase the max FAR to 4.0 consistent with the prior 2035 GP land use designation. Offices are an allowed use in commercial mixed use designation so no need to change the list of allowable uses.	Kaiser Permanente [49]
<p>1650 Response Road (Kaiser APN: 277-0273-003): The Draft 2040 General Plan Update significantly reduces the development intensity/potential of the site from FAR 8.0 to 2.0 and Kaiser Permanente requests that the City review this recommendation given that the subject site is at the Highway 80 and State Route 160 interchange.</p>		 <p>Increase the max FAR to 4.0 for the larger site that had an 8.0 max FAR in the 2035 GP. See snip above.</p>	Kaiser Permanente [49]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>For APNS 250-0010-012, 014-020: APN's 250-0010-112, 115, 116, as well as an expanded portion of 114 should remain Highway Commercial, or a Land Use compatible for Highway Commercial use. The portion of APN 250- 0010-117 that sits on Northgate near the existing HC zone (to the north of 112) should also eventually become HC. There is continued demand for such uses directly off Interstate 80. I envision 10-15 eventual parcels totaling approximately 12-18 acres that could accommodate this need off Northgate.</p> <p>The remainder of parcels 114 and 117 could accommodate a land use that would eventually become C-2 zoning. In looking at the current zoning codes, it would make sense to have much of the property in a C-2 zone, which allows for both commercial and residential opportunities. Residential would be the vision, but this zoning would allow a broader range of uses within that vision.</p> <p>A lot line adjustment on 114 and 117 to better delineate the HC and C-2 potential could align the parcels with the proposed uses. I be happy to start work on that as the City goes through their process of rezoning.</p> <p>APN's 118 and 119, approximately 17 acres by the freeway could have a land use that accommodates light industrial sales or some other use that needs freeway visibility.</p> <p>APN 120 could be planned and zoned for residential similar to that developed in the Parkebridge neighborhood.</p>		<p>Northern portion of property re-designated as EMU (APNs: 25000101180000, 25000101190000). EMU designation description revised to include "hotel and motel" allowed uses.</p>	<p>Six Bar C LLC [56]</p>
<p>Staff initiated correction to minimum density.</p>		<p>The minimum density for the following parcels were corrected back to 15 du/ac, consistent with their minimum density in the 2035 General Plan: West Northgate/80 -25000101180000 -25000101190000 -25000101170000 -25000101140000 -25000101160000 -25000100600000 -25000101150000 -25000101130000 -25000101120000 East of Northgate/80 -25000100360000 -25000100940000 -25000100950000 -25000100990000 -25000100980000 -25000100930000 -25000100920000 -25000100910000 -25000100900000</p>	<p>Staff</p>
Map LUP-6: Max FAR			
<p>Why not upzone along corridors here?</p>		<p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	<p>Austin Wilmoth [K-LUP-20]</p>
<p>This map is a joke. FAR should be higher more or less everywhere.</p>		<p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	<p>Jesse [K-LUP-20]</p>
<p>I am confused by some of the FAR maximums in this map. LUP-2.2 and 2.4 specifically call for development intensities to be linked to transit, but many of the most important transit areas — the residential areas immediately surrounding the closest light rail stations to the central city — are zoned at the lowest possible density (FAR 1.0). Is there a different policy that calls for these neighborhoods to be excepted from transit-based zoning?</p>		<p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	<p>Ben Raderstorf [K-LUP-20]</p>
<p>This area of the Campus Commons area is designated with a 2 FAR, and should be re-designated with a lower if they are as well as specific height limits not to exceed two stories</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>hOward levine [K-LUP-20]</p>

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p><i>Increase FAR</i> landpark and east sac should be 2.0 FAR</p>		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Michael Nerby [K-LUP-20]
<p>2.0 minimum. Don't tell us you're trying to fix the housing crisis and then cap the ability to build housing in the city.</p>		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Matt A [K-LUP-20]
<p>Increase FAR to 2.0 within high opportunity neighborhoods as an effort to affirmatively further fair housing. These are our healthiest neighborhoods with the best access to parks and schools. An FAR of 2.0 will help facilitate missing-middle housing that makes these neighborhoods more accessible.</p>		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Kevin Dumler [K-LUP-20]
<p>Increasing the River Park FAR to 2.0 would also increase public use along the American River.</p>		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Ian Treat [K-LUP-20]
<p>The city should increase the Floor Area Ratio to 2.0 in East Sacramento, a high opportunity area that has great schools and great access to jobs. More people should be able to live here and have housing options here. Increasing the FAR is really critical to improving housing affordability and housing options for as many people as possible.</p>		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-20]
<p>The 38th st and 49th st RT stations are some of the best transit access in the entire city — just a couple stops away from some of the most economically vibrant areas of midtown. I strongly support raising the FAR minimum in the areas around these stations to allow for better transit-oriented housing in East Sac</p>		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Ben Raderstorf [K-LUP-20]
<p>Increase the FAR to 2.0 in Land Park and East Sacramento. It's within high opportunity areas, and Public transit. We're in a housing crisis and choosing to not increase the FAR in Land Park is big issue to our state & our regions housing crisis, and inconsiderate to all Sacramento residents who want to live closer to the high opportunity areas.</p> <p>Per reports from the California department of justice and the office of the attorney general, more than 3 million Californian's — pay more than 30 percent of their income toward rent. Nearly one-third of renters — more than 1.5 million households — pay more than 50 percent of their income toward rent. California is home to 12 percent of the nation's population, and responsible for 22 percent of the nation's homeless population. It is this lack of choosing to opt out certain regions of cities from growth that is causing a lack of mixed affordable housing neighborhoods and is responsible for our state & cities housing affordability and homelessness issues.</p>		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Luis Romo [K-LUP-20]
<p>Agreed. Why are East Sac transit opportunity areas treated differently from the rest of the city?</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-LUP-20]
<p>FAR 4.0 should be the minimum within the grid of Sacramento City. A mid-rise building should be allowed by-right next to any of these Mid-town Sacramento neighborhoods. This aligns with our transit, climate, and infill goals & visions, putting more people near high quality transit.</p>		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Luis Romo [K-LUP-20]
<p>Increase FAR to at least 2.0 in wealthier areas like Land Park and East Sac.</p>		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Jack Barnes [K-LUP-20]
<p>The Floor Area Ratio should be increased to 4.0 in any area of the central grid. The higher FAR helps residents and would-be residents have more housing options, makes housing more affordable, encourages and incentivizes smarter land use by developers, and also can increase property tax revenue for the city which is so important for funding our other goals on climate, environmental justice, youth, etc.</p>		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-20]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Also, we should consider increasing the max FAR in certain areas like Florin/Greenhaven and Florin/Riverside to FAR 4.0		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Francois Kaepelin [K-LUP-20]
FAR 4.0 should be the minimum within a 10 minute walk of all transit stations. A midrise building should be allowed by-right next to any of these stops. This aligns with our transit, climate, and infill goals & visions, putting more people near high quality transit.		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Kevin Dumler [K-LUP-20]
I live near here, in one of the light yellow areas near a blue line SacRT light rail stop. I am a single-family homeowner. I support increasing the FAR to 4.0 within a 10 minute walk of all transit stations in Sacramento, as well as to an FAR of 2.0 in high opportunity and rich neighborhoods.		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Ansel Lundberg [K-LUP-20]
I would also include popular bus routes along with light rail stations.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-LUP-20]
As a fellow single-family homeowner, I completely agree. I would have loved to see more missing-middle type homeownership options. Maximum FAR of 4.0+ helps to unlock that potential.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Troy [K-LUP-20]
city should permit much more homes to be built on properties near light rail stops such as this one! retaining the lowest possible density FAR here seems very backward.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Jeffrey [K-LUP-20]
FAR here should be higher since it's close to light rail/high frequency transit		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Jeffrey [K-LUP-20]
FAR here should be higher. it's close to light rail and popular retail spots		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Jeffrey [K-LUP-20]
FAR south of the light rail station should be higher, as it's right next to high frequency transit		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Jeffrey [K-LUP-20]
Seems like the red zone around Broadway could be expanded by a couple blocks, as Broadway and Stockton are served by high frequency transit (51)		<p>Development intensities do not correspond with land use designations in the 2040 General Plan.</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Jeffrey [K-LUP-20]
FAR near MLK could be higher (expand the red/orange zone). there is good transit access and some retail in this area		<p>Development intensities do not correspond with land use designations in the 2040 General Plan.</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Jeffrey [K-LUP-20]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
FAR in this area of south sac should be higher (expand the high FAR area farther out, and increase the max FAR for areas immediately next to stockton). this area is very retail and shopping rich, and is served by high frquency transit (51)		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Jeffrey [K-LUP-20]
Increase FAR along major transit lines to allow the city to get more bang for its buck and create nice walkable areas where people don't need cars.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Jenny [K-LUP-20]
This proposed stop makes no sense as currently zoned. FAR of 2.0 around these stops should be absolute minimum, ideally 4.0. If not changing the zoning, then there should be fewer stops among the 4+ FAR zones to create pockets of economically diverse, high-opportunity clusters where the MOST convenient form of transportation between them is light rail.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Devin Martin [K-LUP-20]
The city should increase the FAR to 4.0 within a 1/2-mile (essentially a 10-15-minute walk) of all transit stations, including our light rail stations! We've made a huge investment into light rail and we should increase ridership by having more people who can access it within a 10-minute walk, and more places for people to go. As Strong Towns says, successful transit requires 2 things: 1. people to use it, and 2. places for people to go.		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-20]
Increase FAR to 4.0 everywhere within 10 minute walk of a transit station.		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Jack Barnes [K-LUP-20]
It would be better if there was a minimum of 2 FAR around 1/2-mile of a transit station and 1 mile for major transit hubs		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Francois Kaepelin [K-LUP-20]
Increase the FAR to 4.0 within a 10 minute walk to ALL transit stations. If Sacramento is serious about reducing VMT and increasing equitable and sustainable housing & transportation for all residents, we need to build a lot more housing near ALL transit stations. This is only fair and will create easier access to high opportunity areas for all Sacramento residents.		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Luis Romo [K-LUP-20]
Increase the FAR to at least 2.0. In Program H12 from the City's adopted Housing Element, the City committed itself to re-designating and rezoning sites in high resource areas to create more opportunities for affordable housing in areas that offer low-income children and adults the best chance at economic advancement, high educational attainment, and good physical and mental health.		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Jack Barnes [K-LUP-20]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Explore higher FARs within a half-mile of all high frequency transit areas. We recommend expanding this area to half-mile to be consistent with statutory definitions (SB 375 and SB 743) as well as with the city's own TOD Ordinance.		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and; commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	SACOG [2]
Explore applying increased FARs around high frequency transit areas uniformly to all station areas in Map LUP-6. Recommend that transit-rich and high opportunity neighborhoods have an FAR of at least 2.0, consistent with other transit-rich neighborhoods.		<p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	SACOG [2]
We recommend the city explore more explicit language in Policy LUP-4.1 that defines or references a specific definition of existing and planned high frequency transit and then commits to a minimum allowed FAR higher than 1.0 within a ½ mile buffer of these transit stations and corridors.		<p>The General Plan glossary defines "High-Frequency Transit Service" as "Transit service that arrives at regular and frequent intervals – typically every fifteen minutes or less."</p> <p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and; commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	SACOG [2]
<p>Within a ¼ mile radius surrounding all transit stations, "Neighborhood" land uses should be changed to "Residential Mixed-Use" or higher development intensity. Conflicts with LUP-2.4 (Development Intensity Linked to Transit); LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development); LUP-4.4 (Public Uses and Services); LUP-4.5 (Efficient Parcel Utilization); LUP-5.3 (Mixed-Use Neighborhood Centers).</p> <p>Stations referenced: Alkali Flat, 23rd St, Globe Ave, Arden/Del Paso, Royal Oaks, 4th Ave/Wayne Hultgren, 39th St, 48th St, Center Parkway. Future stations referenced: Natomas High School, South Natomas Community Park, W El Camino Ave.</p>		<p>Development intensities do not correspond with land use designations in the 2040 General Plan.</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Alyssa and Troy [3]
Implement a minimum FAR of 2.0 within high opportunity areas to allow more housing in high opportunity areas and near transit to encourage people to get around without using a car. High opportunity areas are the best places to live. A greater array of housing types in high opportunity areas will enable more people to live in healthy places.		<p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	House Sacramento [5] [21]
Increase maximum FAR for all areas zoned "neighborhood" to 2.0 (GP Map LUP-6)		<p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Matt Anderson [6]
Support Development Near High Frequency Transit. A mid-rise building should be allowed near any transit stop. Map LUP-6: Implement a minimum FAR of 4.0 within a 10-minute walk/ ½ mile of high quality transit. Map LUP-3: Expand Opportunity Areas to include a ½ mile radius around light rail stations. Revise LUP-4.1 to expand transit supportive development from ¼ mile to ½ mile.		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and; commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	House Sacramento [5] [21]; Matt Anderson [6]
Building density. Increase the FAR across Sacramento to 2.0, encouraging communities to build up over time rather than precipitate the rapid growth that causes displacement.		<p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Update the following diagrams to reflect the FAR stated in the GP: (1) Land Use, (2) maximum FAR, and (3) minimum density.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Upzone the neighborhood, not just the strip malls. Cramming population along the most polluted streets in the city is inequitable and a crime against environmental justice. The benefits accrue to the homeowners behind the corridor, who see unsightly strip malls get replaced. The costs of poor health and shorter lifespans are imposed on the people who have to settle for living in the deadliest parts of our city. In addition to the traffic deaths that await them right outside their front doors and the air pollution that will be worse from EVs' worse tire and brake particulate pollution, noise pollution (from tires on pavement and car audio systems) literally kills.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Steve Rosen [4]
Various land use maps (Land use diagram, maximum FAR diagram, and minimum density diagram) need to reflect the language set out by the GP to increase transit-oriented development and density near light rail stations in LUP-2.4, LUP-4.1, LUP-4.4, LUP-4.5, and LUP-5.3		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
To meet its housing needs and reduce overall reliance on cars (which allows the city to meet its VMT goals), the City must increase the FAR across the city to at least 2.0. Please ensure that the maps also reflect this information, as many don't even reflect the updates between the 2035 and 2040 GPs.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Kay Crumb [40]
Within a half-mile of light rail stations and major bus corridors, we recommend a minimum FAR of 6.0 and a maximum FAR of 10.0. This maximum can create some consistency of urban density in the numbers of people living in an area, and in the building form -- especially the height to define a street wall and to create tree-lined promenades and plazas.		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	ECOS [42]
Sac Metro Air District recommends raising maximum FAR as necessary to demonstrate consistency with its mode share indicators. An example of maximum FAR to demonstrate consistency with these indicators may generally be at least a 4.0 FAR maximum for parcels within a half mile of transit and 2.0 FAR for other areas. A final plan should incorporate research-based analysis to demonstrate its FAR and density stipulations' potential to achieve its mode share indicators, in appendices as necessary.		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	SMAQMD [58]
Sac Metro Air District recommends that any final plan incorporate CAAP Policy E-5 and include an analysis – in appendices as necessary – of how its current FAR standards support Policy E-5 growth stipulations. We recommend raising maximum FAR standards and reducing minimum FAR standards as necessary to accommodate these growth stipulations.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	SMAQMD [58]
<p>Establish a maximum FAR of no less than 5 within ½ mile of light rail stations. Maximizing the building density allows for greater quantity and variety of uses which not only will support all day demand for light rail services but will increase overall demand as well. Map LUP-6</p> <p>Max FAR around South Sacramento LR stations should be increased both in FAR as well as area. Map will be used to fulfill policy LUP-3.1. Increase FAR to no less than 5 within .5 square miles of all light rail stations.</p>		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Civic Thread [91]
<p>Increase minimum FAR within ½ mile radius of LR stations to 1 which would facilitate greater use of land for commercial or mixed-use services rather than vehicular parking which when placed immediately adjacent to light rail, inhibits usable, activity generating space. Map LUP- 7</p> <p>Minimum building intensity around LR stations is too low to support full potential of system and potential for increased rideshare capture. Map will be used to fulfill policy LUP-3.3. Increase Minimum FAR to 1 within .5 square miles of all light rail stations.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Save Sacramento's historic neighborhoods and single family zoning. Undermining single family zoning is an attack on families at its heart, and it is the family and families that are the foundation of any neighborhood worth living in.		Thank you for your comment.	Kevin and Anne Higgins [54]
<p>Maximum 15 FAR</p> <p>As currently drafted, the 2040 general plan establishes a maximum FAR of 15 on residential buildings within the central business district as shown in map LUP 6. Such a policy stands starkly opposite of the existing policy which has no height restrictions and promotes new construction in an area with minimal lots available. Some builders may have purchased sites in this area with the intention of one day exceeding a 15 FAR. This approach is feasible in areas where there are lots of adequate size. In Sacramento, most of the lots are small, so this approach would be likely infeasible, and a FAR cap would call into question the feasibility of many projects. The city's proposal that a 15 FAR can be exceeded using density bonus statute amounts to a backdoor mandate on inclusionary zoning at a time when many projects are already infeasible. It is our view that the General Plan is not the appropriate place for such a measure.</p> <p>Imposing this maximum FAR of 15 will trigger additional affordable housing and related requirements consequently making a project infeasible because of the significant increase in costs. I request City staff either propose a higher FAR or simply keep the existing FAR requirements of providing community benefits.</p> <p>City of Sacramento should provide as much flexibility and incentive for density bonuses to encourage development to build dense, urban buildings. Request City Staff to propose a higher FAR or keep the FAR requirements as they exist today. Staff has proven its ability to effectively regulate development projects utilizing the significant community benefits clause (LU 1.1.10 of 2035 GP).</p>		Thank you for your comment.	BIA [7]; John Hodgeson [10]; Deana Ellis [19]; Development Representatives [20]; Mohanna Development [22]
<p>Sutter's Landing Park - Various Properties</p> <p>Various properties in this area next to or now part of Sutter's Landing Park are not appropriate for RMU designation as development is restricted on these properties due to their former industrial or land fill uses. In addition to that, it would be housing built on or next to Bell Marine Industrial Aggregate and Concrete Recycling which is a huge health concern. They are huge noise and air polluters in the city of Sacramento.</p> <p>In the case of the SMUD property that will be conveyed to the City as an additional to Sutter's Landing Park, this property has electrical power lines running through it located on a utility easement that SMUD will retain making this property ineligible for residential development. UNLESS we choose to rezone and redevelop this whole area so that we can build more housing in the future, these properties, as indicated in a previous comment, should be designated as OS or PR in the time being.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Luis Romo, Corey Brown [K-LUP-20]
<p>Map LUP-7: Minimum FAR</p> <p>Why is the minimum FAR here lower than other adjacent Office Mixed Use areas? Consider matching to higher minimum FAR of surrounding parcels.</p>		Thank you for your comment. The minimum FAR for this area has been carried over from the 2035 General Plan.	Anonymous [K-LUP-21]
This map has a minimum floor area ratio in the Campus Commons special area. That is not to be less than one. To re-develop all of these with one will change the dominant features of the Campus Commons planned area. Campus Commons is a specially used permit approved area that has a specific Design concepts, contrary to a general plan.		Per the 2040 General Plan, the Neighborhood-designated areas of Campus Commons does not have a minimum FAR. Per the 2040 General Plan, the Office Mixed-Use-designated areas of Campus Commons has a minimum FAR of 0.25, which is the same as the minimum FAR in the 2035 General Plan	hOward levine [K-LUP-21]
<p>Map LUP-8: Min Residential Density</p> <p>Moving to a FAR-based system is good. However, the 1.0 maximum is still too small. FAR should be closer to 4.0 within 1/2 mile of transit, not just along certain corridors. It should also be 2.0 elsewhere. Of course, land acquisition cost and other things will limit what is actually built (FAR less than 1.0 will still be common), which just tells me that we can and should be more ambitious with the deregulation to achieve the stated goals.</p>		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Matt Malkin [K-LUP-22]
See other comments related to properties that have been or will be incorporated into Sutter's Landing Park and properties that are former landfill or industrial uses. These properties are not appropriate for residential development and should be designated as OS or PR. Please update this and all other relevant maps.		Maps will be updated to reflect West Sutter's Landing Park.	Corey Brown [K-LUP-22]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Why do the 48th and 59th St stations even exist? I can see the justification of 39th since it has the shuttle bus connecting to the hospital, but 48th and 59th are surrounded by single-family housing and don't connect to any employment or shopping centers. I've never noticed anybody even getting on/off at those stations. (There's probably a few others, but those two stand out as they're relatively near where I live.) Making useless stops just makes light rail a slower, and therefore less convenient and useful, option. Focus light rail stops on where there's going to be frequent use and make it the fastest option to get between mixed-use, high opportunity hubs.		Thank you for your comment.	Devin Martin [K-LUP-22]
This Campus Commons design area is showing a minimum of 18 units per acre in the University Drive area. Currently it is office, professional, with a zoning that is hard to distinguish, and should not, shall not. Heavy zoning, designation, or land-use designation of that great of concentration without specific site studies. Again, it should be designated a specific study area.		Per the 2040 General Plan, the areas with a minimum density of 18 units per acre apply to areas designated as Office Mixed-Use; this minimum did not change from the 2035 General Plan. These areas allowed and continue to allow a mix of uses, including office, retail, and residential uses.	hOward levine [K-LUP-22]
Map LUP-8 Minimum Residential Density: there appears to be gray and black in the central city but only black is defined – looks like the gray needs to be defined.		No minimum density associated with the light gray parcels.	Matthew Gerken [8]
Establish a minimum of 20 dwelling units per acre within a ½ mile of all light rail stations. Map Lup-8		Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
I oppose the densification of Sacramento's existing diverse single family neighborhoods. Densification will lead to reduction of our mature tree canopy. Densification reduces open space available for trees and plants that are critical summer cooling, reducing air pollution and promoting habitat for birds and insects. Densification also creates congestion on narrow streets not designed for high densities. It promotes urban sprawl by reducing and eliminating the option for single family homes inside the city. Densification also does not result in affordable housing.		Thank you for your comment.	Terry O'Brien [27]; Zoe and Read Harrison [29]; Raeanne Sarti [31]; Rev. J. Patrick Kelly [33]; Charles Conner [35]; Ilsa Louise Hess [36]; Suzy Wahlborg [37]; James Falcone [41]; Debra Lebish [45]; Lynn Orion [48]
Figure LUP-4: Visualizing Density			
150+ should be our target for all of midtown and DT		Thank you for your comment.	Michael Nerby [K-LUP-23]
Honestly we should look into building, building bridges that in other countries service as parks floating in-between buildings, and other uses and can be better for transporting between areas without cars.		Thank you for your comment.	Zane Whitcomb [K-LUP-23]
Goal LUP-2 (balanced land uses/connected community)			
<i>Development-Transit Link</i>			
The planned land use map (LUP-5) completely fails to achieve goal LUP-2.1. Far from balancing uses, it requires that a majority of land in the city exclusively be reserved for neighborhood uses. This precludes use of land for most employment, commercial, cultural, and tourism-related uses, and also renders it ill-suited for the residential needs of many of Sacramento's inhabitants, who do not need large residential areas far from their places of employment and recreation, and who do want low-cost, high-density housing. The general plan should change the designation of most or all of the land currently designated as Neighborhood to RMU	LUP 2.1 (Overall Balance of Uses)	Neighborhood designation description lists allowed uses which includes residential development as well as some mixed-use, including neighborhood-serving commercial and employment uses like corner markets, coffee shops, hair salons, shops, gyms, and fitness centers.	Max Cassell [K-LUP-24]
I really appreciate this sentence. Can we make it even stronger by making sure we say that the network should be "throughout the entire city, not just the already invested in areas."	LUP 2.2 (Interconnected City)	Please see policy EJ-5.5 (Investment Prioritization).	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-24]
An interconnected City is vital for addressing our transportation emissions, but LUP-2.2 (Interconnected City) and 2.3 (Diverse Centers and Corridors) do not establish how the City will establish and encourage transit and AT, nor is there a commitment to any steps to creating this vital infrastructure. LUP-2.5 (Design for Connectivity) goes on to discuss the design for connectivity but does not establish what will happen to the current connections and how the City will build them out. The City needs to determine how to improve these connections so that people who do not normally use AT will find them comfortable and convenient to use.	LUP 2.2 (Interconnected City)	Please see goal sections M-1 and M-2 for policies on facilitating a multi-modal transportation system as well as how to reduce the dependency on single-occupant vehicles.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
<i>Increase Intensity Around Transit</i>			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
I really like this goal of having more development intensity linked to transit. However, the actual Land Use diagram still shows many many areas around light rail stations still designated for "Neighborhood" - the lowest intensity land use designation. In order to meet this LUP goal, the City should update ALL land uses within a ¼ mile radius surrounding all transit stations to be change from "Neighborhood" to "Residential Mixed-Use" or even higher development intensity.	LUP 2.4 (Development Intensity Linked to Transit)	Development intensities do not correspond with land use designations in the 2040 General Plan. For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-24]
Agreed. The city should increase the maximum FAR to at least 4.0 within half a mile of all transit corridors. While the city claims that it wants to link development intensification to transit, the current plan fails to do so.	LUP 2.4 (Development Intensity Linked to Transit)	Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods." For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Max Cassell [K-LUP-24]
Healthy Food			
Nice. Please add healthy food sources as a required connection.	LUP 2.5 (Design for Connectivity)	Please see policies M-1.13 (Walkability), M-1.14 (Walking Facilities), M-1.15 (Improve Walking Connectivity), M-1.16 (Barrier Removal), and M-1.17 (Improve Bicycling Connectivity).	Laurie Heller [K-LUP-24]
Goal LUP-3 (flexible development standards)			
Historically, the City has allowed new buildings to significantly exceed building intensity standards on the grounds that such buildings provide a "community benefit", but has not defined the term "community benefit" With regard to residential buildings, I would like to see "community benefit" defined as affordable housing meaning that, if a residential or residential mixed use building exceeds allowed building intensity by some percent (which would need to be defined and shouldn't be too large), the additional square footage would have to be used for affordable housing. With the increase in allowed densities, it is also important to consider how to avoid displacement of existing residents. As an example, the area of the Central City immediately south of the Central Business District (between the CBD and R Street) has a number of apartment buildings that don't have the density that the 2040 plan will allow, but are affordable. Given the affordable housing crisis, it is important that housing like that is not lost and the residents that live there are not displaced.	Goal LUP-3	Goal 5 of the 2021-2029 Housing Element includes a series of policies that aim to protect residents from displacement. Please see the 2021-2029 Housing Element here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Long-Range/Housing-Element/00_Sac-HE_-AdoptionDft_Aug2021.pdf?la=en	Karen Jacques [K-LUP-25]
Language should be added to help developers understand how to proceed if they would like to exceed the Maximum FAR, whether it's through the City's or state's density bonus program. Needs language to define a clear path for people.	LUP 3.1 (Max FAR)	Thank you for your comment.	Anonymous [K-LUP-25]
LUP 3 Glad to see the exemptions to FAR that allows for the adaptive reuse of both non-historic (LUP 3.6) and historic buildings (LUP 3.7) that are converted to housing. This will save both resources and embodied energy and likely lead to housing units that are less costly per square foot than new construction would be.	Goal LUP-3	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [52]
I strongly support this exemption. It allows the City to retain buildings that add to the historic character of the City, retains existing materials and embodied, thereby significantly reducing the carbon footprint of the project and keeping significant amount of material out of the dump.	LUP 3.7 (Exemptions for Historic Structure Conversions)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-LUP-25]
This sentence gives developers, the foundational, right and entitlement to say that any project will further the objectives of the city and the general plan. This puts residence and property owners at a extreme disadvantage. The sentence should be eliminated	LUP-3.8 (Interim Zoning Inconsistency)	Thank you for your comment.	hOward levine [K-LUP-26]
I agree that this sentence should be removed.	LUP-3.8 (Interim Zoning Inconsistency)	Thank you for your comment.	I Rye [K-LUP-26]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Staff initiated revision to this policy for clarity.	LUP-3.8 (Interim Zoning Inconsistency)	Policy LUP-3.8 (Interim Zoning Inconsistency) revised to say: "Interim Zoning Inconsistency. Zoning is consistent with the General Plan if it is compatible with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs specified in the plan. (Cal. Gov't Code, § 65860 (a)(2).) Zoning is compatible with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs specified in the plan if, considering all its aspects, it will further the objectives and policies of the general plan and not obstruct their attainment. (See also Sacramento City Code, § 17.104.100.C, as may be amended.) In areas where zoning has not been brought into consistency with the General Plan, the City shall allow property owners to develop consistent with the existing zoning if only a ministerial/administrative permit is required. For property owners requiring a discretionary permit, the City shall allow property owners to do either of the following: (1) Develop consistent with the existing zoning, provided the City makes a finding that approval of the project would not interfere with the long term development of the area consistent with the General Plan, or (2) Develop under the General Plan designation, in which case the City will facilitate rezoning consistent with the General Plan. If zoning becomes inconsistent with the general plan due to amendment to the general plan and the City receives a development application, the City will proceed in accordance with California Government Code section 65860."	Staff
Goal LUP-4 (walkable, transit oriented centers and corridors)			
<i>Incentivizing Infill</i>			
Rather than "promote infill" the City should disallow sprawl development. Developers operate within allowed parameters. Homeowners modify their properties according to zone and code requirements. Developers and homeowners respond to incentives. Voluntary compliance is preferable, but in the absence of sufficient incentives, the City must mandate climate friendly choices. This is the only reasonable choice in the context of climate crisis. 85% of current regional VMT rates should not be considered acceptable for new development.	Goal LUP-4	Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
ESCA supports the key land use concepts that promote transit-oriented development, infill focused on commercial corridors, and a greater variety of housing types in neighborhoods. We feel that East Sacramento can contribute to housing goals by accommodatHng duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, bungalow courts, senior and student housing in existHng neighborhoods to a greater extent than currently permissible. We also recognize that the increased Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for commercial corridors such as Alhambra Blvd, J Street, and Folsom Blvd, will help meet housing goals and contribute to a vibrant community. We look forward to working with the City as it implements these concepts and the Missing Middle Study to ensure that development standards reflect community character, such as maintaining massing (height and bulk) controls.	Goal LUP-4	Thank you for your comment.	ESCA [39]
Initiate greater costs to developers who choose to construct non-infill development that more closely reflects the "true cost" of brownfield development.		Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
<i>Transit-Supportive</i>			
This is great. We should accommodate higher densities around transit, and not in areas that would further encourage car use. for example, max FAR values should be at least 4 around all major high frequency transit stops (main bus lines and LRT). this is not currently the case, particularly for curtis park and east sac light rail stops. max allowable FAR values off Broadway/stockton can also be increased	LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development)	For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Jeffrey [K-LUP-27]
A quarter mile is only a five-minute walk. There should be transit-supportive development within a half-mile radius, or a 10-minute walk, of transit stations. Change to "within one-half mile of transit."	LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development)	Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."	Teri Duarte [K-LUP-27]
I support this policy but the proposed Maximum FAR map does not currently do this. This policy should set a standardized Max FAR of at least 4.0 for all areas within a half mile of transit. This is critical to accomplishing the goals of the policy as well as for ensuring exclusionary neighborhoods are not exempted. Re-designating and rezoning these sites in these high resource areas (land park & east sac) would create more opportunities for affordable housing in areas that previously didn't offer low-income children and adults the best chance at economic advancement, high educational attainment, and good physical and mental health.	LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development)	Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods." For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Luis Romo [K-LUP-27]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Policy LUP-4.1: SacRT appreciates the policy on Transit-Supportive Development and suggests stronger language be used to effectively describe the City's continued support; replacing "The City shall encourage" with "The City shall emphasize".	LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development)	Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and , commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."	SacRT [74]
<i>Increase FAR/Intensity</i>			
I support this policy but the proposed Maximum FAR map does not currently do this. This policy should set a standardized Max FAR of at least 4.0 for all areas within a one mile of transit. This is critical to accomplishing the goals of the policy as well as for ensuring exclusionary neighborhoods are not exempted.	LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development)	Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and , commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods." For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Jack Barnes [K-LUP-27]
The current land use map (LUP-5) and Maximum FAR map (LUP-6) shows that the city is not actually serious about achieving goal LUP-4.2. Areas near midtown should be ripe for infill, but the current plan has most of East Sacramento, as well as the Land Park, Curtis Park, and Oak Park areas designated as Neighborhood, with maximum FAR of 1.0. Those areas should be redesignated as RMU, and their maximum FAR increased to at least 2.0, in order to allow for infill development.	LUP 4.2 (Incentivizing Infill)	Development intensities do not correspond with land use designations in the 2040 General Plan. For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Max Cassell [K-LUP-27]
I support this policy but the proposed Maximum FAR map does not currently do this. This policy should set a standardized Max FAR of at least 4.0 for all areas within a half mile of transit. This is critical to accomplishing the goals of the policy as well as for ensuring exclusionary neighborhoods are not exempted.	LUP 4.2 (Incentivizing Infill)	Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and , commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods." For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Ansel Lundberg [K-LUP-27]
be aggressive in land use policy, and the private sector will respond in kind to build what is necessary	LUP 4.2 (Incentivizing Infill)	Thank you for your comment.	Michael Nerby [K-LUP-27]
The free market will never fully provide enough housing. Otherwise, the developers and landlords would lose money. Find a way to force housing to be built in surplus.	LUP 4.2 (Incentivizing Infill)	Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-LUP-27]
LUP 4 Glad to see city exploring incentives for affordable infill housing (LUP 4.2). All infill housing, whether affordable or market rate, should be held to strict requirements to preserve existing trees or include space for trees on lots that don't have them. It is critical that healthy existing trees be protected and that canopy goals be met.	Goal LUP-4	Please see goal section ERC-3 for policies that support and expand the tree canopy. Please also see the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan and the forthcoming Urban Forest Plan.	Karen Jacques [52]
<i>Parking</i>			
Removing mandatory parking minimums will bring down building costs as well.	LUP 4.2 (Incentivizing Infill)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces. This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "...Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City mandated parking minimums; ..."	Jenny [K-LUP-27]
<i>Ministerial Approval Process</i>			
Strongly support ministerial approval processes for developments that meet certain affordability metrics	LUP 4.2 (Incentivizing Infill)	Thank you for your comment.	Jeffrey [K-LUP-27]
If ministerial approval is available, the City should ensure that design standards are appropriate for the respective communities. For example, design standards for Midtown and certain Downtown properties should require building designs to reflect the historic look of these neighborhoods and communities. The design standards should meet the "objective" standard requirements in SB 35 and other state laws that advance housing development. Good design standards will not slow the provision of housing, while helping preserve the many reasons why so many Sacramentans love their neighborhoods.	LUP 4.2 (Incentivizing Infill)	Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-LUP-27]
There always needs to be in appeal process.	LUP 4.2 (Incentivizing Infill)	Thank you for your comment.	hOward levine [K-LUP-27]
There should be a mechanism to ensure public comment can be considered.	LUP 4.2 (Incentivizing Infill)	Thank you for your comment.	I Rye [K-LUP-27]
<i>More Mixed Use</i>			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>I love this! As a Sac resident, I have been so disappointed with how far post offices and pharmacies (in particular) are located from me. In other places I've lived in, I've been able to walk to these, which is so important. Please make sure that the Land Use designations actually reflect being able to do this. As many places as possible should be zoned for "Residential Mixed Use" (not "Neighborhood"). I know the "Neighborhood" designation now automatically includes some complementary residential-serving businesses and public uses. This is a great change, and I think we need to be more ambitious than this in order to meet our climate, VMT reduction, and affordability goals.</p> <p>Please also think about we actually incentivize these neighborhood-serving businesses to be built. I know it's very difficult for local pharmacies to compete with CVS, and very difficult for any small local shops to start. If we want to make this happen, they need to have incentives and support.</p>	LUP 4.4 (Public Uses and Services)	Please see policies E-2.1 (Investments for Inclusive, Equitable Growth) and E-2.7 (Small Business/Startup Support).	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-28]
<p>Keep in mind that a collection of smaller parcels owned by different people results in higher property tax revenue and helps keep cities and towns more resilient to economic disruptions as opposed to consolidating small parcels into larger parcels owned by fewer individuals. That will result in less property tax revenue and help create a less resilient city when economic downturns happen. Maybe be more explicit that GP only supports parcel consolidation when the project helps to achieve TOD goals and not offer same supportive stance for large strip malls or low-intensity uses. These projects could still be approved, just not explicitly supported by GP.</p>	LUP-4.5 (Efficient Parcel Utilization)	Thank you for your comment.	Anonymous [K-LUP-28]
<i>Promoting Walkability</i>			
<p>Agree that these transitions are very important</p>	LUP-4.6 (Compatibility with Adjoining Uses)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-LUP-28]
<p>LUP-4.6 Compatibility with Adjoining Uses (p. 3-28): It's not clear how this policy promotes walkability. This policy has the potential to significantly decrease the viability of mixed-use development along corridors which would decrease walkability. We request removing this policy altogether and cover some of these topics (such as parking landscaping) in other policy areas.</p>	LUP-4.6 (Compatibility with Adjoining Uses)	Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
<p>I definitely encourage the City to reduce setback limits. Smaller setbacks help create a much more engaging street and allow for larger houses on a given lot size.</p>	LUP-4.8 (Buildings That Engage the Street)	Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-29]
<p>LUP-4.8 Buildings that Engage the Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Setback lines discourage pedestrian activity by moving them further from the street. We recommend striking this selection. o Facade articulation has nothing to do with walkability and is often an onerous and capricious requirement for architects. We recommend striking this section. o Ground floor transparency is desirable for retail businesses and restaurants, but can be disruptive to other uses including medical care, residential buildings, and office buildings. We recommend leaving this to the discretion of the developer and architect to choose the appropriate amount of ground-floor transparency. o The proposed policy statement should read: "The City shall require that building be oriented to actively engage and enhance the public realm through techniques such as building orientation, build-to lines, ground-floor transparency for retail buildings, and location of parking" 	LUP-4.8 (Buildings That Engage the Street)	Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
<i>Increased Intensity and Wide Sidewalks (with trees!)</i>			
<p>I love this and I think a way the General Plan can go even further to ensure this happens is to be far more ambitious with Roadway Reallocations. So many streets can't have wide sidewalks because most of the street is allocated to multiple vehicle travel lanes. Otherwise, the only choice is to take away space for verges where we have trees, which are critical. If we want to widen sidewalks, we should reduce vehicle travel lanes as many places as possible.</p>	LUP-4.9 (Enhanced Pedestrian Environment)	Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-29]
<p>I agree with this goal and it should be made much stronger. We can set ourselves up to succeed in achieving this goal by 1) increasing the FAR so that more people for a given residential parcel can access a development to begin with, 2) increase the land use density so that more services and activities can be achieved in walking distance, and 3) have way more roadway reallocations, and reduce vehicle travel lanes so that there is room for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, without taking away space from trees!</p>	LUP 4.10 (Multi-Modal Access)	For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-29]
<p>Policies LUP-4.10, and LUP-4.11: SacRT supports the language in both policies, particularly about reducing the need for onsite parking, and to encourage shared parking areas. Additionally, the mention to minimize the number of driveways and curb cuts is beneficial to transit operations, since they can sometimes become obstacles with respect to bus-pedestrian conflicts, and bus-automobile conflicts.</p>	LUP 4.10 (Multi-Modal Access)/ LUP-4.11 (Shared Parking, Driveways, and Alley Access)	Thank you for your comment.	SacRT [74]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Committer/Organization
<p>City should invest in opportunities to enhance and utilize alley space within the central city as usable public space and freight and utility operations. LUP-4.11</p> <p>City should make more concerted effort to utilize and prioritize alley space which is currently underutilized in the central city. For example text from Seattle's General Plan: "Maintain, preserve, and enhance the City's alleys as a valuable network for public spaces and access, loading and unloading for freight, and utility operations."</p> <p><i>Drive-Throughs</i></p>	LUP-4.11 (Shared Parking, Driveways, and Alley Access)	Please see the Central City Specific Plan for additional policies on the development of a cohesive alley system and activation of the public alley network.	Civic Thread [91]
I support prohibiting ALL new drive-through restaurants in the city. We should not be allowing new developments that are car-centric when we have VMT reduction goals.	LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants)	Policy LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit new drive-through restaurants within ½ ¼-mile walking distance of from the center of an existing or proposed light rail station platform existing and proposed light rail stations and high-frequency transit stops."	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-29]
prohibit motor vehicle drive-through, bikes and other active transportation might be feasible and compatible with transit.	LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants)	Policy LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit new drive-through restaurants within ½ ¼-mile walking distance of from the center of an existing or proposed light rail station platform existing and proposed light rail stations and high-frequency transit stops."	Dale Steele [K-LUP-29]
How about no more in general anywhere	LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants)	Policy LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit new drive-through restaurants within ½ ¼-mile walking distance of from the center of an existing or proposed light rail station platform existing and proposed light rail stations and high-frequency transit stops."	Austin Wilmoth [K-LUP-29]
Not a bad idea. At the very least, once a drive thru line extends beyond the restaurant's property, it should be illegal to wait in a drive through line on public roads.	LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants)	Policy LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit new drive-through restaurants within ½ ¼-mile walking distance of from the center of an existing or proposed light rail station platform existing and proposed light rail stations and high-frequency transit stops."	Devin Martin [K-LUP-29]
Agreed, drive ins are a congestion, pollution and global warming issue. Walk up is better.	LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants)	Policy LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit new drive-through restaurants within ½ ¼-mile walking distance of from the center of an existing or proposed light rail station platform existing and proposed light rail stations and high-frequency transit stops."	Jenny [K-LUP-29]
Transit-supportive development should surround transit stations for a half-mile distance on foot. A quarter mile is only a five-minute walk. Many people will walk 10 minutes to a transit stations. Change this metric to "within a 1/2 mile walking distance."	LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants)	Policy LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit new drive-through restaurants within ½ ¼-mile walking distance of from the center of an existing or proposed light rail station platform existing and proposed light rail stations and high-frequency transit stops."	Teri Duarte [K-LUP-29]
At the very least, this criteria should be updated to 1/2-mile.	LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants)	Policy LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit new drive-through restaurants within ½ ¼-mile walking distance of from the center of an existing or proposed light rail station platform existing and proposed light rail stations and high-frequency transit stops."	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-29]
LUP-4.12 Drive-Through Restaurants: This measure should be expanded to include all automobile-oriented uses within ½ mile of stations. (gas stations, car washes, etc).	LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants)	Policy LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit new drive-through restaurants within ½ ¼-mile walking distance of from the center of an existing or proposed light rail station platform existing and proposed light rail stations and high-frequency transit stops."	House Sacramento [21]
The ATC Recommends the following: Amend the policy LUP-4.12 "Drive-Through Restaurants" to say, "the City shall prohibit new drive-through restaurants," striking the distance requirement.	LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants)	Policy LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit new drive-through restaurants within ½ ¼-mile walking distance of from the center of an existing or proposed light rail station platform existing and proposed light rail stations and high-frequency transit stops."	ATC [26]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
LUP 4.12 calls for prohibition of new drive throughs within a quarter of a mile of light rail. Would like to see new drive throughs prohibited throughout the city.	LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants)	Policy LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit new drive-through restaurants within $\frac{1}{4}$ -mile walking distance of from the center of an existing or proposed light rail station platform existing and proposed light rail stations and high-frequency transit stops."	Karen Jacques [52]
To meet its housing needs and reduce overall reliance on cars (which allows the city to meet its VMT goals), the City must prohibit new drive-throughs and gas stations. Please ensure that the maps also reflect this information, as many don't even reflect the updates between the 2035 and 2040 GPs.	LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants)	Policy LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit new drive-through restaurants within $\frac{1}{4}$ -mile walking distance of from the center of an existing or proposed light rail station platform existing and proposed light rail stations and high-frequency transit stops." Policy LUP-4.13 (Future-Ready Gas Stations) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit the establishment of new gas stations or the expansion of new fossil fuel infrastructure at existing gas stations unless the project proponent provides 50kW or greater Direct Current Fast Charger (DCFC) high-speed electric vehicle charging stations on site at a ratio of at least 1 new charging station per 13 new gas fuel nozzle pumps."	Kay Crumb [40]
<i>Future-Ready Gas Stations</i>			
Would like to see a one charging station per one pump ratio.	LUP-4.13 (Future-Ready Gas Stations)	Policy LUP-4.13 (Future-Ready Gas Stations) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit the establishment of new gas stations or the expansion of new fossil fuel infrastructure at existing gas stations unless the project proponent provides 50kW or greater Direct Current Fast Charger (DCFC) high-speed electric vehicle charging stations on site at a ratio of at least 1 new charging station per 13 new gas fuel nozzle pumps."	Karen Jacques [K-LUP-29]
I definitely support this goal of prohibiting new gas stations in the city.	LUP-4.13 (Future-Ready Gas Stations)	Policy LUP-4.13 (Future-Ready Gas Stations) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit the establishment of new gas stations or the expansion of new fossil fuel infrastructure at existing gas stations unless the project proponent provides 50kW or greater Direct Current Fast Charger (DCFC) high-speed electric vehicle charging stations on site at a ratio of at least 1 new charging station per 13 new gas fuel nozzle pumps."	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-29]
prohibit motor vehicle drive-through, bikes and other active transportation might be feasible and compatible with transit.	LUP-4.13 (Future-Ready Gas Stations)	Policy LUP-4.13 (Future-Ready Gas Stations) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit the establishment of new gas stations or the expansion of new fossil fuel infrastructure at existing gas stations unless the project proponent provides 50kW or greater Direct Current Fast Charger (DCFC) high-speed electric vehicle charging stations on site at a ratio of at least 1 new charging station per 13 new gas fuel nozzle pumps."	Dale Steele [K-LUP-29]
LUP 4.13 deals with gas stations. Need policy that will bring existing gas stations to a 1 to 1 ratio of gas pumps and EV chargers. Also need policy that significantly limits or bans construction of any new gas stations and requires that, if a new gas station is constructed, it has at least as many (or more) EV chargers than gas pumps.	LUP-4.13 (Future-Ready Gas Stations)	Policy LUP-4.13 (Future-Ready Gas Stations) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit the establishment of new gas stations or the expansion of new fossil fuel infrastructure at existing gas stations unless the project proponent provides 50kW or greater Direct Current Fast Charger (DCFC) high-speed electric vehicle charging stations on site at a ratio of at least 1 new charging station per 13 new gas fuel nozzle pumps."	Karen Jacques [52]
How about eliminating parking minimums entirely for "neighborhood" businesses? For businesses whose business can reasonably rely on nearby patrons (small cafes, pubs, corner stores, hair/nail salons, etc), why force unneeded parking to be built? Would it be possible to create a zoning in which businesses operating there would be required to only market in ways that can be targeted to a very limited geographic area (e.g. door hangers, mailers, etc)?	LUP-4.13 (Future-Ready Gas Stations)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "...Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City mandated parking minimums; ..."	Devin Martin [K-LUP-29]
Agreed. Parking minimums can be very restrictive to small business developers.	LUP-4.13 (Future-Ready Gas Stations)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "...Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City mandated parking minimums; ..."	Jenny [K-LUP-29]
I agree! I would actually like to see this General Plan eliminate all parking minimums, period.	LUP-4.13 (Future-Ready Gas Stations)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "...Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City mandated parking minimums; ..."	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-29]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Committer/Organization
Staff initiated development of new policy for encouraging the activation/development of vacant lots.		New policy added after new policy Elimination of Parking Minimums: " Vacant Property. The City shall develop regulations, mechanisms, programs, or incentives to facilitate the development or temporary active use of vacant buildings and property. "	Staff
Thriving Commercial Mixed-Use Centers			
I really appreciate seeing this term here in the plan. The most important way to achieve "pedestrian-scaled architecture" is to reduce sprawl and transform arterial corridors to have fewer vehicle travel lanes. When people have to travel by car, everything needs to be bigger so that it can be seen at high speeds from inside a vehicle.		Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-30]
I agree, pedestrian-scaled centers cannot thrive if they're over-served by auto infrastructure. Parking and car traffic capacity should be explicitly limited to discourage driving to these places.		Thank you for your comment.	Troy [K-LUP-30]
This is very important to me. Being able to walk and bike to mixed-use centers is why I can afford to live in Midtown - because I don't need to own a car. If the City wants to achieve this goal (aka, walk the talk), we need to update the land use designations across the city and make them more intensified across the city, especially in high opportunity areas and areas surrounding public transit.		Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-30]
Goal LUP-5 (commercial centers)			
LUP 5 Redevelopment of shopping malls/shopping centers that include housing should be strongly incentivized. They provide a wonderful opportunity for revitalization. Such redevelopment should include green space and a significant number of trees. Landscape design should also include as much permeable (vs impermeable) surface as possible to reduce runoff and flooding.	Goal LUP-5	Please see LUP-5.4 (Neighborhood Shopping Center Revitalization).	Karen Jacques [52]
Clarify Redevelopment of Parking Spaces			
I recommend changing "the redevelopment of surface parking, drive aisles, and shared parking facilities, ..." with "the replacement of surface parking, drive aisles, and shared parking facilities, ...". The reason for this is that the original language is ambiguous about what "redevelopment" means, and it can be interpreted to mean that surface parking, drive aisles, and shared parking facilities should be refurbished, rather than replaced with housing and/or employment and/or pedestrian uses.	LUP-5.1 (Evolving Regional Commercial Centers)	Policy LUP-5.1 (Evolving Regional Commercial Centers) has been revised to say: "The City shall facilitate the redevelopment replacement of surface parking, drive aisles, and shared parking facilities and existing buildings with alternate land uses to accomplish this. "	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-31]
Suggested edits to LUP-5.1 (Evolving Regional Commercial Centers) [...] The City shall facilitate the redevelopment replacement of surface parking, drive aisles, and shared parking facilities and with alternate land uses to accomplish this. The city shall also facilitate the refurbishment of existing buildings to accomplish this.	LUP-5.1 (Evolving Regional Commercial Centers)	Policy LUP-5.1 (Evolving Regional Commercial Centers) has been revised to say: "The City shall facilitate the redevelopment replacement of surface parking, drive aisles, and shared parking facilities and existing buildings to further this policy. "	Alyssa and Troy [3]
The original language is ambiguous about what "redevelopment" means, and can be interpreted to mean that surface parking, drive aisles, and shared parking facilities should be refurbished, rather than replaced with housing and/or employment uses.			
Increase FAR			
This is a great goal. The Land Use Diagram map does not match the goal here. FAR should be increased in many many more neighborhoods that have the opportunity to become successful mixed-use neighborhood centers. And the land use designations should be updated in many areas to be higher intensity so that we can achieve these mixture of uses.	LUP-5.3 (Mixed-Use Neighborhood Centers)	For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-31]
Reduce Car-centricity			
I really appreciate this being written. I'm fully in support of this vision in the General Plan. However, the goals are weak in this area. There should be stronger language in the goals to talk about car dependence and car centricity. It would be good to see goals in both the LUP element and the Mobility element around slowing streets or making more filtered permeability in streets.	LUP-5.3 (Mixed-Use Neighborhood Centers)	In an effort to minimize duplicate policies, these policies have been placed in the Mobility Element.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-31]
Agreed, if we only focus on pedestrian treatments and amenities to encourage walking, we lose sight of the massive amounts of car infrastructure that induces driving trips and we can lose sight of all the sprawl and noise pollution it causes, detracting from the attractiveness of these centers.	LUP-5.3 (Mixed-Use Neighborhood Centers)	In an effort to minimize duplicate policies, these policies have been placed in the Mobility Element.	Troy [K-LUP-31]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
LUP-5.5 Neighborhood Commerce (3-31): This should be expanded to include the key characteristics that make “main streets” possible from a “streets” point of view. Namely, slowing down cars and increasing the ability to safely walk along and across the street. Also could be expanded to include investing in trees and outdoor dining and streetscape elements (benches, lighting, etc)	LUP-5.5 (Neighborhood Commerce)	Please see policies LUP-8.9 (People-Friendly Design), LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces), LUP-8.14 (Streetscape Beautification), M-1.1 (Street Classification System), M-3.2 (Street Design), M-3.6 (Outdoor Dining Program), and M-4.1 (Application of Safety).	House Sacramento [21]
Complete and Inclusive Neighborhoods			
This all sounds wonderful, but how does the city plan to protect its existing tree canopy, let alone grow it? Bear in mind that only 10% of our Urban Forest is comprised of trees maintained and owned by the city. 10% is owned by other government entities (federal, state, county) and a full 80% of our existing tree canopy is on private property, much of it in residential back and front yards. When we start building "missing middle" housing in R-1 zones, are the trees going to come down to make way for buildings? Once a "right" is created by zoning and ministerial approvals, how will the city control canopy on private land? Will objective zoning standards be created? We need standards that will protect our tree canopy and require green space for trees and other types of plantings (not lawn!), so that rainwater can soak into the ground for trees and and to replenish our aquifer. Hardscape creates storm runoff. Zoning standards will be key, as well as adhering to them. I do not see this happening, even currently. In my neighborhood, large structures are being built and there is very little green space left on a lot. Another issue is clustering of projects, as they are approved separately. If developments are allowed to "cluster" with little space left for trees on several discreet but adjacent projects, will the city have zoning standards that will limit clustering, which will lead to urban heat islands in existing neighborhoods?		Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on preserving and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets.	Francesca Reitano [K-LUP-32]
Pick two: housing, trees, or cars.		Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on preserving and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets.	Troy [K-LUP-32]
Not just to achieve socioeconomic and racial segregation, but also to serve automakers who were seeing vehicle sales slump in the early part of the 1920s. The success of automobiles required cities to be rebuilt in a way that inconvenienced anybody who was not in a car, which is what US cities ultimately did at enormous costs to public safety and public budgets.		Thank you for your comment.	Devin Martin [K-LUP-32]
Goal LUP-6 (complete neighborhoods)			
<i>Housing</i>			
LUP-6.2 Range of Residential Development Intensities (3-32): The word “community” is not defined in this context. We recommend replacing “the community” with “all neighborhoods” so the policy reads “The City shall allow for a range of residential development intensities throughout all neighborhoods to cultivate a mix of housing types at varying sales price points and rental rates, provide options for residents of all income levels, and protect existing residents from displacement”	LUP-6.2 (Range of Residential Development Intensities)	Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
Support a greater array of housing types in existing single family neighborhoods and transit supportive growth along key commercial corridors.		Thank you for your comment.	SACOG [2]
I feel that we need more easily accessible subsidized housing and more shelters, Rapid Rehousing Projects, and Transitional Housing options for those in between to help get more individuals off the streets	LUP-6.3 (Variety of Housing Types)	Goal 7 of the 2021-2029 Housing Element includes a series of policies that aim to address the housing needs of people experiencing homelessness. Please see the 2021-2029 Housing Element here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Long-Range/Housing-Element/00_Sac-HE_-AdoptionDft_Aug2021.pdf?la=en	AMANDA OSTERHOUT [K-LUP-32]
single room occupancy, we need a wider variety of housing types to support all levels of income	LUP-6.3 (Variety of Housing Types)	Please see policies LUP-6.2 (Range of Residential Development Intensities) and LUP-6.3 (Variety of Housing Types), which, in combination with a shift to FAR-based development intensity maximum, effectively open up single-family neighborhoods to a greater array of housing types.	Michael Nerby [K-LUP-32]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>LUP-6.3 Variety of Housing Types (3-32)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We recommend adding the word “all” to encompass “all communities”. - This policy is required based on existing demographics and household incomes, not necessarily future growth. - The policy should be expanded to include SROs, historically one of the most affordable housing options - The proposed policy should read: The City shall promote the development of a greater variety of housing types and sizes in all existing and new growth communities to meet the housing needs of all residents, including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ---Single-unit homes on small lots, ... ---Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units 	LUP-6.3 (Variety of Housing Types)	<p>Policy LUP-6.3 (Variety of Housing Types) revised to say: "The City shall promote the development of a greater variety of housing types and sizes in all existing and new growth communities..."</p> <p>Per Housing Element Program H15, the City is in the process of updating the Zoning Code to allow SROs (i.e., residential hotels) by right in commercial and multi-unit dwelling zones.</p>	House Sacramento [21]
Staff initiated revision to add "neighborhood-scale multi-unit dwellings" for clarity.	LUP-6.3 (Variety of Housing Types)	<p>Policy LUP-6.3 (Variety of Housing Types) revised to say: "The City shall promote the development of a greater variety of housing types and sizes in all existing and new growth communities to meet the needs of future demographics and changing household sizes, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single-unit homes on small lots, • Accessory dwelling units, • Tiny homes, • Alley-facing units, • Townhomes, • Lofts, • Live-work spaces, • Duplexes, • Triplexes, • Fourplexes, • Cottage/Bungalow courts, • Neighborhood-scale multi-unit dwellings, and • Senior and student housing. 	Staff
I also support policies that will create actual solutions for the unhoused. I'm currently embarrassed with our city. It feels as though the unhoused has more rights than taxpayers and local businesses. The current situation is unsafe, not healthy and is not sustainable. Do we want to be like San Francisco, Seattle and Portland whose cities are dying due to tolerance of homeless and crime, human faeces and unsafe interactions.		Thank you for your comment.	Angie Smith [34]
the sacramento city general plan should include a plan and provisions for housing the homeless as much as for housing any other sacramento citizen.		Thank you for your comment.	Muriel Strand [55]
We support policies that will actually create more affordable housing, especially for lower income households, not false claims that affordable housing will result from more Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) or densification of existing single family neighborhoods. One meaningful action the city can take is to prohibit non-owner occupied housing, including ADUs, from being used as short-term rentals, which are defacto hotel rooms and reduce our housing stock.		Thank you for your comment.	Zoe and Read Harrison [30]; Rev. J. Patrick Kelly [33]; Angie Smith [34]; Charles Conner [35]; Ilsa Louise Hess [36]; James Falcone [41]
I agree with high housing density minimums, but an important focus must be reducing construction costs. For very small projects and infill developments that are at the property owner and not commercial real estate scale, we need to have construction labor costs decrease substantially before most property owners are able to afford 61 units/acre projects on the backs of their property or other “stitch” housing locations. This may involve advocacy for state policy or regulatory changes to reduce construction labor costs or overall construction costs. The City may need to advocate to relax prevailing wage triggers at least until the affordable housing crisis has subsided.		Thank you for your comment.	Matthew Gerken [8]
<p>City staff MUST incorporate language prioritizing the preservation of historically marginalized populations within displacement protections. Goal LUP-2, LUP-6.2</p> <p>No direct mention of supporting, prioritizing, or protecting marginalized communities in planned centers, neighborhoods, etc. As example- in Seattle's General Plan, the similar goal is supported by 4 policies that directly address "marginalized communities" or "inequities". Recommend including direct language that protects vulnerable populations susceptible to displacement and harms derived from growth/economic development.</p>		<p>Please see policies EJ-4.4 (Capacity Building), EJ-4.5 (Increasing Participation of Underserved Communities), EJ-4.6 (Community Oversight), EJ-4.7 (Sustained Engagement), EJ-4.8 (Community Ownership and Accountability), and EJ-5.5 (Investment Prioritization).</p> <p>Pplease also see Goal 5 of the 2021-2029 Housing Element, which includes a series of policies that aim to protect residents from displacement. Please see the 2021-2029 Housing Element here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Long-Range/Housing-Element/00_Sac-HE_-AdoptionDft_Aug2021.pdf?la=en</p>	Civic Thread [91]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Neighborhood Form			
The word consider here is not a word that protects and recognizes the neighborhood. The action is benign and without consequences. It is recommended that the word be changed from considers to embraces or required to fit in.	LUP-6.4 (Neighborhood Form)	Thank you for your comment.	hOward levine [K-LUP-33]
LUP 6 this section 'complete neighborhoods' should be strengthened by making front yard set backs (LUP 6.4) mandatory rather than just encouraged.	LUP-6.4 (Neighborhood Form)	Development standards, including front yard setbacks, are included in the Planning and Development Code.	Karen Jacques [52]
Transitions between higher density mixed use areas and neighborhoods (LUP 6.5) should also be mandatory.	LUP-6.5 (Established Neighborhoods)	Please see policy LUP-8.11 (Neighborhood and Transitions). Additionally, transitions between different zones are included in the Planning and Development Code.	Karen Jacques [52]
Urban Forest/Tree Canopy/Green Space			
I do not see how the city can retain the "lush urban forest" in established neighborhoods by upzoning all R-1 parcels for higher density (duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes) "by right" without objective design and zoning standards that would prohibit canopy loss. As 80% of the city's tree canopy is on private property, much of it front and back yards in residential areas, LUP-6.5 sounds like a hollow promise. A tree and a building cannot occupy the same space.	LUP-6.5 (Established Neighborhoods)	Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on preserving and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets.	Francesca Reitano [K-LUP-33]
LUP-6.5 Established Neighborhoods: It is virtually impossible for the city to retain the "lush urban forest" in established neighborhoods by up-zoning all R-1 parcels for higher density. "by right" without objective design and zoning standards that would prohibit canopy loss. As 80% of the city's tree canopy is on private property, much of it front and back yards in residential areas, LUP-6.5 sounds like a hollow promise. A tree and a building cannot occupy the same space.	LUP-6.5 (Established Neighborhoods)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Trees for Sacramento [51]
LUP 6.6: parkway strips in new neighborhoods should be mandatory. The lack of parkway strips in many Sacramento neighborhoods, including its poorest neighborhoods, is what has deprived these neighborhoods of street trees.	LUP-6.6 (New Growth Neighborhoods)	Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on preserving and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	Karen Jacques [52]
LUP-6.7 Architectural Variations (3-33): Its not clear if these requested variations apply at the building level or the community level. While we support a community that is visually interesting, overly-onerous demands can render projects infeasible. Some of our most beautiful buildings, especially historic buildings, lack these elements. Its also not clear what "building placement variations" are and how those connect to (or contradict) setback and build-to lines. We recommend revising the policy to the following: "The City should encourage a varied built-environment with a variety of rooflines, projections, and embellishments at the neighborhood level."	LUP-6.7 (Architectural Variations)	Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
Encourage? No, REQUIRE. 'Encourage' builders creativity by requiring a % of green space in multi-family projects (in proportion to the population being served.)	LUP 6.9 (Design Around Open and Green Space)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Laurie Heller [K-LUP-33]
Encouraging is woefully inadequate. Even when the city has objective design standards, developers ask for, and often get variance. Without trees and greenery this city will become unlivable as the climate warms.	LUP 6.9 (Design Around Open and Green Space)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Francesca Reitano [K-LUP-33]
It is very important for green space to include room for canopy trees. If there are existing trees on the property, particularly large trees that take years to grow, every effort should be made to preserve and design around them (it is currently far too easy for developers to get permission to remove existing trees including in situation where it would have been possible to design around them. Where possible, including a community garden where residents can plant vegetables or flowers should be considered. Growing vegetables also contributes to community resiliency.	LUP 6.9 (Design Around Open and Green Space)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Karen Jacques [K-LUP-33]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
require and incentivize	LUP 6.9 (Design Around Open and Green Space)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Dale Steele [K-LUP-33]
There need to be landscape and open space standards to ensure adequate outdoor space is provided.	LUP 6.9 (Design Around Open and Green Space)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-33]
LUP-6.9 Design around open and green space: "Encouraging" developers to preserve trees will not work. The City staff needs direction: save existing trees. The design standards must be mandatory.	LUP 6.9 (Design Around Open and Green Space)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see policy ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection) and City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Trees for Sacramento [51]
Sliding Scale and FAR			
Policies were developed and revised by staff to support the development of Missing Middle Housing.		<p>The following new policies have been added/revised to goal section LUP-3:</p> <p>LUP-3.1 Maximum FAR. The City shall regulate maximum building intensity using floor area ratio (FAR) standards consistent with Map LUP-6 and Figure LUP-5, which applies to residential uses in the single-unit and duplex zones. Maximum FAR standards shown in Map LUP-6 apply to both residential and non-residential uses.</p> <p>New policy: Sliding Floor Area Ratio Scale. Additional building area may increase proportionally to the number of units proposed on a lot, consistent with Figure LUP-5.</p> <p>New policy: Allowed Net Building Area for Smaller Lots. The City shall permit up to 2,000 square feet of net building area per lot or the maximum allowed by the Sliding FAR Scale (Figure LUP-5), whichever is greater.</p> <p>New policy: Exemption from Sliding Floor Area Ratio Scale for Remodels and Additions. Remodels and additions to existing single-unit, duplex, and neighborhood-scale multi-unit dwellings are exempt from the limits established by the Sliding Floor Area Ratio Scale (Figure LUP-5).</p>	Staff
Staff initiated a revision to the glossary for clarity.		<p>The following term in the glossary has been revised:</p> <p>Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The gross building area (GBA) of development, exclusive of structured parking areas and open space (common, public, and private), proposed on the site divided by the total net lot area (NLA). The formula is GBA/NLA = FAR. (Example: 43,560 / 43,560 = FAR 1.0).</p> <p>FAR is determined by dividing the net building area (NBA) of development proposed on the site by the total net lot area (NLA). The formula is NBA/NLA = FAR. (Example: 3,000 square feet of NBA / 5,000 square feet of NLA = FAR of 0.6). See also Net Building Area, Net Lot Area.</p>	Staff

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Staff initiated the following additions to the glossary.		<p>The following terms have been added to the glossary:</p> <p>Net Building Area (NBA). The gross building area, excluding the floor area of accessory dwelling units (ADUs), junior accessory dwelling units (JADUs), parking structures, any other exclusions or restrictions imposed by the Planning and Development Code of the City of Sacramento, and other exclusions or restrictions imposed by applicable laws. (See generally Sacramento Planning and Development Code title 17, and § 17.104.020 [Types of regulations], as may be amended.) See also Gross Building Area.</p> <p>Gross Building Area (GBA). The total area of all floors of a building, both above and below ground, measured from the exterior faces of the building. (See generally Sacramento Planning and Development Code title 17, and § 17.104.020 [Types of regulations], as may be amended.) See also Net Building Area.</p> <p>Structured Parking. A multi-story accessory structure, typically found in commercial and mixed-use developments, that provides parking areas for vehicles. A structure that is accessory to a single-unit, duplex, neighborhood-scale multi-unit, or manufactured dwelling is a garage and is not included as structured parking.</p> <p>Net Lot Area (NLA). The total area of a lot, excluding publicly dedicated land, private streets which meet city standards, and other public use areas.</p> <p>Neighborhood-Scale Multi-Unit Dwellings. A neighborhood-scale residential building type, usually found in the single-unit and duplex dwelling zones, that contain more than one dwelling unit and are similar in scale and form to single-unit dwellings, such as duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and cottage/bungalow courts.</p>	Staff
Industrial Areas			
I don't know where to put this yet, but the city should require new industrial buildings to design rooftops for solar and make them available to SMUD for panels, decreasing the pressure to convert farmland to solar farms.		Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-34]
The city has an amazing opportunity to develop the area around the railyard to create an oasis of residential, retail, and other employment opportunities within walking distance for residents. I do hope that we are still able to preserve the history of that area as well.		Thank you for your comment.	AMANDA OSTERHOUT [K-LUP-34]
Goal LUP-7 (industrial opportunities)			
Very good policy to protect our rivers from more industrial development. This should be reflected in the maps that show zoning of parcels along the river.	LUP-7.2 (Industrial Uses Along Rivers)	Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-LUP-34]
This policy should be expanded to eliminate existing industrial uses along the rivers as well.	LUP-7.2 (Industrial Uses Along Rivers)	Thank you for your comment.	Kevin Dumler [K-LUP-34]
seek incentives and other tools to relocate existing heavy industry near sensitive natural resources and residences. An example would be Bell Marine which generates considerable dust adjacent to the American River Parkway, Sutter's Landing park and Midtown.	LUP-7.2 (Industrial Uses Along Rivers)	Please see policy EJ-A.4 (Amortization Ordinance).	Dale Steele [K-LUP-34]
LUP-7.2 Industrial Uses Along Rivers: This policy should be expanded to eliminate existing industrial uses along the rivers as well. We recommend the following: "The City shall prohibit new heavy industrial uses along the American River Parkway and Sacramento River Parkway. The City shall prevent incompatible industrial development adjacent to the American and Sacramento Rivers while discontinuing existing industrial uses to the extent feasible."	LUP-7.2 (Industrial Uses Along Rivers)	Please see policy EJ-A.4 (Amortization Ordinance).	House Sacramento [21]
Goal LUP-8 (unique sense of place)			
<i>Suggestions for Incorporating Natural Spaces</i>			
This Chapter is sorely missing key goals and policies that directly increase and protect natural landscapes that support ecosystem functions providing benefits for people and nature. The General Plan Update is deficient in recognizing existing natural areas in the City, and the human and wildlife value of adding native plants/habitat to existing open space and parks. Making nature an integral part of the City (beyond exotic grasses and trees) builds resiliences with social and ecological benefits. All citizens deserve to have nature opportunities and connections where they live, work, play and recreate. Natural habitats and landscaping also help address required climate change mitigations and adaptations.	Goal LUP-8	Please see goal section LUP-11 which contains policies that encourage development to prioritize, support, promote, and embrace ecological regeneration and responsible resource stewardship. Please also see goal sections ERC-1 and ERC-2 for policies that preserve and enhance our natural resources.	Dan Meier [K-LUP-36]
Maximizing visual and physical access to the rivers needs to be contingent on minimizing impacts to the natural environment. Please reword this measure to reflect this.	LUP-8.2 (River as Signature Feature)	Revision to policy LUP-8.3 (River Access and Ecology): "...strive to balance the provision of river access...with efforts to protect, restore, and enhance the ecological setting..."	Dan Meier [K-LUP-36]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Good policy. Suggest adding reference to the state Urban American River Parkway Preservation Act (Public Resources Code Sections 5840-5843) that provides, in part, that "(a)ctions of state and local agencies with regard to land use decisions shall be consistent with the American River Parkway Plan."	LUP-8.2 (River as Signature Feature)	Revision to policy LUP-8.2 (River as Signature Feature): "...federal agencies and plans , including the American River Parkway Plan , the Local Maintaining Agencies..."	Corey Brown [K-LUP-36]
See Tim Vendlinski's comments on the land-use designations for Open Space (OS) and "Natural parks" and Parks and Recreation (PR) on pages 3-16 and 3-17.	LUP 8.3 (River Access and Ecology)	Thank you for your comment.	Tim Vendlinski [K-LUP-36]
Conserving and restoring impacts to sensitive wildlife habitats and environment must have priority over active recreation in these areas.	LUP 8.3 (River Access and Ecology)	Revision to policy LUP-8.3 (River Access and Ecology): "...strive to balance the provision of river access...with efforts to protect, restore, and enhance the ecological setting..."	Dale Steele [K-LUP-36]
Could we create more jobs to be able to keep these waterways cleaned up and free of debris?	LUP 8.3 (River Access and Ecology)	Please see YPRO-1.16 (River Parkways).	AMANDA OSTERHOUT [K-LUP-36]
The City needs to devote adequate resources to maintain and restore the natural resources along the American and Sacramento Rivers. This also applies to the significant existing Natural Areas within the City that includes: Del Paso Regional Park, Fisherman's Lake, Bannon Creek Parkway, Tretheway Oak Preserve, Sutter's Landing Regional Park, William Chorley Park, Granite Regional Park, Reichmuth Park, and North Laguna Creek Park. Current efforts to maintain, expand, and make these Natural Areas an asset to the City's communities is very inadequate. The City needs to designate Natural Areas across the City to conserve and reconnect patches of habitat into a robust network of Natural Areas that serve all Sacramentans. Consider the comments made on the ongoing update of the City's Parks Master Plan that indicate strong support for Natural Areas and nature within City parks.	LUP 8.3 (River Access and Ecology)	Thank you for your comment.	Dan Meier [K-LUP-36]
<i>Development Near Freeway</i>			
Development on freeways should focus mainly on the health impacts of residents living near freeways. What our city looks like to people driving by is not a priority.	LUP-8.5 (Development Adjacent to Freeways and Railroad Corridors)	Thank you for your comment.	Kevin Dumler [K-LUP-36]
Agreed. You can't see any of the city driving 60+ on a freeway anyway.	LUP-8.5 (Development Adjacent to Freeways and Railroad Corridors)	Thank you for your comment.	Jenny [K-LUP-36]
Agree about focusing on health impacts. Where possible, planting trees along freeways can help with air quality and with both visual screening and noise reduction	LUP-8.5 (Development Adjacent to Freeways and Railroad Corridors)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-LUP-36]
Preferably the freeways should be removed. But if not build buildings around the elevated freeways instead of just having parking lots under them.	LUP-8.5 (Development Adjacent to Freeways and Railroad Corridors)	Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-LUP-36]
Removing the I-5 corridor that cuts through downtown and redirecting else where would bring immeasurable benefit to the city. I hope one day there will be enough political will to make this happen.	LUP-8.5 (Development Adjacent to Freeways and Railroad Corridors)	Thank you for your comment.	Brian Junio [K-LUP-36]
LUP-8.5 Development Adjacent to Freeways and Railroad Corridors (3-36): This policy should be revised to only focus on the health impacts of living near freeways. Designing homes so they look good from a freeway should not be a priority.	LUP-8.5 (Development Adjacent to Freeways and Railroad Corridors)	Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
<i>Distinctive Place</i>			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
LUP-8.7 Distinctive Urban Skyline: Tall buildings will always be most likely Downtown. It's not clear why this policy is needed at all. We recommend removing it since it distracts from other important policies.	LUP-8.7 (Distinctive Urban Skyline)	Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
<i>Pedestrian Safety and Priority</i>			
I love this goal. I think it should be made even stronger by naming that the City shall promote and prioritize this over more parking facilities, drive aisles, or other car-serving infrastructure.	LUP-8.9 (People-Friendly Design)	Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-37]
I recommend also including "Pedestrian safety treatments such as sidewalk bulb-outs and widening and improved crosswalks" in this goal LUP-8.9 People-Friendly Design. The plan currently only mentions "pedestrian safety treatments" in "LUP-8.14 Streetscape Beautification" which is frankly insulting. Pedestrian safety treatments are not only for aesthetics; they literally save lives.	LUP-8.9 (People-Friendly Design)	Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-37]
<i>Incorporate Native Plants</i>			
Strongly support use of native plants wherever possible. Native plants provide habitat for beneficial insects, including pollinators and attract birds. The more we can bring nature in the form of native plants and trees into our city, the better	LUP-8.10 (Responsiveness to Context)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-LUP-37]
<i>Reconsider the Need for Transitions</i>			
Its not clear why transitions are beneficial to urban form, or what the definition of "transition" even is. This policy is often used as a pretext for opposing new development that is fully compliant with all other land-use regulations, such as height and massing. I recommend removing this policy altogether.	LUP-8.11 (Neighborhoods and Transitions)	Thank you for your comment.	Kevin Dumler [K-LUP-37]
Agreed, please remove.	LUP-8.11 (Neighborhoods and Transitions)	Thank you for your comment.	Jenny [K-LUP-37]
LUP-8.11 Neighborhoods and Transitions: Neighborhoods will naturally transition between each other, so it's not clear why this policy is necessary. It's also not clear why "transitions" are beneficial to the urban form. These policies are often utilized by residents bent on opposing zoning-compliant buildings that are slightly taller than the existing context. We recommend removing this policy completely.	LUP-8.11 (Neighborhoods and Transitions)	Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
<i>Privately Developed Public Spaces</i>			
Some of the best POPS are those that are tucked away from the street, since they provide a respite from the noises of the City (namely, cars). To be completely visible from the street may defeat the benefit of the POPS. More important than being on the street, they just need to be clearly labeled and signed.	LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces)	Revision to policy LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces), add bullet: " Wayfinding signage; "	Kevin Dumler [K-LUP-37]
I recommend also including "Pedestrian safety treatments such as sidewalk bulb-outs and widening and improved crosswalks" in this goal LUP-8.12 Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces. The plan currently only mentions "pedestrian safety treatments" in "LUP-8.14 Streetscape Beautification" which is frankly insulting. Pedestrian safety treatments are not only for aesthetics; they literally save lives.	LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces)	Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-37]
'Encourage'? Not enough to become a 'livable' city. REQUIRE public spaces in private developments - where feasible. (When I was a kid in NYC our playground was on the roof of our apartment building...)	LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces)	Thank you for your comment. The City already requires open space in private developments.	Laurie Heller [K-LUP-37]
What does "Tree canopy at least equivalent to 50 Percent." mean?	LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces)	Revision to policy LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately Developed Public Spaces) for clarity: "Tree canopy covering at least equivalent to 50 percent of the public space. "	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-37]
LUP-8.12 Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces: Some of the most beneficial public spaces are those that are tucked away from streets and provide a peaceful respite from traffic. It's not critically important that these be visible from the street - they just need clear signage.	LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces)	Revision to policy LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces), add bullet: " Wayfinding signage; "	House Sacramento [21]
<i>Sense of Place</i>			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The Campus Commons plan community has an iconic sense of Place, designed with a unique clustered concept, urban forest, and walkable space, and should be a special study area in the general plan	LUP-8.8 (Iconic Sense of Place)	Thank you for your comment. Special Study Areas are areas outside of the city. The City has identified five Special Study Areas that are adjacent to existing city limits and are of interest to the City of Sacramento (Map SSA 1 in the 2040 General Plan). Planning for the future of these unincorporated areas necessitates coordination between the City and County.	hOward levine [K-LUP-37]
Streetscape			
Streetscape beautification should also include more publicly accessible trash and recycling bins maintained by the city, particularly in the city center. In addition, the city should plan for sidewalk maintenance and regular cleaning/washing, just as it does for street sweeping, in the city center.	LUP-8.14 (Streetscape Beautification)	Thank you for your comment.	Cassie [K-LUP-38]
These should be a major priority. It's interesting that this goal around beautification is the ONLY place in the entire General Plan where widening sidewalks are mentioned (not including 2 mentions in the Community Plans). It's not mentioned in the Mobility element or Vision Zero. It's actually quite insulting and undermining. Pedestrian safety treatments are not only for aesthetics and beautification; they literally save lives. These treatments are also applicable to other goals in this section and are actually critical to meeting other goals in the whole plan. My suggestion is to also include "pedestrian safety treatments" in the following goals: LUP-8.9 People-Friendly Design LUP-8.12 Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces	LUP-8.14 (Streetscape Beautification)	Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-38]
LUP-8.14 (Streetscape Beautification) includes pedestrian safety treatments. Recommend also including "pedestrian safety treatments" in LUP-8.9 (People-Friendly Design) and LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces).	LUP-8.14 (Streetscape Beautification)	Revision to policy LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces), add bullet: " Wayfinding signage; "	Alyssa and Troy [3]
Photo Caption			
A caption should be added to this photo to clarify that it was taken when K street was closed to cars and fully pedestrianized. It is slightly ironic to use this photo to demonstrate liveliness of walkable streets because in reality it has since been reverted back to a through-street for cars complete with on-street parking. Added context via image caption may help readers understand that this is how lively K Street could look like if made car-free. This can also help encourage more pedestrianized streets.	photo on page 3-37	Added caption to photo on page 3-37: "20th Street is often closed off for outdoor events, creating a lively pedestrian environment."	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-37]
Goal LUP-9 (Arts, culture, entertainment)			
Agree, important effort that should be continued and expanded.	LUP-9.5 (Arts Education)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-LUP-39]
Adaptive re-use wherever feasible should be encouraged and incentivized as a of retaining embodied energy and reducing the amount of materials taken to the dump. Sacramento also needs to take a serious look at adopting a deconstruction ordinance.		Please see policies LUP-10.1 (Existing Structure Reuse), LUP-A.7 (Net-Zero Energy or Net-Positive Design), HCR-1.10 (Demolition), HCR-1.12 (Incentives for Rehabilitation and Adaptive Reuse of Historic Resources), and HCR-2.7 (Funding and Financing Mechanisms).	Karen Jacques [K-LUP-40]
Arts section should focus on placekeeping. Think about addition/revision based on comments about anti-displacement for artists and placekeeping. What about an entertainment district? Live-work spaces, performing arts venues, and warehouse galleries have had relatively low rents over the past several decades; however, rising land and housing prices mean that many of these artists and spaces are at risk of displacement. What can we do to make this affordable for artists?		Policy LUP-9.7 (Anti-Displacement Strategies) revised to say: "The City shall strive to prevent displacement and pursue placekeeping consider anti-displacement strategies for artists and creative businesses along with special incentives that drive consumer engagement within arts districts."	Wallace (ACCE); Anderson (ACCE)
Goal LUP-10 (sustainable building and "green" design)			
This city should require an Embedded energy audit that would ascertain the amount of energy in the materials of each building before they are demoed, and to make sure the offsets are justified by a new building	LUP-10.1 (Existing Structure Reuse)	Please see the public review draft of the Existing Building Electrification Strategy.	hOward levine [K-LUP-41]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Transportation type should be a factor in rating how green a building or development is. If a building primarily generates and accomodates car trips, it isn't helping achieve climate goals very much.	LUP-10.2 (Promote Green Buildings)	Thank you for your comment.	Jenny [K-LUP-41]
Goal LUP-11 (human-ecology connection in built environment)			
See Tim Vendlinski's comments on the land-use designations for Open Space (OS) and "Natural parks" and Parks and Recreation (PR) on pages 3-16 and 3-17.	LUP-11.3 (Local Human and Ecological Context)	Thank you for your comment.	Tim Vendlinski [K-LUP-42]
Implementing Actions			
Need an implementing action to direct staff to amend/modify the city's existing density bonus program to allow FAR bonuses and how much can be allowed with specific concessions. The state's density bonus program mentions FAR bonuses but only for application to lots/projects that meet certain criteria. The city will need it's own program that specifically allows FAR bonuses. Should be stated as an implementing action.		Per the City's adopted 2021-2029 Housing Element Implementation Programs, the City's Density Bonus Ordinance will be updated.	Anonymous [K-LUP-42]
Staff has initiated the development of a new implementing action.		The following implementing action will be added to the LUP Element: "LUP-A.3 Local Bonus Program. The City shall amend the Planning and Development Code to develop a local bonus program for development projects providing regulated affordable housing, including those with less than 5 units that would not qualify under the state density bonus law. Responsible Entity: Community Development Department Timeframe: Near-term (2024-2029)"	
When establishing Sustainability and Carbonization Standards in LUP-A.5, the City commits to evaluating best practices for decarbonization in our infrastructure but does not set a timeframe for completion. Nor does it set criteria, or even commit to the recommendations from the evaluation to be implemented.	LUP-A.5 (Sustainability and Carbonization Standards)	Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
report findings to public.	LUP-A.6 (Beyond Climate Resiliency Measures)	The annual progress report for 2040 General Plan implementation will include updates on implementing actions.	Dale Steele [K-LUP-43]
Removing parkin minimums for new/redevelopment would be a good start. This would save small businesses money and increase their sustainability.	LUP-A.6 (Beyond Climate Resiliency Measures)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "...Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City mandated parking minimums; ..."	Jenny [K-LUP-43]
report findings to public.	LUP-A.7 (Net-Zero Energy or Net-Positive Design)	The annual progress report for 2040 General Plan implementation will include updates on implementing actions.	Dale Steele [K-LUP-43]
In response to CAAP comments, the following revision was made.		LUP-A.7 (Net-Zero Energy or Net-Positive Design) revised to say: "The City shall assess the feasibility of requiring or incentivizing net-zero energy (NZE) or net positive design for new buildings and significant retrofitting of existing privately-owned buildings and identify incentives for NZE and net-positive design in adaptive reuse projects. "	CAAP
It always amazes me how designs for minority communities typically have better functionality then "american dream" suburban america. Build more of these where you got some cute shops on the first floor and above it residential. Also turn some comercial buildings already established and add residential on top! Parking can be underground and or parking structures as I would rather build parking up then out. The parking lots obtain a lot of heat and not good land usage!		Thank you for your comment.	Zane Whitcomb [K-LUP-43]
Planning and Development Code Update			
Support			
I support this	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-44]
I support this!! Really grateful to live in a city that has duplexes, triplexes, etc. It makes the city so much more interesting and affordable and economically diverse.	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-LUP-44]
LUP-A.8: Planning and Development Code Update: We strongly support this language and the proposed action	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
Maximum Density Standards			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Include removal of maximum residential density standards from single-unit, duplex dwellings in LUP-A.8	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update) revised to say: "The City shall update the Planning and Development Code to implement the 2040 General Plan, including amendments to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezone parcels for consistency with the 2040 General Plan land use, intensity, and density diagrams; • Remove maximum residential density standards from single-unit, duplex dwelling, multi-unit, commercial, and industrial zones and replace them with floor area ratio-based intensity standards and minimum residential density standards; • Broaden the range of housing types allowed by-right within single-unit and duplex dwelling residential zones; • Update development standards for missing middle housing types, such as accessory dwelling units, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and bungalow courts; • Require new residential development of a certain size to include a variety of housing types and sizes; • Establish requirements for electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure in new and expanded gas stations citywide; • Establish incentives to promote efficient parcel utilization and consolidation, particularly in transit-oriented development (TOD) areas; 	SACOG [2]
		(cont.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit new drive-through restaurants in areas where a strong pedestrian and transit orientation is desired; • Allow for flexibility of new commercial uses in neighborhood-oriented commercial centers; and • Establish incentives to facilitate the retrofit of existing shopping centers with pedestrian amenities, EV charging, bike parking, traffic calming features, plazas and public areas, shade trees, lighting, public art, farmers markets, retail and other services that provide for everyday needs, and community events." 	
<i>Tree Canopy</i>			
How does the city plan to protect its existing tree canopy, let alone grow it? Bear in mind that only 10% of our Urban Forest is comprised of trees maintained and owned by the city. 10% is owned by other government entities (federal, state, county) and a full 80% of our existing tree canopy is on private property, much of it in residential back and front yards. When we start building "missing middle" housing in R-1 zones, are the trees going to come down to make way for buildings? Once a "right" is created by zoning and ministerial approvals, how will the city control canopy on private land? Will objective zoning standards be created and adhered to? We need standards that will protect our tree canopy and require green space for trees and other types of plantings (not lawn!), so that rainwater can soak into the ground for trees and and to replenish our aquifer. Hardscape creates storm runoff. Another issue is clustering of projects, as they are approved separately, and "by right." If developments are allowed to "cluster" with little space left for trees on several discreet but adjacent projects, will the city have zoning standards that will limit clustering, which will lead to urban heat islands in existing neighborhoods?	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on preserving and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets.	Francesca Reitano [K-LUP-44]
Support maintaining tree canopy AND adding housing. No reason we need to cut down all trees to build. Also more actions city can take to encourage new canopy. Recommendation: Transportation planning team includes bulb-outs for tree-planting (e.g., in parking space) as part of street design standards update.	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	See policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets.	Matt A [K-LUP-44]
LUP-A.8 Planning and Development Code Update: Objective design standards are a must to keep the increased density from decimating the existing canopy, leave space for new tree plantings, and avoid the creation of new urban heat islands due to clustering of development projects.	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see policy ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection) and City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Trees for Sacramento [51]
<i>Roadways and Sidewalks</i>			
A lot of roads in the city are too wide, leading to more injury collisions and increasing stormwater pollution and runoff. What if some street area is repurposed as mandatory greenway at the same time as higher density development is constructed?	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Please see policy M-A.7 (Roadway Reallocations).	Jenny [K-LUP-44]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
City needs to develop standards for permeable pavement when sidewalks are replaced and in new developments. Also needs such standards for private walkways and patios. This will help replenish aquifers and also help reduce flooding during heavy rains.	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Please see policies LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces) and ERC-10.8 (Alternative Paving Materials).	Karen Jacques [K-LUP-44]
<i>Affordable Housing</i>			
Require affordable units as well	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Per the City's adopted 2021-2029 Housing Element, the City is in the process of updating the Mixed Income Housing Ordinance which could include a inclusionary housing component.	Austin Wilmoth [K-LUP-44]
<i>Drive Throughs</i>			
existing drive-through restaurants need incentives and other means to modify to better provide access for active transportation use. Any new drive-through restaurants must be for active transportation use.	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Thank you for your comment. New development active transportation elements such as enhanced pedestrian walkways, bike parking, and are reviewed to make sure they meet accessibility requirements. Existing requirements are brought up to code standards as it is possible to do so.	Dale Steele [K-LUP-44]
Include modification of existing drive-through restaurants to provide adequate access to active transportation. Any new drive-through facilities should be limited to active transportation access.	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Thank you for your comment. New development active transportation elements such as enhanced pedestrian walkways, bike parking, and are reviewed to make sure they meet accessibility requirements. Existing requirements are brought up to code standards as it is possible to do so.	Dale Steele [K-LUP-44]
Support. For precedent and COAs, see Chick-fil-a in Oakland/Emeryville.	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-LUP-44]
So prohibit drive throughs everywhere?	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Policy LUP-4.12 (Drive-Through Restaurants) revised to say: "The City shall prohibit new drive-through restaurants within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile walking distance of from the center of an existing or proposed light rail station platform existing and proposed light rail stations and high-frequency transit stops."	Jenny [K-LUP-44]
The actions laid out in LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update) are admirable and point the City toward a more equitable, walkable, and economically successful future. However, some of the language is vague and needs clarification, such as defining "strong pedestrian and transit", and what happens with old drive-throughs. What are the criteria for establishing areas where "strong pedestrian and transit orientation is desired"? What incentives will be available, and what happens with city owned spaces? Can the City pass ordinances to enforce development to be more pedestrian friendly?	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
<i>Home Occupation</i>			
LUP-A.9: Home Occupation Regulations: I whole-heartedly endorse the proposal's "by-right" approach, but we need more than "evaluation" by the end of 2029. We need action—and we need it as soon as possible. In addition, we need that action to specifically include removal of the restrictions described herein [the comment letter].	LUP-A.9 (Home Occupation Regulations)	Thank you for your comment. This action is identified for near-term action.	Tiffany Clark [59]
To meet the goals set out in LUP-A.9 (Home Occupation Regulation), the City must rezone many neighborhoods to allow for mixed use commerce such as grocery stores, restaurants, coffee shops, and other light commercial uses to encourage walkability. This can be encouraged by providing sufficient urban canopy and utilizing native and climate-adapted plants, as outlined in (FB-ERC-1,ERC-3.2, and ERC-2.4).	LUP-A.9 (Home Occupation Regulations)	The Neighborhood designation, as outlined in the Land Use and Placemaking Element, allows for neighborhood-serving mixed-use commerce including corner markets, coffee shops, hair salons, shops, gyms, and fitness centers.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
<i>Design Guidelines - Planting Palate</i>			
Use CNPS's CALSCAPE to create a planting palate for our region. Provide incentives that guide residential and commercial development toward water-wise and energy efficient landscaping.	LUP-A.10 (Design Guidelines Update)	Please see policy ERC-2.4 Native and Climate-Adapted Plants.	Laurie Heller [K-LUP-44]
Staff initiated the development of a new action in response to Technical Advisory Committee comments that the General Plan should consider future high-frequency transit routes.		New action added: "Future High-Frequency Transit Routes. The City shall reevaluate land use designations and maximum development intensities as new high-frequency transit routes are established by transit agencies, including SacRT, SACOG, and San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission."	
Do these initiatives and indicators align with the vision of Sacramento as a national model of sustainable, equitable growth and community development?			
I support the key moves for the land use element		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
I agree with the goals, but am disappointed that FAR around East Sac and Land Park LRT stations is only 1.0. Should be higher.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Yes, I am very happy to see an increase in FARs along urban corridors		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Please consider increasing maximum FAR to allow for more dense development within the city.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
I hope this plan will inspire the removal suburban/curved curbs throughout the city.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
The city should fight to bury I-5 to maximize connection to the river.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Significant investment in transit and traffic calming is required to achieve these walkability goals.		Please see goal sections M-1 and M-2 for policies on creating a multi-modal transportation system, including making streets more walkable.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Yes! I am greatly in favor of the FAR proposal, streamlining some of our zoning.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
The move to FAR is better. However the proposed FAR of 1.0 is too small. It should be up to 4.0 near transit and 2.0 elsewhere.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Yes to inclusive neighborhoods! Let's add intergenerational living opportunities, and remove assistive living.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
I love the idea of more home work options to reduce travel. Good idea to limit gas stations and require ev charging.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Arts is not as important for the city as environmental resiliency. Funding should be put towards resiliency more than arts.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
More emphasis on developing and using our water ways to make the city desirable, fun, and beautiful.		Please see policies LUP-8.2 (River as Signature Feature) and LUP-8.3 (River Access and Ecology).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Please increase FAR to 2 city wide and commercial centers to a min of 5 FAR; this would be more sustainable than current plan		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Re: "Corridors" https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2023/06/09/health/noise-exposure-health-impacts.html		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
more aggressive on land use policy in high demand areas, where everyone wants to live, east sac, land park, mid town, etc.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
We can further these goals by allowing higher FAR near transit and in high opportunity areas.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Yes, but we can further these goals by allowing higher FAR near transit and in high opportunity areas.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
They're great but could be stronger! A lowly FAR of 1.0 in transit/opportunity rich zones is a HUGE missed opportunity!		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Committer/Organization
A higher floor area ratio (FAR) near transit and in high opportunity areas would further these goals!		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Yes! Make streets more walkable and bikeable. Close some streets to cars. Make riverfront attractive.		Please see goal sections M-1 and M-2 for policies on creating a multi-modal transportation system, including making streets more walkable and bikeable. Please see policies M-1.8 (Vacation of Public Right-of-Way) and M-3.5 (Open Street Event) for encouraging repurposing right-of-way areas. Please see policies LUP-8.2 (River as Signature Feature) and LUP-8.3 (River Access and Ecology) which address the riverfront.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
We can further these goals by allowing higher FAR near ALL transit and in high opportunity areas.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
The goals are kind of weak. I'd like concrete goals with metrics like removing parking minimums and instituting parking maximums		New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "...Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City mandated parking minimums; ..."	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Not all neighborhoods are conducive to infill without creating other problems.		The General Plan envisions the most infill growth in opportunity areas.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Rather than more institutions to house older adults, lets build more affordable housing & home repair programs to keep them home		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
We need a lot more mixed use buildings for less car use. More bike lanes, and public transpo that is circular not linear!		Please see policy LUP-2.1 (Overall Balance of Uses) which encourages a balance of uses citywide. Please see goal section M-1 which includes improving bikeway connectivity.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
These are great goals. There is a severe lack of density around light rail stops outside of downtown and midtown.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Yes		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
The city needs an effective commercial vacancy tax in order to revitalize historic business corridors and neighborhoods.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Minimum FAR should be 2 citywide, and 4 for transit oriented areas.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
The distance from light rail and high frequency transit should be one-half mile, up from one-quarter mile.		Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile 1/2-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Another heading is definitely needed: Promote Nature. Cities need biodiversity to provide nature connections for its citizens.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Densification does not support affordability. Recent high density townhomes near by have been priced over \$700,000,		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Committer/Organization
I think these are great goals. To achieve these goals, Sac should allow higher FAR near transit and in high opportunity areas.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
These goals are good, and we should consider increasing our FAR limits in key areas.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
MORE housing! FAR of 4.0 1/2 mile of transit. Explicitly eliminate parking minimums. Increase FAR to 2.0 in high opp areas		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces."</p> <p>This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "...Program components could include the following:...Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;..."</p>	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Max FAR should be linked to transit proximity. 1/2 mile walk from transit should have higher FAR (4.0?) than surroundings.		<p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p> <p>For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).</p>	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
We should explicitly eliminate parking minimums citywide. Parking is a significant impediment to every other goal.		<p>New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces."</p> <p>This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "...Program components could include the following:...Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;..."</p>	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
We can further these goals by allowing higher FAR near transit and in high opportunity areas. We should remove the maximum FAR.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Add to #11 "connected human relationships" as part of the goal.		Please see policy LUP-11.6 (Community Connection).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
We can further these goals by allowing higher FAR near transit and in high opportunity areas.		For parcels that were assigned a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1 in the Draft 2040 General Plan, staff is recommending increasing the maximum FAR to 2, for parcels within 1/2 mile walking distance of high frequency transit stops. These changes will be reflected in Map LUP-6 (Maximum FAR).	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Definitely should put in the green line to airport. Would be a great benefit		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Our old neighborhoods have old trees that improve air quality. Changing takes trees out of the city of trees		Please see policies ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion), ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection), ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance), and ERC-3.9 (Watering and Irrigation). Please also see implementing actions ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) and ERC-A.1 (Urban Forest Plan). Finally, please see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
No, they do not. Why not? 1) Where are new jobs coming from? Without proper jobs, Sacramento could decline like Detroit.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]
Pressure by commercial property developers to build high density housing at the expense of unique Campus Commons must be reigned		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-LUP-1]

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES ELEMENT

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Page 4-1, ¶ 1, sentence 1: Include landscapes and places in the first sentence. Define both cultural resources and historic resources.		Page 4-1, first sentence revised to say: "Sacramento's historic and cultural resources include not only buildings, monuments, places, landscapes , and archaeological remains, but also traditional customs, important infrastructure, and sites where important events once took place." Added to Glossary: " Resources (historic, cultural) mean those properties determined to be a historic resource or cultural resource under CEQA or NEPA, under any other provision of California law, or listed or nominated for listing on the Sacramento register. A resource means any building, structure, site, area, place, feature, characteristic, appurtenance, landscape, landscape design, or improvement. "	Melissa Mourkas [25]
All pages: All photographs should have captions explaining what they are illustrating.		Additional captions will be added.	Melissa Mourkas [25]
Historic Context			
History did not stop with the roads in the Gold Rush. Sacramento continued its history with its new development. Moving east south and north. The Guy West Bridge in sac state are examples of growth and history. In the City Of Sacramento. The Campus Commons development of the mid-1960s is a mid century cluster housing complex that continues to show the benefits of that design concept and should be part of the historical fabric of Sacramento.		Thank you for your comment.	hOward levine [K-HCR-2]
How is a neighborhood or building designated as historically and culturally significant? I live in Campus Commons, near Sac State, and as the area becomes increasingly urbanized, our mid century neighborhood is being impacted negatively. What would we need to do to get a historical designation that can preserve this lovely area?		Please see policy HCR-1.5 (Historic Surveys and Context Statements).	Kim Fuller [K-HCR-5]
Existing Resources, Districts, and Landmarks			
Page 4-3, ¶ 1: Define "sites". It has both built environment and archaeological meanings. ¶ 3: Include National Historic Landmarks as a type of resource.		Page 4-3, second paragraph, first sentence revised to say: " Archaeological sSites recorded in the region include village sites, smaller occupation or special use sites, and lithic scatters." Page 4-3, third paragraph, second sentence revised to say: "The National Register is administered by the National Park Service and includes buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level, including those identified as National Historic Landmarks. "	Melissa Mourkas [25]
Page 4-4: ¶ 1 and ¶ 3: Heading for CRHR is repeated. Combine the two paragraphs into a single discussion. On Page 4-4, "California Register of Historical Resources" is used as a heading twice. The first use, in the left column, should be California Historical Landmarks based on the text in the latter part of the paragraph, although the upper portion refers to the California Register. This paragraph and its heading should be corrected to reflect California Historical Landmarks in Sacramento with specific examples, instead of "railroad buildings, hotels, banks, residences, churches..."		Page 4-4: first and third paragraph combined into one section - third paragraph switched to second paragraph and second "California Register of Historical Resources" heading is deleted.	Melissa Mourkas [25]; Preservation Sacramento [50]
Map HCR-1: Historic Districts and Landmark Parcels			
It's strange that Chinatown doesn't have some sort of historic or landmark designation. As Sacramento Valley Station develops, the city needs to help preserve Chinatown and promote its rebirth. Since it's so close to the station, it's going to be great for TOD, but that can't come at the expense of repeating our history of bulldozing communities.		Thank you for your comment.	Chris Wong [K-HCR-6]
Preservation of "The Colonial Theatre" please.		Please see policy HCR-1.5 (Historic Surveys and Context Statements).	Stephanie Becker [K-HCR-6]
Preservation of 3000 and 3022 "art deco" facade buildings please.		Please see policy HCR-1.5 (Historic Surveys and Context Statements).	Stephanie Becker [K-HCR-6]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
This historical map only represents the downtown core. The plan dismisses possible historical sites outside of the core areas developed in the 60s and 70s of last century may have properties or develop. That should be considered. Such as the Campus Commons master plan community.		Please see policy HCR-1.5 (Historic Surveys and Context Statements).	hOward levine [K-HCR-6]
This map is an example of a myopic view of the history of Sacramento. There is no city, recognition or studies apparently of areas, East of the River such as the Guy Wesr bridge, Campus Commons, Or the modern buildings in the South land Park area. This practice needs to be remedied, and the studies that are called for in the general plan should be done.		Thank you for your comment.	hOward levine [K-HCR-6]
Preservation Framework			
Page 4-7, ¶ 1: Define "built environment". It is repeated on page 4-12, HCR 1-18.		Thank you for your comment.	Melissa Mourkas [25]
Page 4-8: This page discusses local programs for historic preservation. Why is there a photo of a state-owned park building? It would be more appropriate to feature a local preservation or rehabilitation project.		Revisions will be made per comment.	Melissa Mourkas [25]
Page 4-9: What does the photo of city council chambers illustrate relative to historic preservation?		Revisions will be made per comment.	Melissa Mourkas [25]
Historic Preservation Programs and Incentives Callout Box			
Plaque Program needs to be better publicized		Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-HCR-8]
Goal HCR-1 (historic and cultural resources that enrich)			
Page 4-10, HCR 1.1 Heading: I suggest replacing it with : "Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources, Landscape and Site Features". Eliminate the use of the word "landscaping".	HCR-1.1 (Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources Site Features and Landscaping)	Policy title for HCR-1.1 revised to say: "Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources, Landscapes, and Site Features and Landscaping. "	Melissa Mourkas [25]; Preservation Sacramento [50]
Historic preservation should be promoted, but left to the individual property owner. The city does not own these 'resources', the people do. The current setup causes vastly increased cost and elongated timelines for any changes to make and keep buildings and land viable, and represents in a very real sense an uncompensated taking from the property owners, in contravention of the 5th amendment. By all means please incentivize property owners to maintain the beautiful buildings, but I submit that the historic preservation planning process should be abolished forthwith.	HCR-1.1 (Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources Site Features and Landscaping)	Thank you for your comment.	Chris Tucker [K-HCR-10]
My husband and I have rehabilitated ten historic residential buildings over the years we have lived in Sacramento. We have not found any of the problems listed in the previous comment to be the case. Preservation staff have been knowledgeable, professional and helpful and we have gotten preservation approval for our projects quickly. The only delays we have experienced have been in getting building permits and those delays occurred after we had received preservation approval and had nothing to do with the fact that the buildings we were rehabbing were historic. The relatively recent development of design guidelines for each of Sacramento's historic districts has made the process of getting preservation approvals even easier. The fact that Sacramento has a preservation program that protects both individual landmarks and historic districts has added greatly to its character and sense of place. Not having such a program would be a huge loss to the City.	HCR-1.1 (Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources Site Features and Landscaping)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-HCR-10]
Just because a scale or massing is different does not mean it does not complement existing historic uses - indeed many of the historic photographs above demonstrate a variety of scale and massing. Please remove the final sentence of this policy.	HCR-1.3 (Compatibility with Historic Context)	Thank you for your comment.	Kevin Dumler [K-HCR-10]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
HCR-1.3: Compatibility with Historic Context: This policy implies that scale and massing that is different from adjacent sites diminishes the value of a historic district. We see no such argument for this. We recommend removing the final sentence of this policy statement so it reads: "The City will continue to review new development, alterations, and rehabilitation/remodels for compatibility with the surrounding historic context and consistency with design guidelines/standards, including the Historic District Plans."	HCR-1.3 (Compatibility with Historic Context)	Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
The city mouse look outside the downtown core and establish districts.	HCR-1.4 (Historic Districts)	Thank you for your comment.	hOward levine [K-HCR-10]
This is the city will find the phones to review districts and create new districts. The city has been negligent in pursuing that outcome, and let's change to follow this action.	HCR-1.5 (Historic Surveys and Context Statements)	Please see policy HCR-2.7 (Funding and Financing Mechanisms).	hOward levine [K-HCR-10]
Like. In City Updates newsletter, every year or so remind community to note areas/sites they'd like see preserved and how/who they can connect with.	HCR-1.5 (Historic Surveys and Context Statements)	Thank you for your comment.	Stephanie Becker [K-HCR-10]
The recent federally funded outreach that preservation staff did in Sacramento's black community is a model for the kind of work it can do in Sacramento's other ethnic and cultural communities. Such work promotes mutual respect and understanding. One last comment. Preservation staff have developed design guidelines for each of Sacramento's historic districts and will continue to develop such guidelines for new districts as they are identified. This work is very helpful in guiding new infill construction in Sacramento's historic districts so that new construction is compatible with its surrounding historic context.		Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [52]
Over the years, lack of maintenance and resultant deterioration has resulted in the loss of several historic buildings. Typically, these are buildings that are vacant and often inadequately secured, leading to multiple break-ins. In some cases, the deterioration reaches the point where the City tears them down to avoid collapse. The preservation community refers to these situations as 'demolition by neglect'. It is an ongoing problem. There are currently three vacant, at risk historic buildings in the Southside Historic District where I live and likely more in other Historic Districts. Southside lost a vacant City Landmark building on 12th St. to fire because the owner (who had finally submitted plans after more than a year of repeated neighborhood complaints) did nothing to secure it and there were constant break-ins. Code Enforcement needs better tools and policies to deal with these situations or we will just continue to lose historic buildings.	HCR-1.8 (Ongoing Maintenance)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-HCR-10]
The city should include a policy that examines the "embedded energy" in each building before demolition and building of a new building	HCR-1.10 (Demolition)	Please see the public review draft of the Existing Building Electrification Strategy.	hOward levine [K-HCR-11]
City is currently working on an electrification ordinance for the retrofit of existing buildings. It would be very helpful for Preservation Staff to inform people applying for permits to rehab historic buildings that this is coming, encourage them to make their buildings electrification ready now as part of the rehab process and, if gas water heaters or HVAC systems need replacement, to replace with electric heat pump appliances now.	HCR-1.11 (Energy Retrofits of Historic Resources)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-HCR-11]
Happy to see this. Adaptive reuse not only saves historic resources and sense of place, but is very green because it preserves valuable materials (e.g. old growth wood) and embodied energy. The more incentives the City can offer, the better	HCR-1.12 (Incentives for Rehabilitation and Adaptive Reuse of Historic Resources)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-HCR-11]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Staff initiated the development of a new policy that aims support energy retrofit investments.		Added new policy after policy HCR-1.18 (Evaluation of Potentially Eligible Built Environment Resources): "Access to Energy Retrofits. The City shall continue to work with federal, State, and regional agencies and partners to seek funding opportunities for economically disadvantaged property owners to pursue climate-adaptive energy retrofits and electrification of existing historic buildings."	Staff
The more this is done in consultation with local tribes, the better	HCR-1.13 (Indigenous Cultures)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-HCR-12]
Like! Let owner know what resources and/or support is available, such as plaque program, which could help business!	HCR-1.18 (Evaluation of Potentially Eligible Built Environment Resources)	Thank you for your comment.	Stephanie Becker [K-HCR-12]
Goal HCR-1.18 Currently, evaluated properties found eligible as contributors to a historic district, but not listed, can be approved for demolition without subsequent environmental review. This goal should be modified to include reference to properties eligible as contributors.	HCR-1.18 (Evaluation of Potentially Eligible Built Environment Resources)	Thank you for your comment.	Preservation Sacramento [50]
Goal HCR-2 (citywide preservation program)			
Yes! Like.	HCR-2.3 (Sacramento Register)	Thank you for your comment.	Stephanie Becker [K-HCR-13]
In the projects I have worked on so far in the city there has not been an outreach by the city for preservation. The word promote I believe, is like a snake oil. Salesman promote does not preserve. The city needs a definable outreach program understood by The Neighbourhood communities	HCR-2.4 (Incorporating Preservation into Comprehensive Planning)	Please see goal section HCR-3 which discusses increased awareness and appreciation of the city's historic and cultural resources, including policies HCR-3.1 (Education and Awareness) and HCR-3.6 (Public Participation), as well as implementing action HCR-A.3 (Education and Awareness).	hOward levine [K-HCR-13]
How, specifically, will this be done? 'Demolition by Neglect' remains a significant problem.	HCR-2.5 (Code Compliance)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-HCR-13]
Goal HCR-2.5 This goal should include reference to Historic Building Code, an incentive that allows historic buildings to avoid unnecessary work, reinforcing to city code staff that historic buildings do not need to meet modern building codes in all respects.	HCR-2.5 (Code Compliance)	Thank you for your comment.	Preservation Sacramento [50]
Need a fund that could provide low interest loans and grants to owners of historic resources who lack the money needed to repair them. At one time SHRA had a low income loan program to help property owners who could not afford to make needed repairs. The History Places Grant Program could be a source of funding, especially if all or a portion of the match could be waived for low income recipients. When I served on the Preservation Commission the match was waived on one occasion to allow a low income home owner to replace their failing foundation	HCR-2.7 (Funding and Financing Mechanisms)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-HCR-13]
Goal HCR-2.7 Include a requirement that city development fees should be explored as a mechanism to fund and finance preservation programs, such as the Historic Places Grant, which currently has no revenue or source of funding. While nonprofit partners will continue supporting city preservation efforts where necessary, funding mechanisms for city preservation efforts should not be dependent on outside contributions.	HCR-2.7 (Funding and Financing Mechanisms)	Thank you for your comment.	Preservation Sacramento [50]
Public Involvement			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Page 4-14: Bottom photograph: What is this photo of a group of people illustrating? I suggest a photo of people with a recognizable landmark if the intent is to illustrate Heritage Tourism.		Revisions will be made per comment suggestion.	Melissa Mourkas [25]
Goal HCR-3 (awareness and appreciation)			
Implement methods and approaches to ensuring applicable education will be provided around these sites and such to build self-reflexivity, cultural sensitivity around cultural celebrations.	HCR 3.1 (Education and Awareness)	Please see implementing action HCR-A.4 (Historic Context Statements and Survey) and policies LUP-11.3 (Local Human and Ecological Context), LUP-11.4 (Community Education), and LUP (Community Connection).	Civic Thread [91]
Yes. Field trips!	HCR-3.2 (School Programming)	Thank you for your comment.	Stephanie Becker [K-HCR-15]
Yes!	HCR-3.6 (Public Participation)	Thank you for your comment.	Stephanie Becker [K-HCR-15]
Implementing Actions			
Wonderful!	HCR-A.4 (Historic Context Statements and Survey)	Thank you for your comment.	Stephanie Becker [K-HCR-17]
Language around enforcement is incredibly vague and needs to be carefully addressed and clarified, or achieved differently. This should be done in order to create, establish, and protect historic and cultural resources and spaces for communities that have been historically traumatized and currently oppressed by systemic, hegemonic understandings of enforcement.	HCR A.6 (Incentives and Enforcement)	Please see policies EJ-5.1 (Equity Education), EJ-5.4 (Racial, Gender, and LGBTQ+ Equity), and EJ-5.6 (Embedding Racial Equity).	Civic Thread [91]
Would love to see land back program	HCR-A.9 (Native American Cultural Resources)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-HCR-18]
Do these initiatives and indicators align with the vision of Sacramento as a national model of sustainable, equitable growth and community development?			
This makes sense, so long as the veneer of historic preservation isn't weaponized by bad faith actors against new housing!		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-HCR-1]
Out with the old and in with the new. We need to improve -- not stagnate. Look at East Asia which is rapidly modernizing		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-HCR-1]
Yes. I would also like to see additional consideration given to signage, art, and visible storytelling throughout the city.		Please see goal sections LUP-8, LUP-9, and LUP-11 for policies on placemaking, arts, and a built environment that embodies local cultural and historical context.	Station Board [K-HCR-1]
Preservation should be voluntary for the property owner. Abolish the historic preservation districts forthwith.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-HCR-1]
Having been a lifelong resident, Sacramento doesn't have a good track record protecting historic and culture resources.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-HCR-1]
Campus Commons and surrounding areas are architecturally cohesive mid century buildings. This needs to be a historic neighborhood		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-HCR-1]
No! Campus Commons/Sierra Oaks is a classic Sacramento mid century architecture. Repurpose don't demolish buildings to preserve		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-HCR-1]
701 Commons redevelopment destroys the community historic appearance . Repurpose it or lose Sacramento history and character		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-HCR-1]
I moved to Arden Arcade/Campus Commons due to its beautiful architecture and trees. It's classic mid century architecture.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-HCR-1]
Please save 707 Commons Drive and consider repurposing the existing building into a historic and cultural center and resource		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-HCR-1]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Business Attraction and Development			
As long as you do not address rampant crime, businesses cannot survive. Many have closed shop in midtown, and the homeless population has made shopping in downtown a dangerous proposition.		Thank you for your comment.	Richard Watson [K-E-3]
Commend the focus on facilitating the creation of tradable sector clusters, inclusive development, and innovation/collaboration.		Thank you for your comment.	SACOG [2]
Goal E-1 (Dynamic, resilient economy)			
Staff initiated the development of a new policy to support efforts to foster the nighttime economy.		Added new policy after policy E-1.8 (Economic Development Strategic Plan): "Nighttime Economy. The City shall support the nighttime economy to help foster a vibrant and well-managed nightlife in Sacramento."	Staff
Goal E-2 (Sustained, inclusive growth)			
I agree with this section. I'd like to add support to E-2.7 in terms of providing support and assistance to startups, particularly minority/women/veteran-owned. I'd also add local people who will be more invested in seeing their business succeed. I'd like to add that the City needs to keep the streets safe, and prevent areas that start to have vacancies from deteriorating.	Goal E-2	Thank you for your comment.	Kathy Styc [K-E-4]
Implementing Actions			
I suggest the city develop a mentor volunteer or possible paid program focussing on the older adult community.This program would activate this large and growing group (older adult) to support and guide new to the workforce folks.	E-A.3 (Paid and Volunteer Job Programs)	Thank you for your comment.	PATTY WAIT [K-E-7]
E-A.3 Paid & Volunteer Job Programs: Leverage this opportunity to coincide with Safe Passage Pilot (refer to separate comment letter attached, "PFS-1.X").	E-A.3 (Paid and Volunteer Job Programs)	Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
This should include S capital T capital E, capital a capital M education!	E-A.6 (Workforce Preparedness Program)	Thank you for your comment.	hOward levine [K-E-8]
Recommend that Implementing Action E-A.7 (Development Incentives) include language directly tying future incentives to the tradable sector outcomes discussed in the Business Attraction and Development section. These outcomes could include specific clusters like food and agriculture, advanced manufacturing, and life sciences/health services, as identified in Policy E-1.1.	E-A.7 (Development Incentives)	Implementing action E-A.7 (Development Incentives) revised to say: "...in target sectors and employment clusters. The City should..."	SACOG [2]
Do these initiatives and indicators align with the vision of Sacramento as a national model of sustainable, equitable growth and community development?			
Volunteer positions should include all, not just youth. Older Adults have much to share and often an economic need.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-E-1]
Yes although I do not [yet] see [looking at the one-page Econ. Dev. summary] vital attention to zoning definition/problems.		Please see LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Station Board [K-E-1]
All schools need to have free after school care until 6pm. Parents have to work to survive under capitalism!		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-E-1]
No. Missing enforcement of basic laws. As long as theifs can walk into stores and steal items, businesses will not thrive.		Please see the Public Facilities and Safety Element, goal section PFS-1 for policies related to law enforcement.	Station Board [K-E-1]
We need more EV charging for everything, and curbside charging for those of us that rent or want to charge while shopping/dining		Please see goal section M-1 for a series of policies on Zero- and Low-Emission Vehicles.	Station Board [K-E-1]

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS ELEMENT

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Implementation details and milestones for actions must be added. While we are sympathetic to limiting staff time spent on details/timelines that might not come to fruition, these actions may never come to fruition in a meaningful way with vague goals like “support” and “encourage”. Without any meaningful detail, too many measures could be considered successes without having been implemented.		Implementing actions, found at the end of each element and consolidated in Part 4 of the 2040 General Plan, include assigned lead and supporting departments and a timeframe for staff to carry out the implementing action.	Sacramento Sierra Club [81]
Include more measures that boost accountability and institutionalize climate action within the City. Sacramento. Measures should align all planning policies and regulations with the CAAP goals and priorities. We want to see at least annual updates on the City’s efforts to apply a climate lens to programs and projects, as well as reduce emissions from City buildings and fleets.		Please see Part 1, Chapter 2: Sustainability and Equity. This chapter includes a set of indicators to measure progress towards sustainability and equity as the General Plan is implemented. Each year, staff provides an annual update on the General Plan to City leadership.	Sacramento Sierra Club [81]
Edgar and Associates is pleased to support the current Resiliency and Climate Action sections of the 2040 General Plan and its goals to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045 by reducing carbon emissions through reducing energy usage, waste and pollutants, electrifying buildings and transportation, and investing in sustainable infrastructure. Edgar and Associates supports the implementation of compost, and policies regarding soil health and reduced vehicle miles travelled (VMTs).		Thank you for your comment.	California Compost Coalition [85]
We would highly recommend that this plan includes a component for ‘carbon farming’ where compost derived from urban green waste can be sequestered onto the natural working lands of Sacramento County. Whereas we see good policies about compost and soil health, the lynchpin to using this compost for carbon farming deserves a mention in the Climate Action Plan.		New policy added to goal section ERC-9: "Regenerative Food System. The City shall encourage regenerative agriculture practices in urban agriculture uses, including carbon-sequestering practices."	California Compost Coalition [85]
Compost Use should be used on the Natural Working Lands of Sacramento County		Thank you for your comment.	California Compost Coalition [85]
Soil Health should include Carbon Farming		New policy added to goal section ERC-9: "Regenerative Food System. The City shall encourage regenerative agriculture practices in urban agriculture uses, including carbon-sequestering practices."	California Compost Coalition [85]
Please stop entertaining this crazy couple who, for the sake of profit, will destroy, mutilate and ruin our fabulous atmosphere and environment in the best-kept secret in Sacramento...ENOUGH SAID....NOW TAKE ACTION AND DON'T LOOK BACK!!!		Thank you for your comment.	rwhgeo [82]
Introduction			
I see you swallow the LIE about CO2 causing warming. It was proved otherwise is a study of 400,000 years of ice core samples in Vostok, Antarctica. Of course, you can't believe it or change your agenda because you'd have to have a backbone. Anyhow, if you can interpret a graph, the graph in this article proves it: http://www.geocraft.com/WVFossils/last_400k_yrs.html Comparison of Atmospheric Temperature with CO2 Over The Last 400,000 Years So, unfortunately, you will continue to push the LIE, despite now educated.		Thank you for your comment.	steve holmes [K-ERC-1]
It would be nice to have more easily accessible community gardens all over the city		Please see EJ-2.8 (Home and Community Gardening), EJ-2.13 (Public-Private Partnerships), EJ-2.17 (Healthy Food Promotion), and EJ-34 (Healthy Environment) for policies that support community gardens in the city.	AMANDA OSTERHOUT [K-ERC-1]
I appreciate this map and how clearly it shows that the main sources of noise are indeed the highways and large arterial corridors.		Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-1]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
So important, thank you. Businesses/individuals to potentially adopt trees/corridors (which many do already I believe) so they are reminded (additional resources) to keep areas clean and add an additional layer of stewardship.		Thank you for your comment.	Stephanie Becker [K-ERC-1]
Water Resources			
Add in ER 1.1.5 ("Limit Stormwater Peak Flows"), ER 1.1.6 ("Post-Development Runoff"); and ER1.1.9 ("Groundwater Recharge") from the 2035 General Plan unless already incorporated in other 2040 GP policies. (See 2035 GP pages 2-312 and 2-313). These additions will strengthen the 2040 policies and avoid regressing on these points from the 2035 plan.		Please See PFS-3.16 Stormwater Design in Private, ERC-1.4 Construction Site Impacts, ERC-5.2 Reducing Storm Runoff, PFS-4.4 Groundwater Infrastructure, PFS-4.2 Water Supply Sustainability Development.	Corey Brown [K-ERC-2]
I really appreciate that the text here mentions how extensive paving affects groundwater levels and flooding and our water resources. I think this text underplays how significant the impact of the amount of paving we have. This text should also explicitly mention that the main source of extensive impermeable surfaces like asphalt and concrete are massive car infrastructure - highways, arterial corridor, multiple vehicle travel lanes, surface parking lots. One of the limitations of the way this plan is set up is that it doesn't show the issues intersect and affect each other - land use for cars creates more paving which affects water resources. It is disappointing for the ERC section to not include much mention of the impacts of car dependency and sprawl even though they're a main (if not root) cause of many of our environmental constraints, or they at least severely exacerbate our environmental constraints. This sentence shows the importance of depaving and removing parking, making sidewalk bulbouts for space around trees, and making streets narrower		Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-2]
Groundwater quality is also highly affected by urban runoff with petrochemical products and microplastics from vehicle tires. Another reason why it's important to be explicit about why our VMT reduction goal directly supports many of these ERC goals.		Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-2]
At the end of this paragraph, add the following language from page 2-311 of the 2035 General Plan: "Clean Water is essential in sustaining present and future generations, as well as, fisheries, plants, and animals that are part of the ecosystem.		Page 6-2, "Water Resources", bottom of left column, revised to say: "...which requires preparation and maintenance of a groundwater sustainability or management plan. Clean water is essential in sustaining present and future generations, as well as fisheries, plants, and animals that are part of the ecosystem, and t he City's continued participation in regional groundwater initiatives will help to ensure that Sacramento's groundwater remains a clean, sustainable water resource. Policies in this section support effective stewardship of water resources through a framework for protecting and enhancing surface and groundwater quality."	Corey Brown [K-ERC-2]
ERC-1 (water resources management)			
The environmental destruction to our waterways from illegal homeless camping is extensive. Millions of pounds of trash (including needles and human waste) line our rivers and creeks. Camping can, and should be banned in these areas, yet the City and County have ignored this problem. Here is what the often misquoted Martin v. Boise actually says: "we in no way dictate to the City that it must provide sufficient shelter for the homeless, or allow anyone who wishes to sit, lie, or sleep in the streets...at any time and at any place."	Goal ERC-1	Thank you for your comment.	Richard Watson [K-ERC-2]
Add ER1.1.1 from the 2035 General Plan that provides: "Conservation of Open Space Areas. The City shall conserve and where feasible create or restore areas that provide important water quality benefits such as riparian corridors, buffer areas, wetlands, undeveloped open space areas, levees, and drainage canals for the purpose of protecting water resources in the City's watershed, creeks, and the Sacramento and American rivers." As an addition, insert "and habitat" after "protecting water resources." (Page 2-311 of the 2035 General Plan)	ERC-1.1 (Clean Water Programs)	N/A	Corey Brown [K-ERC-2]
Per my previous comment, I just saw that ER 1.1.1 from the 2035 General Plan is now incorporated under "Biological Resources" in the draft 2040 GP under ERC-2.1. Thank you for including this important policy in the plan.	ERC-1.1 (Clean Water Programs)	response to Corey Brown; N/A	Corey Brown [K-ERC-2]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The City should go further in reducing water pollution from non-point sources by implementing various stormwater capture projects that reduce water pollution, help conserve water supplies, and help recharge groundwater basins. Recommend adding the following at the end of this policy: "The City shall advance projects that capture stormwater to prevent pollution of our rivers, help recharge groundwater supplies, and reduce potable water consumption."	ERC-1.3 (Runoff Contamination)	Please also see LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces), ERC-1.4 (Construction Site Impacts), ERC-5.2 (Reducing Storm Runoff), ERC-10.8 (Alternative Paving Materials), PFS-3.15 (Adequate Drainage Facilities), PFS-3.16 (Stormwater Design in Private Development), and PFS-A.4 (Stormwater Master Planning) for policies that support stormwater management.	Corey Brown [K-ERC-2]
Awesome suggestion!	ERC-1.3 (Runoff Contamination)	Please also see LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces), ERC-1.4 (Construction Site Impacts), ERC-5.2 (Reducing Storm Runoff), ERC-10.8 (Alternative Paving Materials), PFS-3.15 (Adequate Drainage Facilities), PFS-3.16 (Stormwater Design in Private Development), and PFS-A.4 (Stormwater Master Planning) for policies that support stormwater management.	AMANDA OSTERHOUT [K-ERC-2]
Also agree. Capture and reuse of gray water will become increasingly important as heat increases and drought worsens	ERC-1.3 (Runoff Contamination)	Please also see LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces), ERC-1.4 (Construction Site Impacts), ERC-5.2 (Reducing Storm Runoff), ERC-10.8 (Alternative Paving Materials), PFS-3.15 (Adequate Drainage Facilities), PFS-3.16 (Stormwater Design in Private Development), and PFS-A.4 (Stormwater Master Planning) for policies that support stormwater management.	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-2]
ERC 1:Clean Water: ERC 1.3 which discusses runoff contamination impact, underscores the importance of designing projects that include space for plants and trees and use permeable rather than impermeable surfaces so that water can go into the ground rather than becoming runoff.		Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [52]
After new developments, insert: "protect the quality of water bodies and natural drainage systems through site design (e.g. cluster development), source controls, storm water treatment, runoff reduction measures, best management practices (BMPs), and Low Impact Development (LID), and hydromodification strategies to avoid or ..." This language strengthens this policy and is taken from E.R.1.1.4 of the 2035 General Plan.	ERC-1.4 (Construction Site Impacts)	Policy will be revised per comment suggestion. The following revision will be made to policy ERC-1.4 (Construction Site Impacts): "The City shall require new development to protect the quality of water bodies and natural drainage systems through site design (e.g., cluster development), source controls, stormwater treatment, runoff reduction measures, best management practices (BMPs), Low Impact Development (LID), and hydromodification strategies to avoid or minimize disturbances..."	Corey Brown [K-ERC-2]
After "developments to", insert "avoid or". Avoidance should be the first priority.	ERC-1.4 (Construction Site Impacts)	Policy will be revised per comment suggestion. The following revision will be made to policy ERC-1.4 (Construction Site Impacts): "The City shall require new development to protect the quality of water bodies and natural drainage systems through site design (e.g., cluster development), source controls, stormwater treatment, runoff reduction measures, best management practices (BMPs), Low Impact Development (LID), and hydromodification strategies to avoid or minimize disturbances..."	Corey Brown [K-ERC-2]
The official name of the Natomas East Main Drain Canal is Steelhead Creek. We respectfully ask that you amend this to reflect the community and city's preferred legal name. The canal replaces natural drainage although local residents recall usage of the name Steelhead Creek. The use of the name Natomas East Main Drain Canal promotes resource neglect not enhancement. Our community associations requests amendment of any City proposed plans, ordinances, maps and other documents to properly identify Steelhead Creek, including the North Natomas Community Plan.		References to the "Natomas East Main Drainage Canal" have been changed to "Steelhead Creek" on pages 11-NN-1, 11-NN-20 (NN-YPRO-2 (Ninos Parkway)), 11-NS-1, and 11-NS-5.	Barbara Graichen [73]

Biological Resources

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>While this section does contain a number of very good policies, it is less protective of biological resources than the 2035 General Plan as it does not include several existing policies that should be added to make this part of the 2040 GP adequate. Accordingly, please add the following policies from the 2035 GP to this section: ER2.1.3 (Natural Lands Management); ER 2.1.4 (Retain Habitat Areas); 2.1.5 (Riparian Habitat Integrity); ER 2.1.6 (Wetland Protection); ER 2.1.7 (Grassland Protection); 2.1.8 (Oak Woodlands); ER 2.1.9 (Wildlife Corridors); ER 2.1.10 (Habitat Assessments); ER 2.1.11 (Agency Coordination); ER 2.1.13 (Support Habitat Conservation Plan Efforts); ER 2.1.15 (Climate Change-related Habitat Restoration and Enhancement); and ER 2.1.17 (Community Involvement). I did not reference the 2035 policies regarding the Natomas Basin as I am not current on these issues.</p>		<p>The title of ERC-2.1 has been revised to say: "ERC-2.1 Conservation of Water Resources in Open Space Areas."</p> <p>The following ER policies from the 2035 GP have been carried over to the 2040 GP into goal section ERC-2:</p> <p>ER 2.1.6 Wetland Protection. The City shall preserve and protect wetland resources including creeks, rivers, ponds, marshes, vernal pools, and other seasonal wetlands, to the extent feasible. If not feasible, the mitigation of all adverse impacts on wetland resources shall be required in compliance with State and Federal regulations protecting wetland resources, and if applicable, threatened or endangered species. Additionally, the City shall require either on- or off-site permanent preservation of an equivalent amount of wetland habitat to ensure no-netloss of value and/or function.</p> <p>ER 2.1.7 Annual Grasslands. The City shall preserve and protect native grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species. If not feasible, the mitigation of all adverse impacts on annual grasslands shall comply with State and Federal regulations protecting foraging habitat for those species known to utilize this habitat.</p>	<p>Corey Brown [K-ERC-3]</p>
		<p>(cont.) ER 2.1.9 Wildlife Corridors. The City shall preserve, protect, and avoid impacts to natural, undisturbed habitats that provides movement corridors for sensitive wildlife species. If corridors are adversely affected, damaged habitat shall, be replaced with habitat of equivalent value or enhanced to enable the continued movement of species.</p> <p>ER 2.1.10 Habitat Assessments. The City shall consider the potential impact on sensitive plants and wildlife for each project requiring discretionary approval. If site conditions are such that potential habitat for sensitive plant and/or wildlife species may be present, the City shall require habitat assessments, prepared by a qualified biologist, for sensitive plant and wildlife species. If the habitat assessment determines that suitable habitat for sensitive plant and/or wildlife species is present, then either (1) protocol-level surveys shall be conducted (where survey protocol has been established by a resource agency), or, in the absence of established survey protocol, a focused survey shall be conducted consistent with industry-recognized best practices; or (2) suitable habitat and presence of the species shall be assumed to occur within all potential habitat locations identified on the project site. Survey Reports shall be prepared and submitted to the City and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (depending on the species) for further consultation and development of avoidance and/ or mitigation measures consistent with state and federal law.</p>	
		<p>(cont.) ER 2.1.11 Agency Coordination. The City shall coordinate with State and Federal resource agencies (e.g., California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to protect areas containing rare or endangered species of plants and animals.</p> <p>ER 2.1.12 Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan. The City shall continue to participate in and support the policies of the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan for the protection of biological resources in the Natomas Basin.</p> <p>ER 2.1.13 Support Habitat Conservation Plan Efforts. The City shall encourage and support regional habitat conservation planning efforts to conserve and manage habitat for special status species. New or amended Habitat Conservation Plans should provide a robust adaptive management component sufficient to ensure that habitat preserves are resilient to climate change effects/impacts and to ensure their mitigation value over time. Provisions should include, but are not limited to: greater habitat ranges and diversity; corridors and transition zones to accommodate retreat or spatial shifts in natural areas; redundant water supply; elevated topography to accommodate extreme flooding; and flexible management and fee structure.</p>	

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
		<p>(cont.) ER 2.1.14 Climate Change-related Habitat Shifts. The City shall support the efforts of The Natomas Basin Conservancy and other habitat preserve managers to adaptively manage wildlife preserves to ensure adequate connectivity, habitat range, and diversity of topographic and climatic conditions are provided for species to move as climate shifts.</p> <p>ER 2.1.15 Climate Change-related Habitat Restoration and Enhancement. The City shall support active habitat restoration and enhancement to reduce impact of climate change stressors and improve overall resilience of habitat within existing parks and open space in the city. The City shall support the efforts of Sacramento County to improve the resilience of habitat areas in the American River Parkway.</p>	
define "valuable" and include "sensitive" species		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-ERC-3]
Please insert "restore" after "preserve." Habitat restoration is very important to increase the health of our natural systems and their ability to provide environmental services including flood control and water quality.		<p>Revision to last sentence of "Biological Resources" subsection to say, "...Policies in this section seek to preserve, restore, and protect..."</p> <p>ERC-2.5 (Environmental Awareness) also revised to say, "...encourage the protection and restoration of natural resources."</p>	Corey Brown [K-ERC-3]
We request the Council retain the Biological Resources (ERC2) in the 2035 General Plan, adopted in March 2015, rather than change to those in the 2040 draft General Plan. Specific policies that have been removed include references to the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan and the Natomas Basin Conservancy. The Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan mitigates the development in the North Natomas Community impact on habitat and threatened species and demonstrates what the City has achieved in protecting natural areas. The General Plan should acknowledge rather than obfuscate this achievement.		<p>The title of ERC-2.1 has been revised to say: "ERC-2.1 Conservation of Water Resources in Open Space Areas."</p> <p>The following ER policies from the 2035 GP have been carried over to the 2040 GP into goal section ERC-2:</p> <p>ER 2.1.6 Wetland Protection. The City shall preserve and protect wetland resources including creeks, rivers, ponds, marshes, vernal pools, and other seasonal wetlands, to the extent feasible. If not feasible, the mitigation of all adverse impacts on wetland resources shall be required in compliance with State and Federal regulations protecting wetland resources, and if applicable, threatened or endangered species. Additionally, the City shall require either on- or off-site permanent preservation of an equivalent amount of wetland habitat to ensure no-netloss of value and/or function.</p> <p>ER 2.1.7 Annual Grasslands. The City shall preserve and protect native grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species. If not feasible, the mitigation of all adverse impacts on annual grasslands shall comply with State and Federal regulations protecting foraging habitat for those species known to utilize this habitat.</p>	ECOS (Friends of Swainson's Hawk) [42]
		<p>(cont.) ER 2.1.9 Wildlife Corridors. The City shall preserve, protect, and avoid impacts to natural, undisturbed habitats that provides movement corridors for sensitive wildlife species. If corridors are adversely affected, damaged habitat shall, be replaced with habitat of equivalent value or enhanced to enable the continued movement of species.</p> <p>ER 2.1.10 Habitat Assessments. The City shall consider the potential impact on sensitive plants and wildlife for each project requiring discretionary approval. If site conditions are such that potential habitat for sensitive plant and/or wildlife species may be present, the City shall require habitat assessments, prepared by a qualified biologist, for sensitive plant and wildlife species. If the habitat assessment determines that suitable habitat for sensitive plant and/or wildlife species is present, then either (1) protocol-level surveys shall be conducted (where survey protocol has been established by a resource agency), or, in the absence of established survey protocol, a focused survey shall be conducted consistent with industry-recognized best practices; or (2) suitable habitat and presence of the species shall be assumed to occur within all potential habitat locations identified on the project site. Survey Reports shall be prepared and submitted to the City and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (depending on the species) for further consultation and development of avoidance and/ or mitigation measures consistent with state and federal law.</p>	

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
		<p>(cont.) ER 2.1.11 Agency Coordination. The City shall coordinate with State and Federal resource agencies (e.g., California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to protect areas containing rare or endangered species of plants and animals.</p> <p>ER 2.1.12 Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan. The City shall continue to participate in and support the policies of the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan for the protection of biological resources in the Natomas Basin.</p> <p>ER 2.1.13 Support Habitat Conservation Plan Efforts. The City shall encourage and support regional habitat conservation planning efforts to conserve and manage habitat for special status species. New or amended Habitat Conservation Plans should provide a robust adaptive management component sufficient to ensure that habitat preserves are resilient to climate change effects/impacts and to ensure their mitigation value over time. Provisions should include, but are not limited to: greater habitat ranges and diversity; corridors and transition zones to accommodate retreat or spatial shifts in natural areas; redundant water supply; elevated topography to accommodate extreme flooding; and flexible management and fee structure.</p>	
		<p>(cont.) ER 2.1.14 Climate Change-related Habitat Shifts. The City shall support the efforts of The Natomas Basin Conservancy and other habitat preserve managers to adaptively manage wildlife preserves to ensure adequate connectivity, habitat range, and diversity of topographic and climatic conditions are provided for species to move as climate shifts.</p> <p>ER 2.1.15 Climate Change-related Habitat Restoration and Enhancement. The City shall support active habitat restoration and enhancement to reduce impact of climate change stressors and improve overall resilience of habitat within existing parks and open space in the city. The City shall support the efforts of Sacramento County to improve the resilience of habitat areas in the American River Parkway.</p>	
<p>If the City wishes to proceed by including a Natural Areas designation in the 2040 General Plan as outlined by the Campaign (ECOS Campaign for Natural Areas), the City should begin by the same clear and well-published public notification and public comment period that they have held for other aspects of the 2040 General Plan.</p> <p>I require that the following process is implemented by the City before placing any Natural Area Designations within the 2040 General Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a city-wide public unbiased survey (and not substitute this City survey with the Valley Vision survey conducted a year ago for a different purpose); 2. publish with at least 2 months notice a series of public workshops and informational sessions in every council district to inform and include the public in the meaning and implications of the Natural Area designation; and 3. a 60-90 public comment period on the proposed Natural Area designations ahead of any City Council vote. <p>If this cannot be accomplished in time to include in the 2040 General Plan, I require that every step of the above process still be conducted with the goal of being included in the 2045 General Plan update. The City has an obligation to bring any changes of public spaces this widespread to the 2040 General Plan with time for clear public review and comment before being made City policy and placed in any General Plan.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment. At this time, the 2040 General Plan has no plans to include a Natural Area designation. Please follow updates for the forthcoming Parks Plan 2040 for additional details on how the City will plan for green areas and open space.</p>	<p>Dennis Palmquist [60]; Susan Boone-Rowan [61]; Peter Budge [62]; Tristan Albor [63]; Joshua Everett [64]; Klynton Kammerer [65]; Melissa Wharton [66]; Michael Corley [67]; Cole Trouberman [68]; Caley Smith [69]; Matthew King [70]; Kevin DiLoreto [71]; Jon Feenstra [72]</p>
<p>Address toxic tobacco product waste (TTPW). Toxic tobacco waste includes, but is not limited to, discarded cigarette 'filters', cigarillo and cigar tips, waste from electronic smoking devices (e.g. vapes, e-cigarettes), and single-use packaging. All of these products are toxic, hazardous, expensive for communities to cleanup and dispose of, and disproportionately impact communities low-income, and communities of color in the Sacramento region.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>Sacramento Sierra Club [81]</p>
<p>Sacramento Sierra Club supports recommendations to maintain the City's commitment to its current boundary in North Natomas.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>Sacramento Sierra Club [81]</p>
<p>Sacramento Sierra Club supports recommendations to protect the Natomas Basin Conservation Plan conservation strategy and Natomas Basin Conservancy</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>Sacramento Sierra Club [81]</p>

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Sacramento Sierra Club supports recommendations to maintain the integrity of and expand the protect area in the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan		Thank you for your comment.	Sacramento Sierra Club [81]
Sacramento Sierra Club supports recommendations to support the County Urban Services Boundary (USB) and County farmland and open space protection policies		Thank you for your comment.	Sacramento Sierra Club [81]
ERC-2 (thriving natural resources)			
As noted in my previous comment, extensive damage to our waterways has occurred and will continue to do so as long as illegal camping is allowed in these areas. See documentation of such damage at: https://www.youtube.com/@rivercitywaterwayalliance4646	Goal ERC-2	Thank you for your comment.	Richard Watson [K-ERC-3]
ERC 2: Biological Resources: ERC 2.4 calls out the importance of native and climate adapted plants. They should be included in the landscape plans for all new development, including infill development. These plants will save on water use and they also support local pollinators and other beneficial insects.	Goal ERC-2	Policy ERC-3-5 (Tree List) revised to say: "The City shall maintain and update a list of desirable trees that suit soil and climate conditions in specific areas of Sacramento. Consider carbon sequestration potential of selected species. Continue to explore and promote Select tree species that demonstrate greater adaptiveness to projected climate change impacts, including the ability to thrive: - in higher temperatures;,- -with reduced water use;,- - with grey and recycled water; and - with increased pest and disease prevalence resistance. "	Karen Jacques [52]
Insert "habitat" between "water quality" and "benefits" and insert "and habitat" between "water resources" and "an in the city's". This policy should be more express about protecting habitat which is primary to protecting biological resources.	ERC-2.1 (Conservation of Open Spaces)	Policy ERC-2.1 (Conservation of Open Space Areas) revised to say: "The City shall support efforts to conserve and, where feasible, create or restore areas that provide important water quality and habitat benefits such as creeks, riparian corridors, buffer zones, wetlands, undeveloped open space areas, levees, and drainage canals for the purpose of protecting water resources and habitats in the city's watersheds, creeks, and the Sacramento and American Rivers."	Corey Brown [K-ERC-3]
Staff initiated the following revisions for clarity.	ERC-2.1 (Conservation of Open Spaces)	Policy ERC-2.1 (Conservation of Water Resources in Open Space Areas) revised to say: " The City shall continue to preserve, protect, and provide appropriate access to designated open space areas along the American and Sacramento Rivers, floodways, and undevelopable floodplains, provided access would not disturb sensitive habitats or species, and The City shall support efforts to conserve and, where feasible, create or restore areas that provide important water quality and habitat benefits such as creeks, riparian corridors, buffer zones, wetlands, undeveloped open space areas, levees, and drainage canals for the purpose of protecting water resources and habitats in the city's watersheds, creeks, and the Sacramento and American Rivers."	Staff
The City should not just be "supporting efforts" by unnamed parties, the City should demonstrate leadership in protecting, connecting, and restoring landscapes within its sphere of influence, especially on lands already owned by the City! The City needs to establish a Natural Areas Program and embrace the theme of "nature in the city". Contrary to the General Plan 2035, and at least since 2009, the City has been actively attempting to give away and/or sell public parkland within Del Paso Regional Park to developers for private profit. Although the City Council unanimously designated 100-acres of Natural Areas within that Park in 1985 and 2002, City staff have never pro-actively proposed the formal designation of Natural Areas within the Park even though ~100 acres remain as unprotected, de facto, natural areas vulnerable to development. The conservation of the Park was always driven by the environmental community, and City staff and elected officials have always been reluctant partners. For example, it took 17 years for environmentalists to secure protection for the Longview Oaks Preserve, and that was only after we fended-off the City's planned hotel complex (1984-1990), and a planned industrial development (1995-2002).	ERC-2.1 (Conservation of Open Spaces)	Thank you for your comment. At this time, the 2040 General Plan has no plans to include a Natural Area designation. Please follow updates for the forthcoming Parks Plan 2040 for additional details on how the City will plan for green areas and open space.	Tim Vendlinski [K-ERC-3]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>(cont.) In 2014, the City staff and Council proposed conveying ~30 acres of parkland on the East Side of the Park (covered with thousands of native oaks) to a developer (SIBA) in exchange for the conversion of the 300-seat municipal ballpark at Renfree Field to a 3,000-seat stadium and retail complex.</p> <p>https://saccreeks.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/HagginOaksBackgroundReport_Draft11-10-09.pdf</p> <p>http://sacramento.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=7&clip_id=1194&meta_id=102142</p> <p>http://sacramento.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=22&clip_id=3537&meta_id=428497</p>			(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-ERC-3]
Recommend adding the following at the end of this policy: "The City should advance projects to protect and restore habitat along our waterways including at Sutter's Landing Park and other locations."	ERC-2.1 (Conservation of Open Spaces)	Please see goal section LUP-11, which includes policies that aim to create built and natural environments within the city that prioritize, support, promote, and embrace ecological regeneration and responsible resource stewardship, among other priorities.	Corey Brown [K-ERC-3]
Suggest adding to the end of this policy: "When mitigation is required for impacts to biological resources, highest priority shall be on locating in-kind mitigation in or as near as practical to the areas of impact. If on-site mitigation is not feasible or would have minimal biological benefits, mitigation should be located to increase the value of important habitat areas that are nearby (for example, along the American River, Sacramento River, local creeks, etc.)."	ERC-2.2 (Biological Resources)	Thank you for your comment. The policy, as-written, captures what the commenter is recommending. Project impacts are mitigated based on the recommendations of biological experts and wildlife resource agencies.	Corey Brown [K-ERC-3]
At the end of the paragraph, insert "with highest priority on avoiding adverse impacts."	ERC-2.2 (Biological Resources)	Thank you for your comment. The policy, as-written, captures what the commenter is recommending. Project impacts are mitigated based on the recommendations of biological experts and wildlife resource agencies.	Corey Brown [K-ERC-3]
This is an excellent goal/policy. In order to make this a reality, the City needs to develop a recommended native plant list for Sacramento that can be used by developers and homeowners. This list would include plant attributes such as size, sun requirements, water needs, wildlife benefits, bloom color and timing, etc. See Calscape.org for helpful native plant landscaping information.	ERC-2.3 (Onsite Preservation)	Thank you for your comment.	Dan Meier [K-ERC-3]
and restore	ERC-2.3 (Onsite Preservation)	Policy ERC-2.3 (Onsite Preservation) revised to say: "The City shall encourage new development to preserve and restore onsite natural elements..."	Dale Steele [K-ERC-3]
Love this! Planting natives also helps us reduce fertilizer loads in local waterways (many have low nutrient requirements or are nitrogen fixing) and sometimes pesticide loading as well (resilient to local pests). Consider language that would encourage the CAREFUL consideration of native plants.	ERC-2.3 (Onsite Preservation)	Thank you for your comment.	Lauren Ledesma [K-ERC-3]
Native plants would also help support beneficial insects including pollinators, some of which provide food for various bird species. The numbers of beneficial insects have been dropping drastically throughout the world (including in Sacramento). These insects are a key part of healthy ecosystems and it is important to do everything possible to increase their numbers.	ERC-2.3 (Onsite Preservation)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-3]
Very strongly support this	ERC-2.4 (Native and Climate-Adapted Plants)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-4]
Urban Forest			
The 2035 General Plan portion on the Urban Forest stated that "Extensive tree canopies reduce the urban heat island effect ..." This is a specific benefit of a healthy urban forest that should be included here.		Revision to second sentence of "Urban Forest" subsection: "Trees cool the streets and the city which reduces the urban heat island effect ; help conserve energy...sequester carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and produce oxygen ..."	Francesca Reitano [K-ERC-4]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
should add "and produce oxygen" as was stated in the 2035 General Plan.		Revision to second sentence of "Urban Forest" subsection: "Trees cool the streets and the city which reduces the urban heat island effect ; help conserve energy...sequester carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and produce oxygen ..."	Francesca Reitano [K-ERC-4]
Trees are key to reducing heat island effect which is one of the reasons Sacramento badly needs more of them. In recent years it appears that the tree canopy has been shrinking, not growing.		Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-4]
Environmental Resources and Constraints P 6-1/124-521: Should add language from GP2035: "Extensive tree canopies reduce the urban heat island effect ...and produce oxygen"		Revision to second sentence of "Urban Forest" subsection: "Trees cool the streets and the city which reduces the urban heat island effect ; help conserve energy...sequester carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and produce oxygen ..."	Trees for Sacramento [51]
I suggest including "soil compaction and extensive paving which damage their longevity"		Revision to last paragraph, second sentence of "Urban Forest" subsection: "...challenges in funding maintenance costs, soil compaction and extensive paving which damage their longevity , and overhead..."	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-4]
ER 3.1.6 from GP 2035 is missing from GP 2040's Goals and Policies for the Urban Forest. Missing: "Urban Heat Island Effects. The City shall continue to promote plantings shade trees with substantial canopies, and require, where feasible, site design that uses trees to shade rooftops, parking facilities, streets, and other facilities to minimize heat effects." Also missing is the concept of ER 3.1.9 from GP 2035, which should also be part of GP 2040: "The City shall provide adequate funding to manage and maintain he city's urban forest on City property, including tree planting, training, maintenance, removal and replacement."		Please see LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces), ERC-3.10 (Parking Lot Shading), ERC-8.1 (Cooling Design Techniques), ERC-8.2 (Large Heat Islands), ERC-A.7 (Cooling Landscape Standards), YPRO-1.21 (Climate-Resilient Design), AA-EJ-1 (Tree Planting in Parking Lots), FB-ERC-1 (Tree Planting and Maintenance) for policies that actively seek to address the effects of urban heat islands.	Francesca Reitano [K-ERC-4]
Proposed new hire density housing, runs up against the urban forest on private properties where developers can cut down significant trees and benefit mightily without repercussions based on the tree ordinance interpretations. The city ordinance language must be cleaned up to eliminate loopholes, allowing Significant heritage trees to be destroyed.		ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	hOward levine [K-ERC-4]
Three key elements must be highlighted and coordinated in these documents related to the urban forest: [1] Justice – the City planning documents, policies, codes, goals, and regulations must work toward equity in the Urban Forest across all neighborhoods. [2] Preservation – City planning documents, policies, codes, and design and zoning standards must guard the existing canopy which is endangered by climate change and development. [3] Canopy Growth – City Planning documents, policies, codes, and regulations must enhance the growth of canopy Citywide – in all developments, in all zones, in Smart Street planning, and in design standards and zoning standards.		Please see policies ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion), ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection), ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance), and ERC-3.9 (Watering and Irrigation). Please also see implementing actions ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) and ERC-A.1 (Urban Forest Plan). Finally, please see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Francesca Reitano [11]; Maggie Coulter [12]; Eric Ball [14]; Michael Silver and Chris Ratekin [16]; Maria Kelly [23]
Please continue to support the importance of Sacramento's Urban Forest. Keep our trees and the health of our urban forest in the forefront when planning for the future.		Thank you for your comment.	Sam Keshavarz [13]; Debra van Hulsteyn [15]
For all of its neighborhoods, the City needs to proactively plant trees in the front of properties that do not have sidewalk strips. In other words, the City needs to get into the business of planting trees, and maintaining the trees for 3 years, on private properties. I believe that the City should approach this as a city wide effort to achieve canopy equity. This effort should be marketed and communicated city wide. There should be a way for citizens who can afford to donate money to this end to make donations to achieve this equity. If the City is truly interested in affecting environmental justice in this area, it will take more than the commitments to "promote" and "encourage" mentioned on this page.		Please see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	Jeff Solomon [46] [47]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
We ask the City Council and city staff to keep the importance of the Urban Forest and our neighborhoods at the forefront. There are virtually no provisions in GP 2040 or the CAAP to protect our existing, mature tree canopy - 80% of which is on private property, much of it in residential front and back yards slated for upzoning and increased density.		Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on maintaining and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	Zoe and Read Harrison [28]; Christie Munson [32]; Rev. J. Patrick Kelly [33]; Angie Smith [34]; Charles Conner [35]; Ilsa Louise Hess [36]; James Falcone [41]; Lynn Orion [48]
There needs to be a commitment to requirements to preserve existing canopy – not just private protected trees –and making space for new canopy in the move toward higher density. Preserving and expanding tree canopy often conflicts with infill. Right now, with ministerial approval of infill, tree canopy is LOSING THE CONFLICT. If the City wants to preserve and grow canopy “in all neighborhoods” as called for in the City’s vision, it needs to establish legal protections for tree canopy in the development process.		Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on maintaining and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	Trees for Sacramento [51]
Can we plant our way to meeting the UTC goal? We cannot. Any existing tree canopy lost must be replaced by new planting, and that planting must grow to produce canopy, before we can increase UTC. Every percentage point of tree canopy lost to development, drought, and inadequate maintenance must be replaced by planting BEFORE any growth can occur in the canopy coverage overall. Every healthy tree we remove for infill is a step back from meeting our UTC goal.		Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on maintaining and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	Trees for Sacramento [51]
Drought, climate change, development pressure, and inadequate maintenance have taken their toll on Sacramento’s urban forest. Without the focused attention of City leaders to policies that will mitigate these challenges, we will not reach our UTC goals. There needs to be a commitment to retaining existing trees, alongside new plantings.		Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on maintaining and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	Trees for Sacramento [51]
Building UTC cannot be an afterthought; it must be built into City design. Tree Canopy cannot exist without accommodation in building and other infrastructure design. Trees cannot grow on the same space as building. Tree Canopy needs space both above (the leafy canopy) and below (the roots) ground. Growing tree canopy takes space + water + continuing care + cost (arborist care).		ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see policy ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection) and City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Trees for Sacramento [51]
Preservation of existing canopy is critical to meet the tree canopy goal. And preservation of space for future canopy must be part of the goal.		ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see policy ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection) and City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Trees for Sacramento [51]
The City must commit to a healthy canopy in every neighborhood – and in its transportation corridors and parks as well. The DACs need extra support for existing canopy and for building new canopy. Every area in the City (including commercial and industrial areas) must be explored for future canopy growth.		Please see ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion) which aims to reduce barriers to tree planting in disadvantaged communities.	Trees for Sacramento [51]
Any tree planting without support is performative. Such plantings will produce inadequate canopy growth unless there is appropriate support for growing those trees. Giving homeowners or other property owners a website link and a brochure is not appropriate support. That strategy is especially inadequate in DACs.		Please see ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion) which aims to reduce barriers to tree planting in disadvantaged communities.	Trees for Sacramento [51]
Chronic underfunding of the Urban Forestry Department is a symptom of disregard of trees. Using tree-related funding for non-tree uses is another. The Urban Forest Department is hidden away in Public Works with insufficient staff and funds to perform its duties.		Thank you for your comment.	Trees for Sacramento [51]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Creation of a Tree Committee with members drawn from the arborist, neighborhood, and advocate community, to advise the Council on tree canopy issues. This committee will be a tool for public oversight of progress toward meeting our UTC goals.		Thank you for your comment.	Trees for Sacramento [51]
Transportation Corridors: The move toward complete streets is essential, but there is scant mention or space for tree canopy. Yet if you ask any Sacramento resident which street they want to bike or walk on, they will tell you: the one with tree canopy. Tree canopy on corridors must be planned for to ensure “vibrant, walkable, and transit-supportive neighborhoods” (p. 65 of 521).		Please see LUP-8.1 (Unique Sense of Place), LUP-8.9 (People-Friendly Design), and LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces).	Trees for Sacramento [51]
Existing tree canopy. We support all efforts to plant new trees, in addition to replacing those lost and it is but it is critically important to make sure we maintain Sacramento’s existing mature tree canopy.		Please see policies ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection), ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance), ERC-3.8 (Public Education),and ERC-3.9 (Watering and Irrigation).	Sacramento Sierra Cub [81]
ERC-3 (urban forest)			
ERC 3: Urban Forest: parkway strips need to be mandatory in new neighborhoods so that this problem of no street trees doesn’t repeat itself. This section on the urban forest contains good ideas ,but these ideas need to be incorporated into a new, updated Urban Forest Master Plan and the tree equity problem needs to be resolved.	Goal ERC-3	Please see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion) prioritizes expansion efforts in disadvantaged communities.	Karen Jacques [52]
ERC 3: Urban Forest: This section also calls for a new Parking Lot Shade Ordinance because the current one doesn’t seem to be working and isn’t being enforced .The new Shade Ordinance is urgently needed because asphalt parking lots without shade turn into dangerous urban heat islands when temperatures go up.	Goal ERC-3	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [52]
ERC 3: there need to be adequate funds appropriated to manage the urban forest, including caring for the trees in parkway strips and on other City property.	Goal ERC-3	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [52]
An updated Urban Forest Master Plan is long overdue and badly needed. The delay in developing this plan has had a negative impact leaving neighborhoods that lack trees, including publicly planted and maintained street trees, still waiting for them and little consistency about replacing public street trees that have had to be removed due to death, damage or disease	ERC-3.1 (Urban Forest Plan)	The Urban Forest Plan is underway. Please see project website for updates. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/About-Urban-Forestry/Urban-Forest-Master-Plan	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-4]
The Urban Forest Plan is significantly overdue since it was originally targeted for completion in the summer of 2019. The stakeholder process for this Plan needs to be readvertised and restarted asap to ensure an adequate plan is developed consistent with the Climate Action Plan and policies of the General Plan Update. The are numerous key stakeholders missing from the original efforts.	ERC-3.1 (Urban Forest Plan)	The Urban Forest Plan is underway. Please see project website for updates. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/About-Urban-Forestry/Urban-Forest-Master-Plan	Dan Meier [K-ERC-4]
Sacramento urgently needs an Urban Forest Master Plan. We need a tree canopy throughout Sacramento. Every neighborhood needs trees and so do non-residential areas. The need for all neighborhoods to have a tree canopy is an environmental justice issue. Reducing vehicle miles traveled requires street trees. Trees must be considered part of the infrastructure necessary for active transportation and public transit. Maintaining existing canopy, including replacing trees when they die, is critical. A large percent of Sacramento’s existing trees are in backyards or other private outdoor areas. As density increases, these trees are at risk. Sacramento must require developers to create plot plans and building designs that save as many healthy, existing trees as possible and/or include space for new trees. Growing the canopy by planting new trees is also critical. Heat and drought tolerance are key to tree species selection and pollinators, birds and other wildlife will benefit from native species. The 2045 goal should be 45% canopy coverage, not 35% as proposed in the draft general plan.		Thank you for your comment. The Urban Forest Plan is in development and includes actions to meet these canopy targets.	Karen Jacques [18]
We need a more ambitious canopy goal: 25% by 2030 30% by 2035 and 45% by 2040	ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion)	Thank you for your comment. The Urban Forest Plan is in development and includes actions to meet these canopy targets.	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-4]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>The FOUR PLANS: General Plan, CAAP, Urban Forest Plan, and Parks Plan 2040 need to emphasize the need to CONSERVE, RESCUE, and STEWARD the wild native trees.</p> <p>These trees are typically seedlings and saplings of the oaks native to Sacramento (blue oak, interior live oak, and valley oak). These wild trees are typically found in untended parts of our parks and urban environs, and along fence lines. Otherwise, they are routinely killed for the sake of weed management and fuel reduction with an assortment of tools, e.g., mowers, string-trimmers, plows, scrapers, herbicides, etc.</p> <p>The wild oak seedlings and saplings are the progeny of the pre-settlement, great oaks, many of which have been lost in recent decades due to ground disturbance, turfing and irrigation, topsoil compaction, and loss of soil moisture (drought and heat).</p> <p>For example, there are thousands of oak seedlings and saplings growing in Del Paso Park, and there are no pro-active nor visionary municipal programs to safeguard these wild trees. Beyond the genetic wealth of these trees, they come free of charge to the City, require no tree stakes and ties, and require no irrigation. And yet we treat this priceless, floral heritage with complete disregard. Instead we favor the planting of expensive, nursery grown trees. These trees are often non-native and therefore provide virtually no benefits to resident and migratory wildlife while also having the downside of being energy and water intensive.</p>	ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion)	Thank you for your comment. At this time, the 2040 General Plan has no plans to include a Natural Area designation. Please follow updates for the forthcoming Parks Plan 2040 for additional details on how the City will plan for green areas and open space.	Tim Vendlinski [K-ERC-4]
I suggest adding language like "The City shall promote roadway reallocations to replace vehicle travel lanes with tree strips, particularly in tree canopy priority areas and urban heat priority areas." There are many areas where it will not be easy to plant trees without sacrificing the sidewalk, which should not be an option. Instead, we should really decrease the space for cars, especially where there are multiple vehicle travel lanes and high-speed arterial corridors. This should apply to both existing and proposed new streets. Reducing vehicle lanes and parking spaces not only creates the space we need for the trees to exist and to thrive, but it also helps us reach our other ERC goals for water infiltration, reducing noise pollution not to mention our Land Use and Placemaking goals, Mobility goals, and Climate goals.	ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion)	The primary goal of roadway reallocation is to support walking, biking, and transit. See policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets; policy also stipulates that existing street trees should be maintained and replaced, new trees installed where feasible, and street trees should be incorporated into new neighborhood streets. Additionally, Policy ERC-A.11 (Street Standards for Tree Canopy) will update the Street Standards to optimize tree canopy and provide solutions for various street functions and conditions.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-4]
We urge the Council to adopt a UTC goal in 2030 of 35% and in 2045 of 45%. The City must set higher UTC goals. Future Sacramento will be warmer, and must have more tree cover than that called for in this General Plan. Setting the UTC goal in this document so low will tie the hands of those working on the long overdue Urban Forest Master Plan.		Thank you for your comment. The Urban Forest Plan is in development and includes actions to meet these canopy targets.	Trees for Sacramento [51]
ERC -3.2 Tree Canopy Expansion: Focusing on tree canopy on private property is largely outside the authority or influence of the City. We encourage prioritizing metrics that focus on street trees that shade sidewalks and reduce the amount of sunlight reaching asphalt. These trees are also most likely to be maintained and planted by the City.	ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion)	Please see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	House Sacramento [21]
In response to CAAP comments, the following revision was made.		Policy ERC-3-2 (Tree Canopy Expansion) revised to say: "The City should strive to achieve a 25 percent urban tree canopy cover by 2030 and 35 percent by 2045. Prioritize tree planting and tree maintenance in areas with the lowest average canopy cover and explore strategies to reduce barriers to tree planting in disadvantaged communities and improve tree health."	CAAP
ERC 3.3 requiring "private development projects to consider alternatives to removals of healthy trees" is no requirement at all. Requiring to "consider" is too weak of a standard to preserve our existing tree canopy. If there is a lack of objective design standards the trees will fall, especially in the case of ministerial approvals of projects large and small.	ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Francesca Reitano [K-ERC-4]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
I strongly agree with the preceding comment. It is currently far too easy for developers to remove healthy trees and, without a much clearer set of regulations, including requiring plot plans that design around existing trees wherever possible or leave space for new trees, and design guidelines that call for step backs to accommodate canopy trees, Sacramento will just keep losing trees. It is possible to increase density and increase canopy, but it requires clear, thoughtful design standards that support this goal	ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-4]
ERC 3.3 (Tree Protection) language must be strengthened. Requiring "private development projects to consider alternatives to removals of healthy trees" is no requirement at all. To "consider" is too weak of a standard for preserving our existing tree canopy.	ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection)	Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on maintaining and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	Trees for Sacramento [51]
In many areas that are lacking street trees, including low income areas, there is no planting strip (ie public right of way) next to the sidewalks to plant city owned and maintained trees. The city planted and maintained trees in front yards, on private property, to compensate, but abandoned these trees in the early 90s. That is one reason there is a lack on canopy there. What can the city do to create planting space?	ERC-3.4 (Private Streets)	M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) provide guidance for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Additionally, the Urban Forest Plan is underway. Please see project website for updates. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/About-Urban-Forestry/Urban-Forest-Master-Plan	Francesca Reitano [K-ERC-6]
Trees that shade the street, whether in parkway strips or front lawns where there are no parkway strips are the infrastructure necessary to make walking and bicycling possible on hot days. If the City wants to get people out of their cars, it will take trees. There is also an equity issue here with some neighborhoods getting public trees that shade their sidewalks and streets (and lowering their energy bills) and other neighborhoods, including many of Sacramento's poorest neighborhoods, not getting public street trees and the benefits those trees provide because they were designed without parkway strips	ERC-3.4 (Private Streets)	ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion) prioritizes tree planting in areas with the lowest average canopy coverage and explores strategies to reduce barriers to tree planting in disadvantaged communities.	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-6]
This is why it's important to reduce the amount of space we've over-allocated to cars. I suggest adding language like "The City shall promote roadway reallocations to replace vehicle travel lanes with tree strips, particularly in tree canopy priority areas and urban heat priority areas."	ERC-3.4 (Private Streets)	The primary goal of roadway reallocation is to support walking, biking, and transit. See policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets; policy also stipulates that existing street trees should be maintained and replaced, new trees installed where feasible, and street trees should be incorporated into new neighborhood streets. Additionally, Policy ERC-A.11 (Street Standards for Tree Canopy) will update the Street Standards to optimize tree canopy and provide solutions for various street functions and conditions.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-6]
Include a metric about the extent to which private streets should include trees, such as "street trees to achieve 35% tree canopy coverage of the private development area by 2045," to support the City's tree canopy goal. Otherwise, there is no metric about how MANY street trees to be planted.	ERC-3.4 (Private Streets)	Thank you for your comment. The Urban Forest Plan is in development and includes actions to meet these canopy targets.	Teri Duarte [K-ERC-6]
ERC-3.4 (Private Streets): we have learned that the city is frequently not replacing city trees that have been removed. Often these are large canopy trees.	ERC-3.4 (Private Streets)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see policy ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection) and City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Trees for Sacramento [51]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>The Tree List used by the City needs to emphasize the planting of trees native to the California floristic province. UC Davis and CalPoly are advancing the doctrine of "climate ready trees" and interpreting "biological diversity" to mean planting urban and suburban trees in California from an array of foreign, hot, and arid geographical areas. While some of these trees are attractive and provide various levels of shade and cooling, they are ecologically irrelevant to the Sacramento Valley.</p> <p>The City's existing tree list consists of ~90% non-native trees while almost totally ignoring the wealth and diversity of native trees and large shrubs within the California floristic province.</p> <p>https://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/meet-ecologist-who-wants-unleash-wild-backyard-180974372/</p> <p>https://climateredytrees.ucdavis.edu</p> <p>https://ufei.calpoly.edu</p>	ERC-3.5 (Tree List)	<p>Policy ERC-3-5 (Tree List) revised to say: "The City shall maintain and update a list of desirable trees that suit soil and climate conditions in specific areas of Sacramento. Consider carbon sequestration potential of selected species. Continue to explore and promoteSelect tree species that demonstrate greater adaptiveness to projected climate change impacts, including the ability to thrive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in higher temperatures;,- -with reduced water use;,- - with grey and recycled water;,- and - with increased pest and disease prevalence resistance." 	Tim Vendlinski [K-ERC-6]
<p>It will be important for the City to focus on trees that are climate resilient, and that address carbon sequestration, minimize water use, and provide wildlife habitat benefits.. To achieve these benefits, California native trees need to be a significant component of future plantings. The Urban Forest Plan will need to collect and develop scientific information to create a tree list to address climate resiliency and wildlife needs. This will require the City to look well beyond the typical urban trees that are often planted throughout the United States and without regard to local conditions. Local trees support local wildlife.</p>	ERC-3.5 (Tree List)	<p>Policy ERC-3-5 (Tree List) revised to say: "The City shall maintain and update a list of desirable trees that suit soil and climate conditions in specific areas of Sacramento. Consider carbon sequestration potential of selected species. Continue to explore and promoteSelect tree species that demonstrate greater adaptiveness to projected climate change impacts, including the ability to thrive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in higher temperatures;,- -with reduced water use;,- - with grey and recycled water;,- and - with increased pest and disease prevalence resistance." 	Dan Meier [K-ERC-6]
<p>Agree with all of this! Native trees should be the priority.</p>	ERC-3.5 (Tree List)	<p>Policy ERC-3-5 (Tree List) revised to say: "The City shall maintain and update a list of desirable trees that suit soil and climate conditions in specific areas of Sacramento. Consider carbon sequestration potential of selected species. Continue to explore and promoteSelect tree species that demonstrate greater adaptiveness to projected climate change impacts, including the ability to thrive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in higher temperatures;,- -with reduced water use;,- - with grey and recycled water;,- and - with increased pest and disease prevalence resistance." 	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-6]
<p>After "resistance," insert "as well as provide habitat values"</p>	ERC-3.5 (Tree List)	<p>Policy ERC-3-5 (Tree List) revised to say: "The City shall maintain and update a list of desirable trees that suit soil and climate conditions in specific areas of Sacramento. Consider carbon sequestration potential of selected species. Continue to explore and promoteSelect tree species that demonstrate greater adaptiveness to projected climate change impacts, including the ability to thrive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in higher temperatures;,- -with reduced water use;,- - with grey and recycled water;,- and - with increased pest and disease prevalence resistance." 	Corey Brown [K-ERC-6]
<p>Are trees from warmer climates considered for this list? Climate change will be impacting biomes.</p>	ERC-3.5 (Tree List)	<p>Policy ERC-3-5 (Tree List) revised to say: "The City shall maintain and update a list of desirable trees that suit soil and climate conditions in specific areas of Sacramento. Consider carbon sequestration potential of selected species. Continue to explore and promoteSelect tree species that demonstrate greater adaptiveness to projected climate change impacts, including the ability to thrive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in higher temperatures;,- -with reduced water use;,- - with grey and recycled water;,- and - with increased pest and disease prevalence resistance." 	Ian Treat [K-ERC-6]
<p>Change "explore the selection of tree species..." to "prioritize the selection of tree species..." Stronger language is needed to guide the City toward planting more native (climate appropriate) species.</p>	ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance)	<p>ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) revised to say: "...and continue to explore prioritize the selection of tree species..."</p>	Teri Duarte [K-ERC-6]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
This section should include a requirement that the City shall REPLACE all trees lost in its urban forest, whether due to weather events, vehicle collisions, natural death, or whatever the cause. Currently, when the City has been requested through 311 to replace lost trees, there has been no response.	ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance)	Policy ERC-3-2 (Tree Canopy Expansion) revised to say: "The City should strive to achieve a 25 percent urban tree canopy cover by 2030 and 35 percent by 2045. Prioritize tree planting and tree maintenance in areas with the lowest average canopy cover and explore strategies to reduce barriers to tree planting in disadvantaged communities and improve tree health."	Teri Duarte [K-ERC-6]
A concept that is missing in GP 2040 and should be included: GP 2035 said "ensure new developments have sufficient right-of-way width for tree plantings, manage and care for all publicly owned trees [a no brainer], and work to retain healthy trees. The city shall monitor, evaluate and report, by community plan area and city wide, on the entire tree canopy in order to maintain and enhance trees throughout the City and to identify opportunities for new plantings." The concept of monitoring the ENTIRE tree canopy - not just city trees - is missing from the 2018 Davey report and is a missing concept in GP 2040.	ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance)	See policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets; policy also stipulates that existing street trees should be maintained and replaced, new trees installed where feasible, and street trees should be incorporated into new neighborhood streets.	Francesca Reitano [K-ERC-6]
Also missing is the requirement that the city "ensure new developments have sufficient right-of-way width for tree plantings"	ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance)	See policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets; policy also stipulates that existing street trees should be maintained and replaced, new trees installed where feasible, and street trees should be incorporated into new neighborhood streets.	Francesca Reitano [K-ERC-6]
I strongly agree with all of those comments. Monitoring the canopy is necessary to assure that the City meets its' canopy goals. Such monitoring is also necessary to assure that equity issues are being addressed	ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance)	See policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets; policy also stipulates that existing street trees should be maintained and replaced, new trees installed where feasible, and street trees should be incorporated into new neighborhood streets.	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-6]
ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) language should add back GP 2035 language: "ensure new developments have sufficient right-of-way width for tree plantings, manage and care for all publicly owned trees, and work to retain healthy trees. The city shall monitor, evaluate and report, by community plan area and city wide, on the entire tree canopy in order to maintain and enhance trees throughout the City and to identify opportunities for new plantings." The concept of monitoring the ENTIRE tree canopy - not just city trees - is missing from GP 2040.	ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance)	Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on maintaining and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	Trees for Sacramento [51]
add "by promoting stewardship of such trees"	ERC-3.7 (Trees of Significance)	ERC-3.7 promotes stewardship of city trees and private protected trees.	Francesca Reitano [K-ERC-6]
Developer should have to show that there is no possible alternative that would allow for retention of the tree. Developer should also have to design plot plan in such a way that there is space for new trees	ERC-3.7 (Trees of Significance)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code as necessary to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-6]
Private protective trees are being destroyed through developer, greed, port city ordinance, interpretation, and climate change. The words in this paragraph "where possible" take away any meaningful policy statement and make it sentiment. The words where possible should be removed.	ERC-3.7 (Trees of Significance)	Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on maintaining and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	hOward levine [K-ERC-6]
The words appropriate mitigation do not come close to the destruction of significant trees. There affects on climate, temperature, neighborhood, identity sense of place quality of life, and the beauty of nature are not Relieved by mitigation. Trees that are diseased should be destroyed taken down. Buildings that are being destroyed, and that our significance should be considered as any other priority. That's it.	ERC-3.7 (Trees of Significance)	Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on maintaining and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	hOward levine [K-ERC-6]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Do not allow the removal of private protected trees that currently help prevent heat island effects, in any part of the city, in order to allow for development of high priced and high profit redevelopment. To allow is contrary to equity for nearby residents.	ERC-3.7 (Trees of Significance)	Please see goal section ERC-3 as well as the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for policies on maintaining and expanding the tree canopy. Additionally, see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	Inderjit K Rye [K-ERC-6]
As heat continues to increase, City should extend the length of time during which new and recently planted public trees in parkway strips receive water. As heat has increased there are more recently planted public trees in parkway strips that appear to be dying due to lack of water	ERC-3.9 (Watering and Irrigation)	ERC-3.9 encourages appropriate watering practices. ERC-3.7 promotes stewardship of city trees and private protected trees. Additionally, the Urban Forest Plan is underway. Please see project website for updates. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/About-Urban-Forestry/Urban-Forest-Master-Plan	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-6]
ERC-3.9 works to conserve our natural resources, stating "The City shall encourage appropriate watering practices and irrigation to minimize needed water use and support healthy tree growth; support responsible tree irrigation during droughts to minimize tree stress and loss; and convert irrigation in parks and streetscapes where needed." The City needs to improve education and outreach on these practices, and to incentivize conserving valuable drinking water. What measures/goals will the City use?	ERC-3.9 (Watering and Irrigation)	Please see policy ERC-3.8 (Public Education).	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Just a note that the city should prioritize reducing parking lots and replacing them with green space as a way to promote urban forest over adding shading to parking lots. They're both important, but the first is a lot more effective at meeting these and other ERC goals.	ERC-3.10 (Parking Lot Shading)	AA-EJ-1 (Tree Planting in Parking Lots) works to ensure future major reuse plans will increase tree canopy and include other urban heat interventions. ERC-A.10 (Parking Lot Shade Ordinance) commits to updating the Parking Lot Shade Ordinance and Guidelines to support and improve ongoing maintenance and replacement of trees in parking lots. LUP-5.1 (Evolving Regional Commercial Centers) supports redevelopment of surface parking, drive aisles, shared parking facilities, and existing buildings to establish a more pedestrian-oriented experience, including creating more public spaces.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-6]
Parking lot shading: The existing ordinance does not seem to be well enforced. What is the use of having a standard that no one is truly required to follow?	ERC-3.10 (Parking Lot Shading)	ERC-A.10 (Parking Lot Shade Ordinance) commits to updating the Parking Lot Shade Ordinance and Guidelines to support and improve ongoing maintenance and replacement of trees in parking lots.	Francesca Reitano [K-ERC-6]
Add: The City shall enforce the Parking Lot Shade ordinance through regular inspections and enforcement actions including requiring tree maintenance and replacements and prohibiting excessive pruning as needed to maintain 50% shade coverage after 15 years.	ERC-3.10 (Parking Lot Shading)	The process of updating the Parking Lot Shade Ordinance (ERC-A.10 Parking Lot Shade Ordinance) will include updates to improve inspection and monitoring. Please also look for updates regarding the forthcoming Urban Forest Plan.	Teri Duarte [K-ERC-6]
The City must take immediate action to increase parking lot shade to reduce the heat-island effect in all neighborhoods in Sacramento (ERC-3.10) through planting trees or covering lots with solar panels.	ERC-3.10 (Parking Lot Shading)	Please see implementation action ERC-A.10 (Parking Lot Shade Ordinance).	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
ERC-3.10: Parking Lot Shading: This program lacks enforcement and most trees fail to be maintained. We support additional measures, such as bonds or fines, to facilitate the ongoing maintenance and expansion of the tree canopy within parking lots.	ERC-3.10 (Parking Lot Shading)	Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
ERC-3.10 Parking Lot Shading: existing ordinance does not seem well-enforced.	ERC-3.10 (Parking Lot Shading)	Thank you for your comment.	Trees for Sacramento [51]
ERC-3.11 Planting. This is largely going be up to the planning department - to write strong objective ordinances and to adhere to them, instead of allowing developer variances that increase lot coverage and eliminate green space and trees in deference to hardscape and structure size/shape.	ERC-3.11 (Planting)	Thank you for your comment.	Francesca Reitano [K-ERC-6]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
We are in a climate crisis. The city should mandate designs and project layouts that include trees with an option for a developer to apply for a variance if there are unusual circumstances that preclude this. Drip irrigation should be mandated for all new projects. Sacramento is predicted to get heavier rains, alternating with drought. To reduce the risk of flooding, projects need to be designed to include some minimum amount of planting area that can absorb rain water. This is also necessary to replenish the aquifer.	ERC-3.11 (Planting)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-6]
Strike "should" and insert "shall." Planting and caring for the right trees is an important climate strategy that also improves air quality and helps protect public health from extreme heat. Shade trees can also save ratepayers significant dollars on their utility bills. This should be a mandatory direction.	ERC-3.11 (Planting)	Policy ERC-3.11 (Planting) revised to say: "The City should shall encourage development..."	Corey Brown [K-ERC-6]
ERC-3.11 Planting: This is largely going to be up to the planning department - to write strong objective ordinances and to adhere to them, instead of allowing developer variances that increase lot coverage and eliminate green space and trees in deference to hardscape and structure size/shape.	ERC-3.11 (Planting)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see policy ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection) and City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Trees for Sacramento [51]
I suggest adding a goal to prioritize space for trees whenever a street is due for repaving or updating. Perhaps the language could be "When streets are due for repaving, the City shall prioritize incorporating tree planting strips in the street design to meet the City's goals for expanding tree canopy, especially in areas with the lowest average canopy cover."		See policy ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance), which supports trees in the right-of-way.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-6]
Street Tree Expansion in Right of Way: We recommend adding a new policy that seeks to expand the tree canopy within the existing right of way. Asphalt has many negative externalities, from heat island effects to stormwater runoff. We propose the following: "In areas with limited planting strips or with excess pavement, the City shall facilitate the expansion of the urban canopy by removing or reducing the width of the street and planting street trees."		Please see policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development.	House Sacramento [21]
Add back ER 3.1.9 from GP 2035: "The City shall provide adequate funding to manage and maintain the City's urban forest on city property, including tree planting, training, maintenance, removal and replacement." and add "by promoting stewardship of such trees."		Please see policies: ERC-3.1 Urban Forest Plan; ERC-A.1 Urban Forest Plan; ERC 3.2 Tree Canopy Expansion; ERC-3.6: Urban Forest Maintenance;	Trees for Sacramento [51]
Air Quality			
Our geographic features and limitations are an important reason why we must do everything we can to reduce our own local sources of air pollution - trucks and cars.		Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-7]
It's very disappointing that there isn't a SINGLE goal in this section about reducing trucks and cars and VMTs, even though this sentence is here. It is obvious that vehicle pollution is a primary source of air pollutants. The City can directly influence vehicle pollution by the way it encourages or discourages driving vs. walking/biking/public transit.		Policy M-1.11 (Increase Bicycling and Walking) strives to increase bicycling and walking citywide so that it can meet its equity, reduced vehicle miles traveled, and sustainability goals. Policy M-2.2 (Wider Participation) also encourages Transportation Management Associations (TMAs), public agencies, major employers, and school districts to expand and increase participation in programs that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and increase regional average vehicle occupancy.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-7]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
One of the biggest polluters in both air quality and noise is the freeways. Something needs to be done about them		Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-ERC-7]
An important action to protect residents from air pollution near freeways is to require the planting of vegetation barriers, wherever space is available. Trees and shrubs planted along freeway edges capture and absorb pollutants and reduce heat impacts. to do this requires extensive collaboration with CalTrans.		Policy LUP-8.5 (Development Adjacent to Freeways and Railroad Corridors) promotes high-quality design along freeway and railway corridors, including requiring extensive landscaping and trees along the freeway. NN-LUP-4 (Landscape Freeway Buffers) also requires the city to maintain a 100-foot-wide landscaped freeway buffer along the north side of I-80, the east and west sides of I-5 (From I-80 to the 99 interchange) and along the east side of the 99.	Teri Duarte [K-ERC-7]
I believe that the term "sensitive receptors" is outdated. Today the research has shown that the impacts of particulate pollution are experienced by everyone, including healthy young men, even while they are more pronounced among children, the elderly, and people living with stressors such as poverty and chronic health conditions. The phrase "minimizing pollution exposure near sensitive receptors" should be changed to "minimizing pollution exposure in areas where people live or work." In addition, the systematic planting of trees and shrubs along heavily-traveled roadways should be specifically called out as an effort the City shall take to reduce pollution exposure of City residents.		Some additional policies that aim to reduce pollution exposure and awareness citywide include ERC-4.1 (Regional Coordination), ERC-4.2 (Air Quality Awareness) and ERC-4.3 (Project Design). Policy LUP-8.5 (Development Adjacent to Freeways and Railroad Corridors) promotes high-quality design along freeway and railway corridors, including requiring extensive landscaping and trees along the freeway. NN-LUP-4 (Landscape Freeway Buffers) also requires the city to maintain a 100-foot-wide landscaped freeway buffer along the north side of I-80, the east and west sides of I-5 (From I-80 to the 99 interchange) and along the east side of the 99. Added to glossary: "Sensitive receptors. Sensitive Receptor locations may include hospitals, schools, and day care centers, and such other locations as the air district board or California Air Resources Board may determine (California Health and Safety Code § 42705.5(a)(5))."	Teri Duarte [K-ERC-7]
ERC-4 (air pollution)			
Add a new goal under ERC-4 to directly address the primary sources of air pollution by reducing VMTs (Vehicle Miles Traveled) for cars and trucks along freeways and major arterials. Reducing the usage of the primary air polluting equipment (cars and trucks) would have the most significant dividends for air quality, especially during periods of air stagnation, and therefore should be an explicit goal.	Goal ERC-4	Please see goal sections M-1 and M-2 for policies on facilitating a multi-modal transportation system as well as how to reduce the dependency on single-occupant vehicles. In particular, Policy M-1.11 (Increase Bicycling and Walking) strives to increase bicycling and walking citywide so that it can meet its equity, reduced vehicle miles traveled, and sustainability goals. Policy M-2.2 (Wider Participation) also encourage Transportation Management Associations (TMAs), public agencies, major employers, and school districts to expand and increase participation in programs that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and increase regional average vehicle occupancy.	Troy [K-ERC-7]
Add a new goal under ERC-4 to directly address the primary sources of air pollution by reducing VMTs (Vehicle Miles Traveled) for cars and trucks along freeways and major arterials.	Goal ERC-4	Please see goal sections M-1 and M-2 for policies on facilitating a multi-modal transportation system as well as how to reduce the dependency on single-occupant vehicles. In particular, Policy M-1.11 (Increase Bicycling and Walking) strives to increase bicycling and walking citywide so that it can meet its equity, reduced vehicle miles traveled, and sustainability goals. Policy M-2.2 (Wider Participation) also encourage Transportation Management Associations (TMAs), public agencies, major employers, and school districts to expand and increase participation in programs that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and increase regional average vehicle occupancy.	Alyssa and Troy [3]
ERC 4: Air Quality: trees help clean the air which is one more reason why Sacramento need to increase its' tree canopy. Gas powered landscaping equipment emissions contribute to poor air quality. This equipment is ubiquitous in Sacramento. The City needs an ordinance to phase it out, replace it with electric equipment and help small landscape companies purchase such equipment. My understanding is that the emissions from gas powered equipment are very high. It is going to be difficult if not impossible to meet green house gas reduction goals if this issue isn't addressed.	Goal ERC-4	Please see ERC-4.6 (Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment) and ERC-A.6 (Landscape Maintenance Ordinance).	Karen Jacques [52]
"explore" needs to be strengthened and include metrics to measure conversion of existing gas powered equipment.	ERC-4.6 (Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment)	Policy ERC-4.6 (Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment) revised to say: "The City shall explore encourage alternatives to gas-powered..."	Dale Steele [K-ERC-8]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Highly agree.	ERC-4.6 (Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment)	Policy ERC-4.6 (Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment) revised to say: "The City shall explore encourage alternatives to gas-powered..."	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-8]
Change "shall explore" to "shall develop" in order to give this policy more impact.	ERC-4.6 (Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment)	Policy ERC-4.6 (Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment) revised to say: "The City shall explore encourage alternatives to gas-powered..."	Teri Duarte [K-ERC-8]
This equipment causes significant green house gas emissions. City should explore a requirement that would mandate replacement with electric equipment on burn out and should also look at ways to help small landscaping businesses do that.	ERC-4.6 (Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment)	Policy ERC-4.6 (Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment) revised to say: "The City shall explore encourage alternatives to gas-powered..."	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-8]
Exactly agree, especially with providing incentives to shift to electric landscaping equipment or to even provide incentives to reduce use of landscaping equipment altogether. Leaf blowing and lawn moving are not good for the environment or the native insects. There should be explicit incentives set up for residents to not mow and to not leaf blow.	ERC-4.6 (Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment)	Policy ERC-4.6 (Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment) revised to say: "The City shall explore encourage alternatives to gas-powered..."	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-8]
For ERC 4-6 to have maximum influence, we encourage the City to explore ways to facilitate replacing existing conventional landscaping equipment with all-electric equipment, including by committing to using only zero emission landscaping equipment on City property.	ERC-4.6 (Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment)	Thank you for your comment.	ECOS [42]
<p>Recommend adding a new goal under ERC-4 to directly address the primary sources of air pollution by reducing VMTs (Vehicle Miles Traveled) for cars and trucks along freeways and major arterials.</p> <p>Reducing the usage of the primary air polluting equipment (cars and trucks) would have the most significant dividends for air quality, especially during periods of air stagnation, and therefore should be an explicit goal.</p> <p>Supporting research: --"Diesel and smoking car exhaust represents most of the very fine mass in Sacramento and Fresno, even well away from freeways" Cahill, 2005 - https://delta.ucdavis.edu/presentations.htm --"We also find significant concentrations (6 µg/m3) over large areas of downtown Sacramento well away (> 400 m) from the nearest freeway source [in periods of stagnation]" Cahill, 2005 - https://delta.ucdavis.edu/presentations.htm --Salt Lake City, Utah, which is also located in a valley, claims that "mobile sources" (vehicles, trains, and aircraft) are the largest source of PM2.5 at 49% overall. Utah Department of Environmental Quality, 2023 - https://deq.utah.gov/communication/news/understanding-utahs-air-quality</p>		Policy M-1.11 (Increase Bicycling and Walking) strives to increase bicycling and walking citywide so that it can meet its equity, reduced vehicle miles traveled, and sustainability goals. Policy M-2.2 (Wider Participation) also encourage Transportation Management Associations (TMAs), public agencies, major employers, and school districts to expand and increase participation in programs that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and increase regional average vehicle occupancy.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-8]
<p>The Sacramento 2035 General Plan included Policy ER 6.1.3, to "require development projects that exceed [Sac Metro Air District's thresholds of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NOX)] to incorporate design or operational features that reduce emissions equal to 15 percent from the level that would be produced by an unmitigated project." No commensurate policy is evident in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Sac Metro Air District recommends incorporating a policy into the Sacramento 2040 General Plan to require that development projects incorporate design or operational features that reduce emissions equal to 15 percent over unmitigated project conditions if they exceed Sac Metro Air District's NOx threshold of significance.</p>		The following 2035 GP Policy (with revised title) carried over to the 2040 GP, goal section ERC-4: ER-6.1.3-Operational Emissions Reduction. The City shall require development projects that exceed SMAQMD ROG and NOX operational thresholds to incorporate design or operational features that reduce emissions equal to 15 percent from the level that would be produced by an unmitigated project.	SMAQMD [58]

ERC-5 (water and energy)

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Either at the end of ERC 1.3 or 5.2, the City should go further in reducing water pollution from non-point sources by implementing various stormwater capture projects that reduce water pollution, help conserve water supplies, and help recharge groundwater basins. These projects can also increase green spaces benefitting communities and add some habitat values. Recommend adding the following at the end of one of both of these policies: "The City shall advance projects that capture stormwater to prevent pollution of our rivers, help recharge groundwater supplies, reduce potable water consumption, and provide urban greening and habitat benefits."	ERC-5.2 (Reducing Storm Runoff)	The following revision will be made to policy ERC-1.3 (Runoff Contamination): "...sources to prevent pollution of our rivers, help recharge groundwater supplies, and reduce potable water consumption, as required by..." Please also see LUP-8.12 (Design of Privately-Developed Public Spaces), ERC-1.4 (Construction Site Impacts), ERC-5.2 (Reducing Storm Runoff), ERC-10.8 (Alternative Paving Materials), PFS-3.15 (Adequate Drainage Facilities), PFS-3.16 (Stormwater Design in Private Development), and PFS-A.4 (Stormwater Master Planning) for policies that support stormwater management.	Corey Brown [K-ERC-9]
This should be a slam dunk. If Sacramento truly wants to be a leader in environmentally conscious growth and development then time should not be wasted on a "feasibility" study. Re-use of gray and black water is currently allowed in many locales across California. I suggest this be updated to reflect that the City WILL develop water re-use, especially for on-site applications.	ERC-5.7 (Onsite Water Reuse)	Policy ERC-5.7 (Onsite Water Reuse) will be revised to say: "The City shall explore the feasibility of requiring onsite water reuse..."	Matthew [K-ERC-9]
ERC-6 (flooding hazards)			
Add a new ERC-6 goal to increase water infiltration in urban areas: The City shall promote the replacement of paved surfaces dedicated for cars, such as surface parking, driveways, and excessively wide streets, with permeable alternatives. Replacements should incorporate natural amenities which function to detain and efficiently absorb rainwater, such as trees, bioswales, rain gardens and native gardens. Section ERC-6 does not include any goals for improving water infiltration in urban areas where there are extensive impermeable surfaces.	Goal ERC-6	Please see policies ERC-5.2 (Reducing Storm Runoff) and ERC-10.8 (Alternative Paving Materials).	Alyssa and Troy [3]
Insert: After "maintain", insert: ",and where feasible, expand"	ERC-6.3 (Floodplain Capacity)	Policy ERC-6.3 (Floodplain Capacity) was revised to say: "...maintain and, where feasible, expand existing floodplain capacity..."	Corey Brown [K-ERC-12]
After quality, insert "habitat values"	ERC-6.3 (Floodplain Capacity)	Policy ERC-6.3 (Floodplain Capacity) revised to say: "...while enhancing environmental and habitat quality and..."	Corey Brown [K-ERC-12]
"replacing" over simplifies the ongoing process to evaluate, design and construct improved levee systems that include habitat protection and establishment. Suggest using a photo that better shows current approach.	photo caption	Photo caption on page 6-12 revised to say: "Improving the levee system Replacing old levees is part of the flood protection plan."	Dale Steele [K-ERC-12]
Urban Heat			
It's really important for us to tie together that Urban Heat and having a tree canopy is directly related to reducing cars and narrowing streets. If there's no room for a tree without reducing parking or narrowing the street, how do you expect to expand the tree canopy?		See policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets; policy also stipulates that existing street trees should be maintained and replaced, new trees installed where feasible, and street trees should be incorporated into new neighborhood streets.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-14]
This should inform the goals. There are currently no goals around reducing paving even though it is a key contributor to urban heat.		AA-EJ-1 (Tree Planting in Parking Lots) works to ensure future major reuse plans will increase tree canopy and include other urban heat interventions. ERC-A.10 (Parking Lot Shade Ordinance) commits to updating the Parking Lot Shade Ordinance and Guidelines to support and improve ongoing maintenance and replacement of trees in parking lots. Policy ERC-A.2 (Tree Education) provides informational materials to residents and businesses to support the City's tree canopy, including options and strategies to convert paved areas to tree planting areas. LUP-5.1 (Evolving Regional Commercial Centers) supports redevelopment of surface parking, drive aisles, shared parking facilities, and existing buildings to establish a more pedestrian-oriented experience, including creating more public spaces. Policy ERC-8.1 (Cooling Design Techniques) promotes the use of tree canopy, cool pavements, landscaping, building materials, and site design techniques that provide passive cooling and reduce energy demand.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-14]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>The city's plans to allow increased density through "missing middle housing" in mostly single-family zones, including in areas with good canopy holds the possibility of decimating the existing mature tree canopy and creating urban heat islands. This will be a net loss to the canopy if community development/planning cannot create robust objective standards to protect trees, maintain space for trees, and avoid clustering of separately-approved projects.</p> <p>In areas that lack good canopy, many lack public right-of-way planting space for city street trees, due to what we now see to be poor planning. The city planted and maintained thousands of trees in front yards in such areas, and then in the early 90s, abandoned these trees and left it to the homeowner to maintain them. In low income areas where at least half the homes are rentals, or the residents cannot afford arborist services, this has been a disaster, as the maps sadly show. As the city only own 10% of the tree canopy, with another 10% on other government agency land, and 80% of the canopy on private property - mostly in residential back and front yards - something must be done to work with citizens to create and maintain our tree canopy. In the case of environmental and economic justice areas, this means funding.</p>		<p>Consistent with LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update). The City has commissioned a Missing Middle Study. Preliminary recommendations for how this will be implemented, including how open space and tree canopy will be incorporated, will be available for public review starting October 2023. ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion) prioritizes tree planting in areas with the lowest average tree canopy cover and disadvantaged communities.</p>	<p>Francesca Reitano [K-ERC-14]</p>
<p>Again, "large expanses of asphalt and concrete" should inform goals here around depaving in the city, especially areas that are priority for urban heat.</p>		<p>AA-EJ-1 (Tree Planting in Parking Lots) works to ensure future major reuse plans will increase tree canopy and include other urban heat interventions. ERC-A.10 (Parking Lot Shade Ordinance) commits to updating the Parking Lot Shade Ordinance and Guidelines to support and improve ongoing maintenance and replacement of trees in parking lots. Policy ERC-A.2 (Tree Education) provides informational materials to residents and busiessses to support the City's tree canopy, including options and strategies to convert paved areas to tree planting areas. LUP-5.1 (Evolving Regional Commercial Centers) supports redevelopment of surface parking, drive aisles, shared parking facilities, and existing buildings to establish a more pedestrian-oriented experience, including creating more public spaces. Policy ERC-8.1 (Cooling Design Techniques) promotes the use of tree canopy, cool pavements, landscaping, building materials, and site design techniques that provide passive cooling and reduce energy demand.</p>	<p>Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-14]</p>
<p>Urban Heat (2nd column) P 6-14: The city's plans to allow increased density through "missing middle housing" in mostly single-family zones, including in areas with good canopy holds the possibility of decimating the existing mature tree canopy and creating urban heat islands. This will be a net loss to the canopy if community development/planning cannot create robust objective standards to protect trees, maintain space for trees, and avoid clustering of separately-approved projects. In areas that lack good canopy, many lack public right-of-way planting space for city street trees. As the city only owns 10% of the tree canopy, with another 10% on other government agency land, and 80% of the canopy on private property - mostly in residential back and front yards - something must be done to work with citizens to create and maintain our tree canopy. In the case of environmental and economic justice areas, this means funding and support.</p>		<p>ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see policy ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection) and City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050</p>	<p>Trees for Sacramento [51]</p>
ERC-8 (heat)			
<p>ERC 8: Heat The discussion of urban heat island effect contained in this section underscores why it is so crucial for Sacramento to protect and grow its urban canopy. For me it also underscores the need to increase the 2045 canopy goal from 35% to 45%</p>	<p>Goal LUP-8</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Urban Forest Plan is in development and includes actions to meet these canopy targets.</p>	<p>Karen Jacques [52]</p>
<p>"cool pavements" is important and will probably need to be a tool in our toolbox. But again, it's really disappointing that the ERC section consistently prioritizes fancy and expensive technologies to address our environmental challenges (such as noise and air pollution and urban heat) rather than more obvious, simpler, more accessible, more impactful solutions that will also help us reach other goals - like depaving extensive concrete/asphalt (like parking lots, vehicle travel lanes), reducing space for cars, and reducing number of cars on the road through effective urban planning.</p>	<p>ERC-8.1 (Cooling Design Techniques)</p>	<p>AA-EJ-1 (Tree Planting in Parking Lots) works to ensure future major reuse plans will increase tree canopy and include other urban heat interventions. ERC-A.10 (Parking Lot Shade Ordinance) commits to updating the Parking Lot Shade Ordinance and Guidelines to support and improve ongoing maintenance and replacement of trees in parking lots. Policy ERC-A.2 (Tree Education) provides informational materials to residents and busiessses to support the City's tree canopy, including options and strategies to convert paved areas to tree planting areas. LUP-5.1 (Evolving Regional Commercial Centers) supports redevelopment of surface parking, drive aisles, shared parking facilities, and existing buildings to establish a more pedestrian-oriented experience, including creating more public spaces.</p>	<p>Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-18]</p>

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
I recommend adding this sentence to the end of ERC-8.1: "The City shall also promote the use of trees and gardens in place of on- and off-street parking and driveway surfaces." The section already states that "paved streets, parking lots, and buildings absorb and amplify the heat of the sun, unlike vegetation and soil of rural areas" (page 6-14). Replacing car-specific pavement with vegetation wherever possible is another opportunity to achieve cooling effects. This change also aligns with other goals, such as: * LUP-2.2 Interconnected City * LUP-4.7 Visual and Physical Character * LUP-4.9 Enhanced Pedestrian Environment	ERC-8.1 (Cooling Design Techniques)	Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-18]
There are abysmally ZERO goals in ERC-8 for urban heat related to depaving or reallocating roadways or street space away from cars toward trees or toward green space that can help cool the area, even though the impacts of extensive paving were directly mentioned in the introduction. I recommend adding a goal here such as "The City shall promote roadway reallocations to depave and create space for effective cooling solutions such as tree canopies." Another goal could be "The City shall promote depaving by exploring incentive programs for residents and local businesses to trade space that would be allocated for drive aisles and parking lots toward green space or shaded space."	ERC-8.1 (Cooling Design Techniques)	Policy ERC-10.8 (Alternative Paving Materials) explores opportunities to use alternative pavement materials such as rubberized asphalt and porous pavement on residential roadways in order to reduce noise generation, extend maintenance cycles, and improve air quality and stormwater management.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-18]
Depaving should also be included as an option that can qualify for cool retrofits.	ERC-8.4 (Municipal Cool Roof Retrofits)	Policy ERC-10.8 (Alternative Paving Materials) explores opportunities to use alternative pavement materials such as rubberized asphalt and porous pavement on residential roadways in order to reduce noise generation, extend maintenance cycles, and improve air quality and stormwater management.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-18]
Recommend replacing car-specific pavement with vegetation (e.g., trees and gardens) wherever possible. It is another opportunity to achieve cooling affects. Recommend adding to ERC-8.1 (Cooling Design Techniques). This would align with LUP-2.2 (Interconnected City); LUP-4.7 (Visual and Physical Character); LUP-4.9 (Enhanced Pedestrian Environment)	ERC-8.1 (Cooling Design Techniques)	Please see policy PFS-3.16 (Stormwater Design in Private Development).	Alyssa and Troy [3]
Add back ER 3.1.6 from GP 2035 "Urban Heat Island Effects". The City shall continue to promote plantings shade trees with substantial canopies, and require, where feasible, site design that uses trees to shade rooftops, parking facilities, streets, and other facilities to minimize heat effects.		Policy ER 3.1.6 from 2040 GP has been expanded into several policies in the 2040 GP, including but not limited to ERC-8.1 (Cooling Design Techniques), ERC-8.2 (Large Heat Islands), ERC-8.6 (Heat-Reducing Public Amenities), ERC-3.10 (Parking Lot Shading), and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance). The CAAP also includes an entire goal section that aims to create built environments that reduce exposure to extreme heat and mitigate urban heat island effect.	Trees for Sacramento [51]
Noise			
Once again, the general plan says really great, smart things in the introduction but then the goals do not match up. It's explicitly acknowledged here that the LARGEST source of noise is generated by vehicle traffic on freeways and surface streets. Why are there no goals related to reducing vehicle traffic and also slowing vehicles down? These would also align with other goals in this plan under the Mobility element and also contribute to supporting our Urban Forest, Urban Heat, Air Quality, and Water Resources goals.		Policy M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds) works to maximize the safety of the transportation network by designing streets for lower driving speeds and enforcing speed limits in an unbiased manner as well as promoting safer driving behavior.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-22]
Do the non traffic noise levels on ERC-5 include noise from airplanes, construction, etc? What does it include?	Map ERC-5 (Existing Noise Contour)	Non-transportation noise sources typically refer to stationary sources, which include HVAC systems, bldg.. generators, compressor pumps, etc.	Sacramento County Public Health [K-ERC-22]
ERC-10 (healthy sound environment)			
Map ERC-6 clearly shows that noise is caused by cars, and the summary states that "the largest source of noise is generated by vehicle traffic on freeways and surface streets". So, why are there no goals to reduce speeds and traffic capacity?	Goal ERC-10	Please see M-1.5 (Street Design Standards), M-3.1 (Local Streets), and M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds) for policies on slower driving speeds. Please see goal sections M-1 and M-2 for policies that aim to increase multmodal transportation options (including reallocating roadway space in favor of bicycle/pedestrian-friendly infrastructure) and reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicles which will decrease reliance on automobiles on roadways.	Troy [K-ERC-30]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
ERC-10.1 should be made more explicit by proposing to minimize average vehicle speeds and minimize ADT (Average Daily Traffic) on collectors, arterials and freeways located adjacent to commercial and residential land uses.	ERC-10.1 (Exterior Noise Standards)	Please see M-1.5 (Street Design Standards), M-3.1 (Local Streets), and M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds) for policies on slower driving speeds. Please see goal sections M-1 and M-2 for policies that aim to increase multmodal transportation options (including reallocating roadway space in favor of bicycle/pedestrian-friendly infrastructure) and reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicles which will decrease reliance on automobiles on roadways.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-30]
The Plan contains multiple statements which claim that cars are the primary source of noise, yet there are no goals that directly address vehicle speeds or traffic volumes. Reducing these two metrics also has a noise reduction effect in locations not addressed by existing ERC-10 goals (such as outside of buildings and in pre-existing developments). This change likely overlaps with goals in "ERC-4 air quality", as well as "M-2 Reduced reliance on single-occupant vehicles"	ERC-10.1 (Exterior Noise Standards)	Please see M-1.5 (Street Design Standards), M-3.1 (Local Streets), and M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds) for policies on slower driving speeds. Please see goal sections M-1 and M-2 for policies that aim to increase multmodal transportation options (including reallocating roadway space in favor of bicycle/pedestrian-friendly infrastructure) and reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicles which will decrease reliance on automobiles on roadways.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-30]
ERC-10.1 Should be made more explicit by proposing to minimize average vehicle speeds and minimize ADT (Average Daily Traffic) on collectors, arterials and freeways located adjacent to commercial and residential land uses. The Plan contains multiple statements which claim that cars are the primary source of noise, yet there are no goals that directly address vehicle speeds or traffic volumes.	ERC-10.1 (Exterior Noise Standards)	Please see M-A.7 (Roadway Reallocations), M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds), goal section M-1 which contains policies supporting a multi-modal transportation system and goal section M-2 which contains policies supporting reduction in single-occupant vehicles.	Alyssa and Troy [3]
This is a useful goal, but notably these other ERC goals only affect NEW developments and do nothing to reduce the point source of noise (which is primarily from vehicles), or to reduce the impact of noise in non-new developments (or when people are outside of a building).	ERC-10.2 (Noise Source Control)	Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-30]
This is important but again, we should not rely on expensive technologies that require costly replacements. The city of Sacramento already faces a huge municipal debt, and transportation projects are already enormously backlogged with repaving projects, few of which serve to benefit people who rely on walking or biking or other forms of active transportation. We should prioritize reducing the point source of noise (i.e. vehicles) rather than over-relying on making repaving even costlier to the city than it already is.	ERC-10.8 (Alternative Paving Materials)	Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-30]
Implementing Actions			
When the recommendations of the Mayors' Climate Commission were adopted, the community was promised a draft Urban Forest Master Plan in early 2020. Now the timeline is 2024-2029. Meanwhile nothing is being done to increase canopy, improve tree maintenance, or reduce the removals of large healthy trees because it's so easy for developers to get permits to remove them instead of designing to include them. Creating a good Urban Forest Master Plan that protects existing trees, replaces trees that are dying or structurally unsound and expands the canopy simply cannot be put off any longer.	ERC-A.1 (Urban Forest Plan)	The Urban Forest Plan is underway. Please see project website for updates. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/About-Urban-Forestry/Urban-Forest-	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-30]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
In response to CAAP comments, the following revision was made.		ERC-A.4 (Heat Reduction in the Public Realm) revised to say: "The City should explore opportunities to amend development standards and guidelines so as to promote the use of heat mitigation strategies to reduce temperatures in the public realm, particularly on active transportation networks, commercial corridors , near light rail transit (LRT) stations, and along transit corridors. Requirements may include the incorporation of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building design strategies (varied building heights; setbacks from sidewalks; vertical and horizontal shade features); • Minimize areas of reflective hard surfaces and maximize permeable surfaces; • Cooling building and pavement materials, treatments, and coatings; • Multiple layers of shading to maximize coverage throughout the day; and • Street trees, and landscaping. " 	CAAP
This gas powered equipment emits a large amount of green house gases (as well as other toxins). The time frame should be moved up to 2024-2029.	ERC-A.6 (Landscape Maintenance Ordinance)	The timeframe will be moved up to 2024-2029.	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-30]
How does this relate to the Urban Forest Master Plan? Tree canopy targets should be part of that plan and should be identified well before 2030.	ERC-A.7 (Cooling Landscape Standards)	Thank you for your comment. The Urban Forest Plan is in development and includes actions to meet these canopy targets.	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-30]
ERC-A.7 Cooling Landscape Standards: Change implementation schedule to near-term to align with Tree education	ERC-A.7 (Cooling Landscape Standards)	ERC-A.7 timeline updated to near-term.	Kaplan (CC)
Staff initiated revision to "Responsible Entity" to better reflect each department's roles and responsibilities.		ERC-A.7 "Responsible Entity" revised to say: " Department of Public Works (lead) , Community Development Department (support lead); Department of Youth Parks and Community Enrichment (support)" ERC-A.7 "Timeframe" revised to say: " Mid-term (2030-2035) Near-term (2024-2029) "	Staff
ERC-A.8 should be moved forward in order for findings to be widely utilized as soon as possible, before the urban heat issue becomes much more severe. ERC-A.8 is highly important, but the Implementation Schedule marks it for completion more than 10 years into the future.	ERC-A.8 (Heat-Resilient Design Techniques)	Implementing action ERC-A.8 moved from long-term to mid-term timeframe.	ECOS [42]
In response to CAAP comments, the following revision was made.		ERC-A.8 (Heat-Resilient Design Techniques) revised to say: "The City shall evaluate the feasibility of updating design guidelines, standards, and the municipal code to promote require -building materials and site design techniques to minimize areas of reflective hard surfaces that provide passive cooling and reduce energy demand."	CAAP
How does this relate to Urban Forest Master Plan? Should be par off or developed in conjunction with it. Like the Master Plan, this is needed urgently.	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements)	The Urban Forest Plan will be consistent with the General Plan. The Urban Forest Plan is underway. Please see project website for updates. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/About-Urban-Forestry/Urban-Forest-	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-30]
The current issue with this process is that for ministerial project reviews, the tree removal application/permit process takes place after the project is a done deal (unlike design reviews, where landscape plan is part of the project approval process and includes plantings and removals). Unless and until the city can create objective design standards to protect existing mature trees, our canopy will suffer mightily as the city builds out and grows.	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Francesca Reitano [K-ERC-30]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
ERC-A.9 Minimum Tree Requirements: There must be objective design standards that are part of the ministerial review. Currently, after a project is approved and is a "done deal," the developer applies for tree removal permits. This is how we lose existing tree canopy. In this instance, the tree canopy is an afterthought, not forethought.	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements)	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see policy ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection) and City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Trees for Sacramento [51]
In coordination with the Missing Middle Housing Study and Urban Forest Plan projects, the following revision was made.		Policy ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) revised to say: "The City shall review and amend the planning and development code as necessary to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development and significant remodels, and improve tree canopy inclusion. Review the following topics at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements for trees in setback areas, particularly in new single-unit dwelling developments and subdivisions; • Opportunities to provide incentives or requirements for inclusion of trees in front, back and side yards, particularly when sited to provide shade for sidewalks and streets; • Tree plantings in site plan review to place trees to maximize energy conservation; • Chapter 12.56 of the City Code related tree permits for ministerial development project review; and • Solar panel installation requirements to minimize potential conflicts with tree planting." 	Staff
Parking lots help drive heat island effect. The existing ordinance has not been enforced for years. Too many parking lots have no trees, empty tree wells or dead trees. This cannot wait until 2030-2035. How does it relate to Urban Forest Master Plan?	ERC-A.10 (Parking Lot Shade Ordinance)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-30]
Needs to be part of or coordinated with Urban Forest Master Plan. Street tree canopy is part of the infrastructure needed for walking and biking.	ERC-A.11 (Street Standards for Tree Canopy)	The Urban Forest Plan will be consistent with the General Plan. The Urban Forest Plan is underway. Please see project website for updates. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/About-Urban-Forestry/Urban-Forest-	Karen Jacques [K-ERC-30]
Please work with residents to prohibit widespread unpermitted "landscaping" in park strips. Residents intentionally cover the soil surrounding city trees with plastic, dense landscape cloth, concrete, thick layers of rocks or gravel, and artificial turf. Implications of these features: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) eliminate or reduce soil permeability so water can't infiltrate and runs off into the street (consider the almost six inches of rain that fell on October 24, 2021—we'll have more atmospheric rivers like this in the future); (2) prevent city trees from receiving air and water because their roots are covered; (3) create a tripping hazard for pedestrians (e.g., small to medium rocks that are kicked on to the sidewalk); (4) increase the ambient temperature, especially nighttime temperatures, because rocks and artificial turf trap heat—thus contributing to the heat island effect. 	ERC-A.11 (Street Standards for Tree Canopy)	Thank you for your comment.	Nita Davidson [K-ERC-30]
The heat-resilient design techniques that are proposed for the city should explicitly name that reduction of vehicle travel lanes should be considered in order to create space for landscaping that reduces heat (without sacrificing sidewalks and other pedestrian space).	Diagram on page 6-30	Please see policy ERC-A.11 (Street Standards for Tree Canopy).	Alyssa Lee [K-ERC-30]
In response to CAAP comments, the following revision was made.		ERC-A.11 (Street Standards for Tree Canopy) revised to say: "The City shall update Street Standards with objective design standards for shade trees along roadways to optimize tree canopy and provide solutions for various street functions and conditions."	CAAP
Do these initiatives and indicators align with the vision of Sacramento as a national model of sustainable, equitable growth and community development?			
Some cities are requiring that all new projects use at least 50% native plants.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-ERC-1]
We need lighting infrastructure that preserves dark skies. Wildlife and people need dark skies. We need to see the stars.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-ERC-1]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The City's Urban Forest Plan needs to be developed asap.The stakeholder process for this plan needs to be renewed and restarted.		The Urban Forest Plan is underway. Please see project website for updates. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/About-Urban-Forestry/Urban-Forest-	Station Board [K-ERC-1]
Existing natural areas within the Cite need to be protected, managed and restored creating a network of natural areas.		Thank you for your comment. At this time, the 2040 General Plan has no plans to include a Natural Area designation. Please follow updates for the forthcoming Parks Plan 2040 for additional details on how the City will plan for green areas and open space.	Station Board [K-ERC-1]
Hire qualified City staff (esp. natural resources background) to manage a Natural Areas Program within the City.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-ERC-1]
Recent city policies have promoted destruction of tree canopy		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-ERC-1]
These goals are great but woefully incomplete if they do not mention ending sprawl, reducing car infrastructure, and modeshift.		Please see the Land Use and Placemaking Element for policies on infill development and the Mobility Element for policies on promoting multi-modal transportation options and reduced reliance on single-occupant vehicles.	Station Board [K-ERC-1]
No they do not. The biggest environmental threat has been occuring along the American River Parkway and the City's creeks.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-ERC-1]

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ELEMENT

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Introduction			
Being one of the most polluted districts in the city, more resources should be provided for sewer, undergrounding power lines, cleaning up garbage on the streets, tree planting. Air quality is the poorest in Sacramento. We do not need more gas stations in the city. Traffic is a big concern. The area is not safe for walking or biking. Apartment construction must be LEED, not just minimum standards.		Please see LUP-4.13 (Future-Ready Gas Stations), goals section LUP-11, and goal sections M-1 and M-2 for policies on limiting expansion of gas stations, supporting green building strategies, facilitating a more multi-modal built environment, and reducing reliance on single-occupant vehicles.	Pat Sayerhandley [K-EJ-1]
Air Quality and Pollution			
seems a transportation component is missing in this section that should focus on greenhouse gases reduction as a priority tool to improve air quality in impacted neighborhoods and communities.		Please see the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan for a comprehensive approach to reaching GHG-reduction goals.	Dale Steele [K-EJ-7]
To help ensure long-term public health protections that are both flexible and consistent with the intent of AB 617, beyond the intended timespan of AB 617, Sac Metro Air District recommends expanding Draft Plan Policies EJ-1.2 and 1.3 so that they reference support of "AB 617 and other Community Emissions Reduction Programs (CERPs)."		Policy EJ-1.2 (Community Air Protection) revised to say: "... in implementation of AB 617 and other Community Emissions Reduction Programs (CERPs), which may include..." Policy EJ-1.3 (Data-Informed Efforts) revised to say: "actions outside of AB 617-related efforts and other Community Emissions Reduction Programs (CERPs)..."	SMAQMD [58]
Sac Metro Air District recommends using the following text for the text box on AB 617 on Draft Plan page 7-7: "In 2017, Governor Brown signed Assembly Bill 617 (C. Garcia, Chapter 136, Statutes of 2017) to develop a new community-focused program to more effectively reduce localized exposure to air pollution and preserve public health. This bill directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to work with local air districts and community organizations to identify and select underserved communities with the highest cumulative air pollution burden. CARB selected the South Sacramento–Florin community in 2018 to be one of the first 10 communities in California to develop and implement a community air monitoring plan. Other community areas within the City of Sacramento have also been identified and nominated by Sac Metro Air District for consideration into the state program. Highly sensitive areas of Sacramento are shown in Map EJ-2."		Text revised per comment suggestion: Text box on AB 617 will be revised to say: "In 2017, Governor Brown signed Assembly Bill 617 (C. Garcia, Chapter 136, Statutes of 2017) to develop a new community-focused program to more effectively reduce localized exposure to air pollution and preserve public health. This bill directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to work with local air districts and community organizations to identify and select underserved communities with the highest cumulative air pollution burden. CARB selected the South Sacramento–Florin community in 2018 to be one of the first 10 communities in California to develop and implement a community air monitoring plan. Other community areas within the City of Sacramento have also been identified and nominated by Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) for consideration into the state program. Map EJ-2 shows areas of Sacramento with the highest cumulative air pollution burden."	SMAQMD [58]
Map EJ-1 (State Designated Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) in Sacramento)			
The Environmental Justice Map doesn't include Valley View Acres. It stops at the southern boundary of this more than 100 year old multi ethnic, multi racial mixed income community. The map stops at Del Paso Road. The Panhandle traffic impacts are an example of a disadvantaged neighborhood being inflicted with traffic impacts unrelated to its own needs. The fact that the North Natomas Community Plan included a provision prohibiting streets from new development to access Sorento Road and the fact that a City Traffic Calming process resulted in the closure of Sorento Road to through traffic (at the East Levee Road/Elkhorn Boulevard intersection) because of substantial adverse health and safety and traffic impacts from thousands of daily vehicle trips through this neighborhood, did not stop the City from approving two through roads into the neighborhood from the Panhandle as part of the annexation plan. The neighborhood can once again expect serious accidents especially at the dangerous curves as previously documented during the City's early 2000 traffic calming process. Before the TC plan was implemented, it was not unusual for cars to knock down power poles along Sorento near the curves, or run off the road into yards. Speeds of 80 mph and more were recorded. There were traffic fatalities. It is our opinion that such proposals and approvals would have been stopped, or properly mitigated, if a traffic calming project was undermined in any affluent or middle class neighborhood in this City. It would never have happened to a neighborhood with political power. It is exactly the type of injustice that your Environmental Justice policy seeks to remedy or avoid in the future. Our old and already underserved neighborhood is now expected to bear adverse traffic and safety impacts and crime related to traffic from the high school. The neighborhood needs the protections the EJ designation provides. We urge that the proposed maps be amended to include at least south Valley View Acres.		Please see M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds) and EJ-5.5 (Investment Prioritization).	Barbara Graichen [75]
Map EJ-2 (Census Tracts with Highest Cumulative Air Pollution Burden)			
To ensure the most current information to inform any final plan, Sac Metro Air District recommends that Map EJ-2 utilize data from the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District's (SMUD's) Sustainable Communities Resource Priorities Map.		Add to last sentence of AB 617 text box: "...Areas of Sacramento most impacted by poor air quality are shown on Map EJ-2. Data is also available on the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District's (SMUD) Sustainable Communities Resource Priorities Map."	SMAQMD [58]
Goal EJ-1 (environmental conditions)			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Sac Metro Air District commends and welcomes collaboration with the City on Policy EJ-1.1 "Air Quality Monitoring," including collaboration on particulate matter monitoring efforts at City facilities.	EJ-1.1 (Air Quality Monitoring)	Policy EJ-1.1 (Air Quality Monitoring) revised to say: "The City shall collaborate with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to support the expansion of air quality monitoring efforts in Sacramento..."	SMAQMD [58]
Addition: Second bullet should read "...co-benefits for air quality, such as planting trees, planting vegetation barriers along high-volume roadways, and installing..."	EJ-1.3 (Data-Informed Efforts)	Policy EJ-1.3 (Data-Informed Efforts) revised to say: "...Prioritizing areas for capital investments with co-benefits for air quality, such as planting trees, planting vegetation barriers along high-volume roadways, and installing tree planting and installation of electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure;..."	Teri Duarte [K-EJ-10]
Planting trees: where, is the operative question. City trees are only 10% of the city's canopy. Private trees are needed in front, back and side yards, and as a matter of environmental and economic justice, disadvantaged community members will need assistance in maintaining their trees. Water is metered, and arborist fees are beyond many families' means. Over half of the homes are rented, which also puts maintenance out of the resident's control. As I have mentioned elsewhere, many disproportionately burdened neighborhoods were planned with no public right of way (park strips) for the city to plant and maintain city street trees. Many years ago the city planted trees in front yards in such neighborhoods as an alternative, but in the early 90s the city abandoned thousands of these trees and turned their care back to the homeowner. As a matter of economic and environmental justice, this situation must be rectified and solutions found.	EJ-1.3 (Data-Informed Efforts)	Policy ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion) commits the city to achieve a 25 percent urban tree canopy cover by 2030 and 35 percent by 2045. Prioritize tree planting in areas with the lowest average canopy cover and explore strategies to reduce barriers to tree planting in disadvantaged communities and improve tree health. The Urban Forest Master Plan is underway and is anticipated for release for public review in December 2023. Please see project website for updates. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/About-Urban-Forestry/Urban-Forest-Master-Plan	Francesca Reitano [K-EJ-10]
I am in complete agreement with this comment. It is a serious injustice that so many neighborhoods, including many of Sacramento's poorest neighborhoods, have no parkway strips and therefore no public street trees and no shade over their sidewalks and roadways. Large canopy trees, which are the species needed to provide badly needed shade (and all the other benefits large trees provide) are expensive to maintain and a way must be found to address this in low income/high rental neighborhoods that currently lack parkway strips and therefore lack public street trees.	EJ-1.3 (Data-Informed Efforts)	Policy ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion) commits the city to achieve a 25 percent urban tree canopy cover by 2030 and 35 percent by 2045. Prioritize tree planting in areas with the lowest average canopy cover and explore strategies to reduce barriers to tree planting in disadvantaged communities and improve tree health. The Urban Forest Master Plan is underway and is anticipated for release for public review in December 2023. Please see project website for updates. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/About-Urban-Forestry/Urban-Forest-Master-Plan	Karen Jacques [K-EJ-10]
Communities without parkway strips deserve to have canopy trees that can shade their sidewalks and streets in their front yards. It is not right that the City pays to plant and maintain trees that shade the sidewalks and streets in neighborhoods that have parkway strips, while people that don't have parkway strips have to pay for front yard trees themselves and most of them aren't able to do it.		M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) provide guidance for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Additionally, the Urban Forest Master Plan is underway. Please see project website for updates. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/About-Urban-Forestry/Urban-Forest-Master-Plan	Karen Jacques [52]
Air quality mitigation should prioritize methods that provide additional promote public health public health benefits, such as tree planting and sound walls (which reduce both noise and pollution exposure)	EJ-1.3 (Data-Informed Efforts)	Policies under Goal ERC-10 promote a healthy sound environment conducive to living and working. LUP-8.5 (Development Adjacent to Freeways and Railroad Corridors) promotes high-quality design of buildings along freeway and railway corridors, including requiring extensive landscaping and trees along the freeway.	Teri Duarte [K-EJ-10]
Map EJ-4 (Areas Underserved by Healthy Food Resources)			
Staff initiated revisions to map to reflect missing locations and symbology.		The following locations were added to and buffers updated accordingly in Map EJ-4 (Areas Underserved by Healthy Food Resources): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add 2 Grocery Outlet locations (6419 Riverside Boulevard, 6720 Folsom Boulevard) • Add Shun Fat Supermarket at South Hills Shopping Center (5820 S Land Park Drive) Additionally, move Rush River Drive street label for Bel-Air Market in Pocket area.	Staff
Goal EJ-2 (healthy food)			
<i>Healthy Food Access</i>			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Consider working with Sacramento County Public Health and our Obesity Prevention Program on many of these projects!	Goal EJ-2	Thank you for your comment.	Sacramento County Public Health [K-EJ-15]
This is an important plan section and I agree with the goals and policies. In support of home and community gardens, I would advocate for free soil test kits, free plants, soil amendments, and workshops, particularly in disadvantaged areas.	Goal EJ-2	Thank you for your comment.	Kathy Styc [K-EJ-15]
I am very glad that the 2040 GP contains a detailed section on environmental justice. I was particularly interested in the section (EJ 2) on healthy food resources and would love to see the proposals contained there implemented.	Goal EJ-2	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [52]
It is recommended to include making groceries accessible to families with children.	EJ-2.2 (Grocery Access)	Policy EJ-2.2 (Grocery Access) revised to say: "...Strategies may include increasing transit access, connecting residents with on-going food assistance programs , and promoting the use of app-based microtransit and home delivery services among seniors, people with disabilities, families with children , and residents of areas underserved by healthy food retail."	Civic Thread [91]
There is an opportunity to include private groups within this section e.g. Religious institutions	EJ-2.3 (Open Air Food Sales)	Policy EJ-2.3 (Open Air Food Sales) revised to say: "...the City should collaborate with community-based organizations (CBOs), including but not limited to faith-based organizations , to establish community markets..."	Civic Thread [91]
Education is important in terms of understanding how to maintain a garden at home, but many community members cannot afford materials for home gardens. Connecting residents to financial support opportunities such as community grants would be recommended.	EJ-2.8 (Community and Home Gardening)	Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
is "food swamps" really the best way to describe an area that is "saturated with unhealthy food" choices doesn't have adequate access to healthy and culturally relevant food options? I've seen "desert" used this way but why not just go with something like "underserved areas for good food choices"?	EJ-2.15 (Limit Food Swamps)	Policy EJ-2.15 (Limit Food Swamps) revised to say: "Limit Food Swamps-Unhealthy Food Establishments . The City shall explore mechanisms to limit food swamps unhealthy food establishments, which are environments that are saturated with unhealthy food establishments , especially in disadvantaged communities (DACs) and historically underserved areas."	Dale Steele [K-EJ-17]
Healthy Food Awareness			
Consider also using the CDC Social Vulnerability Index	EJ-2.20 (Evaluating Health Impacts)	Policy revision: "...including but not limited to Healthy Places Index, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Social Vulnerability Index , and CalEnviroScreen..."	Sacramento County Public Health [K-EJ-17]
Goal EJ-3 (safe and sanitary housing)			
Sacramento County Department of Homeless Services should be included.	EJ-3.1 (Resource Optimization)	Policy EJ-3.1 (Resource Optimization) revised to say: "... (CADA), Sacramento County , and others..."	Sacramento County Public Health [K-EJ-18]
How about developing a volunteer driven healthy home support group. Available to low income folks to maintain their homes. Let' engage our Older Adult population to lead and staff this effort.	EJ-3.3 (Healthy Homes)	The Age-Friendly Action Plan is underway.	PATTY WAIT [K-EJ-19]
Tree planting definitely must be incentivized, as well as required by the city's tree and zoning ordinances.	EJ-3.4 (Healthy Environment)	Thank you for your comment.	Francesca Reitano [K-EJ-19]
I also want to call out the need to preserve existing housing. It is less expensive and more sustainable to do so. Sacramento has already lost too much existing, affordable housing to large, market rate development projects.		Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [52]
Goal EJ-4 (active participation of community)			
Civic Engagement			
Let's increase the participation of our Older Adults in local government. The largest under represented group in city government today is the older adult group. There is a culture bias against including this valuable group in community decisions, and on committees and commissions.	EJ-4.5 (Increasing Participation of Underserved Communities)	The Age-Friendly Action Plan is underway.	PATTY WAIT [K-EJ-21]
Accountability			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Let's add an elder advisor or council to support and advise our community leaders	EJ-4.6 (Community Oversight)	Thank you for your comment.	PATTY WAIT [K-EJ-22]
Implementing Actions			
Civic Thread in particular appreciates the inclusion of the following policies as being in support of equitable and healthy communities. - EJ-A.3 Diverse Representation - EJ-A.8 Community Input Database - EJ-A.4-EJ-A.6 (Amortization Ordinance, Performance Zoning, Healthy Food Zoning)		Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
This effort should include increasing the age diversity on our boards and commissions	EJ-A.3 (Diverse Representaiton)	Thank you for your comment.	PATTY WAIT [K-EJ-26]
Reduce or eliminate barriers for new stores (such as parking minimums and setbacks)	EJ-A.6 (Healthy Food Zoning)	The City is currently undertaking a Parking Reform Study which is investigating parking requirements.	Kevin Dumler [K-EJ-27]
EJ-A.6: Healthy Food Zoning: To support the expansion of groceries in underserved areas, we recommend expanding this policy to reduce the development constraints on typical grocery stores, such as parking minimums and setbacks, to make grocery stores more feasible.	EJ-A.6 (Healthy Food Zoning)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces. This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "...Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City mandated parking minimums; ..."	House Sacramento [21]
We also need to establish institutional memory for projects and outreach. High staff turnover makes this extremely difficult. Shift responsibility from residents to staff to recall previous input on topical areas, projects and plans. Certainly by corridor, if not, community plan, we should be able to look up a comprehensive narrative of past, current, and future efforts as well as community feedback to help inform any resident conversations.	EJ-A.8 (Community Input Database)	Thank you for your comment.	Jackie Cole [K-EJ-28]
EJ-A.9 Outreach Funding: Appreciate the effort to fiscally support community engagement outside the realm of projects/grants. This pool of funds should be as unrestricted as possible to ensure community engagement best practices are eligible expenses (i.e. compensating community members, providing food and childcare, etc.). Emphasis should be on leveraging outreach methods to increase community capacity building to the greatest extent possible.	EJ-A.9 (Outreach Funding)	Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
Healthy food initiatives could include promotion of plant based or primarily plant based diet which research shows to be a very healthy which could play a significant role in reducing green house gases if adopted by a large segment of the population	EJ-A.10 (Healthy Food Initiatives Partnership)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-EJ-28]
and establish more supported community gardens	EJ-A.10 (Healthy Food Initiatives Partnership)	Please see EJ-2.8 (Home and Community Gardening), EJ-2.13 (Public-Private Partnerships), EJ-2.17 (Healthy Food Promotion), and EJ-34 (Healthy Environment) for policies that support community gardens in the city.	Dale Steele [K-EJ-28]
Do these initiatives and indicators align with the vision of Sacramento as a national model of sustainable, equitable growth and community development?			
No, in fact, they do very little to help make the City a national model. Equity must be at the forefront of the decision making		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-EJ-1]
Yes, I really like the goals highlighted throughout this section.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-EJ-1]
No.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-EJ-1]
Excellent goals. What are the actual plans, both logistical and fiscal, to implement them?		Please see the implementing actions in the Environmental Justice Element.	Station Board [K-EJ-1]

MOBILITY ELEMENT

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>Specificity around active transportation policy goals was relatively lost from 2035 General Plan to the 2040 Update. Previous 2035 goals that are recommended to be sustained in the final 2040 update include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - M 5.1.2 The City shall provide bikeway facilities that are appropriate to the street classifications and type, number of lanes, traffic volume, and speed on all rights-of-way. - M 5.1.7 The City shall provide bike lanes on all repaved and/or reconstructed arterial and collector streets to the maximum extent feasible. The appropriate facility type for each roadway segment shall be consistent with the Roadway Network and Street Typologies defined in this General Plan. - M 5.1.9 The City shall convert underused rights-of-way, including drainage canals, freeway easements, railroad corridors, and underutilized travel and parking lanes to bikeways bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities where possible and appropriate. 		<p>Please follow and participate in the Streets for People project, the City's Active Transportation Plan. See website here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Streets-For-People</p>	<p>Civic Thread [91]</p>
<p>Civic Thread in particular appreciates the inclusion of the following policies as being in support of equitable and healthy communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map M-1 Roadway Allocations. • M-1.2 User Prioritization. • M-1.9 Equitable Processes and Outcomes. • M-1.10 Community Engagement. • M-1.11 – M-1.19 Active Transportation. • M-3.4 Cul-de-Sacs. • M-2.5 Onsite Childcare. 		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>Civic Thread [91]</p>
Introduction			
<p>Bike ways and Pedestrian Crossings over all Freeways Need to retain a personal scene of psychological safety for both modes! Bike ways and pedestrian paths need to retain a personal scene of psychological safety while on route using barriers and landscape as separation. The City center transition to South Natomas and the transition to North Natomas is Brutal for pedestrians and bicycles both, these are major routes from the city to the airport! Natomas needs much more connective between these areas, Neighborhoods significantly isolated breaking down community fabric. Easier connection between all would create improved opportunities for downtown Sacramento. This is not a suggestion it is an absolute need!</p>	<p>on photo</p>	<p>Please see policy LUP-8.5 (Development Adjacent to Freeways and Railroad Corridors).</p>	<p>Tim Ellison [K-M-1]</p>
Equitable and Sustainable Mobility			
<p>The greatest synergistic effect on the growth of Sac in regards to economic and quality of life is from the intersection of roads and travel. Roads not necessarily in the formal sense, but as a means of moving people. Light rails are such old thinking. Above ground, costly in creation and repair, zoning, moving or going around existing infrastructure...bleh. Have their been any studies about Sacramento being an early adopter of a tunnel system utilizing vehicles or high a speed rail people mover? Look at what Vegas is doing to solve their congestion issues with tunnels from the Boring company. I want Sac to think big and innovative, create plans to draw in skilled workers to the city center, and be connected to expansive neighborhoods surrounding the city. Make center city the main economic hub and attraction but it has to be connected to other parts of the Bay Area and surrounding counties in an easy efficient quick manner. Above ground light rails is not the answer.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>J Moore [K-M-2]</p>
<p>Please god do not look at the Vegas tunnel. It is a disaster. Do not go near anything connected to Elon musk please. I am all for subways though but I think the city has more pressing issues sadly. Plus I think giving locals access to transit so they can reduce their driving is more important that pulling in people from the bay area.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>Austin [K-M-2]</p>
<p>https://youtu.be/p8NiM_p8n5A</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>Austin [K-M-2]</p>
<p>Also adding this link. Big Tech isn't interested in moving people around. https://newrepublic.com/article/174089/big-tech-watching-drive</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>Ian Treat [K-M-2]</p>
<p>Or instead of underground tunnels, we could focus on how to support the already-being-implemented California High Speed Rail project to connect our city to other hubs in the region. Passenger and light rail need to be strengthened.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>M [K-M-2]</p>

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Cars are by far the least efficient and most polluting mode of transportation. The Vegas tunnel thing is going to be a money pit that is a poor attempt to reinvent the subway. I am very on board with sacramento's plan to prioritize transit and active transportation over personal vehicles.		Thank you for your comment.	Jenny [K-M-2]
Complete street improvements such as parking-protected bike lanes are great. They do need to (1) consider the impacts to folks with disabilities, who may be able to drive but need to get their mobility-assistive devices out and could be deterred by fast bicyclists; and (2) include public education for all road users. How many more cars have to park in bike lanes for this to be a more prioritized effort?		One of the main goals of the Mobility Element is to foster an equitable, sustainable multimodal system that provides a range of viable and healthy travel choices for users of all ages, backgrounds, and abilities.	M [K-M-2]
Good points, need to have voices from the disabled driving and nondrivong community involved. From my old state - Washington Disability Mobility Initiative did research with disabled nondrivers and released a design guide: https://www.disabilityrightswa.org/transportation-access-for-everyone-research-paper-release/		One of the main goals of the Mobility Element is to foster an equitable, sustainable multimodal system that provides a range of viable and healthy travel choices for users of all ages, backgrounds, and abilities.	Jenny [K-M-2]
Increasing the number of people who walk and bike to get to their destinations and who use transit are important goals. Street trees need to be viewed as part of the mobility infrastructure, along with sidewalks, bike lanes, and pedestrian cross walks. Streets cannot be considered complete without trees. Bus and light rail stops also need shade and people who use transit need shaded routes to and from them. The more heat increases, the more people will have to be protected from urban heat island effect. This is yet another reason why ambitious urban canopy goals and to adopting an Urban Forest Master Plan are so important.		Please see policy M-3.2 (Street Design).	Karen Jacques [52]
A final plan should utilize mode share targets from the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change Report as mode share indicators.		Thank you for your comment.	SMAQMD [58]
Map M-1 (Roadway Reallocations)			
Thoroughly support roadway reallocations. Forward thinking and would like to see more of them!		Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-M-3]
Map M-1: Roadway Allocations: Clarify terminology and methodology. We see no reason why these could not be significantly expanded to exploring roads that clearly have excess capacity, such as 7th & 8th Streets		Text added to page 8-2, first column, first paragraph, after 2nd sentence: " These segments were selected based on early community input, traffic modeling results, Vision Zero corridors, and high-frequency transit corridors. Additional consideration was given to minimize gridlock and ensure continued operation of the transportation network. The proposed future roadway reallocations shown in Map M-1 do not include the roadway segments identified for reductions as part of Grid 3.0, the Central City Specific Plan, the Broadway Complete Streets Project, the North 12th Street Complete Streets Project, the Vision Zero Top 5 Corridor Study, and the Stockton Boulevard Corridor Plan. "	House Sacramento [21]
Staff initiated corrections to Map M-1 (Roadway Reallocations)		Map M-1 revised to reflect a technical update.	Staff
Light Rail			
Light rail connecting Broadway & 19th with Globe Avenue would be huge		Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-M-3]
U and 19th light rail stop		Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-M-3]
Map M-1: The future Green Line light rail alignment is included in the map as a high-frequency transit service; however, SacRT does not currently operate high-frequency transit service from downtown Sacramento to the Sacramento International Airport. If this map is intended to depict future highfrequency transit, in addition to existing high-frequency transit, then SacRT suggests adding that distinguishing language to the map legend for clarity.		Map M-1 revised to distinguish existing from planned light rail alignments and stations. This GPU includes a major pivot from previous General Plans, moving away from street widenings to reallocations. Proposed reallocations must meet standard thresholds to ensure continue operation of the transportation network. Streets that are not recommended for reallocation do not meet best practices or typical thresholds for lane reductions.	SacRT [74]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Committer/Organization
Map CP-FB-6: Extend 65th St. Expressway Future Roadway Reallocation Segment to connect to light rail and Stockton Blvd on the southern end.		This GPU includes a major pivot from previous General Plans, moving away from street widenings to reallocations. Proposed reallocations must meet standard thresholds to ensure continue operation of the transportation network. Streets that are not recommended for reallocation do not meet best practices or typical thresholds for lane reductions.	Civic Thread [91]
Ped and Bike Facilities			
Please consider creating a dedicated Sidewalk and protected Bike Lane for Elkhorn BLVD. Currently there is only a soft shoulder which many utilize to walk to school, bike to the store, and it is quite unsafe.		Please follow and participate in the Streets for People project, the City's Active Transportation Plan. See website here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Streets-For-People	Jordan Leigh [K-M-3]
All 10 Vision Zero Corridors are hostile to pedestrians and cyclists. Crossing 4 lanes of 45mph+ traffic with signaled cross walks >0.5 miles apart disincentivizes walking in these neighborhoods.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-3]
Transit Corridors			
Please address how transit corridors are planned in coordination with the County. Residents need to travel efficiently regardless of borders. The blight north and south of "the thumb" is only made worse by not coordinating.		Please see policy M-5.1 (Regional Mobility System).	Susan Hida [K-M-3]
Annex the finger (costs pending, oof) and coordinate planning transit better please.		Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-M-3]
Map M-2a (Circulation Diagram)			
Please ditch this way of thinking of our streets and roads or put a huge asterisk on it. There are streets, where we build our places, and roads that are limited access and are used to connect places. This highway planning era language degrades the sense of place by saying we "need" a certain amount of throughput on an arterial to meet some need for mobility.		Thank you for your comment.	ew [K-M-4]
I absolutely agree--at the very least, this should be a "car circulation" diagram, to complement a "bike circulation" diagram--and efforts should be made to disentangle the routes.		Please follow and participate in the Streets for People project, the City's Active Transportation Plan. See website here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Streets-For-People	Sean [K-M-4]
I know there is a bike master plan, but it should be included in this series of maps. And any existing unprotected bike lanes on fast roads should be marked as "uncomplete" routes.		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-4]
Staff initiated corrections to Map M-2a/b (Circulation Diagram).		The following roadway segments have been modified: -Franklin Blvd: change highlighted segment to 3 lanes (Sutterville south the 38th Ave) -Riverside Blvd: Change highlighted segment to 2 lanes (Vallejo to Sutterville) -I Street: Change highlighted (12th to 21st) segment to 2 lanes	Staff
Suggested Changes			
Natomas Central should not be an arterial. It doesn't function as one. Everyone uses El Centro as the arterial. Natomas Central is a collector. Please fix this now.		Thank you for your comment. This GPU includes a major pivot from previous General Plans, moving away from street widenings to reallocations. Proposed reallocations must meet standard thresholds to ensure continue operation of the transportation network. Streets that are not recommended for reallocation do not meet best practices or typical thresholds for lane reductions.	Anonymous [K-M-4]
Add Natomas Crossing of I-5 back in the map. This was removed solely because of neighborhood pressure. More connectivity is needed rather than less. This is mobility 101. Just because neighbors don't want "those people" driving into their neighborhood doesn't mean the City should do it. Costco is going to create a traffic mess on Commerce and Arena. Another route is needed. Be brave, provide connectivity.		Thank you for your comment.	Anonymous [K-M-4]
Agree with this comment. This portion of Natomas feels isolated and not connected with the rest of the community. Please explore finding ways to connect, especially with the services and schools that need to be accessed by all. Commuting via bike on Del Paso or Arena is intimidating and the only option is car access, which does not help with GHG reductions especially since those trips are local.		Please see policies NN-M-3 (High-Frequency Transit) and SN-M-3 (American River Parkway Connections).	Anonymous [K-M-4]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>Map M-2a: Circulation Diagram</p> <p>- Its not clear what the basis of the number of lanes is and how these numbers were selected. We request reducing the number of lanes on the following streets:</p> <p>--- 7th Street, between T Street and Richards Boulevard (2 lanes maximum, 1 recommended)</p> <p>--- 8th Street, between T Street and E Street (2 lanes maximum, 1 recommended)</p> <p>--- 16th Street, between Q and C Street (2 lanes maximum)</p> <p>--- 16th Street, between C St and 160 (3 lanes maximum)</p> <p>--- I street, between 3rd street and 21st Street (2 lanes maximum)</p> <p>--- J street, between 3rd street and 21st Street (2 lanes maximum)</p> <p>--- L street, between 3rd street and 21st Street (2 lanes maximum)</p> <p>--- N street, between 3rd street and 10th Street (2 lanes maximum)</p> <p>- Reduce the barriers that make crossing freeways so challenging, such as the large adjacent streets</p> <p>--- W Street, between 3rd and 28th (2 lanes maximum)</p> <p>--- X Street, between 3rd and 28th (2 lanes maximum)</p> <p>--- 29th Street, between E and T St (2 lanes maximum)</p> <p>--- 31st Street, between E and T St (2 lanes maximum)</p> <p>-24th street between Broadway and 2nd Ave - the existing configuration is two lanes. There is no justification for expanding this road to four lanes.</p> <p>- Summit Tunnel Ave (aka South Park Drive) in the Railyards is shown as a 4 lane major collector. The existing configuration is two lanes. The EIR for the railyards only studied two lanes. There is no justification for expanding this road.</p> <p>- Truxel Bridge over the American River: the bridge is shown as including two general purpose lanes. To further support climate goals, the bridge should not include any general purpose automobile lanes.</p>		<p>Maps M-2a and M-2b mainly show existing roadway conditions. Only a small number of new roadways are planned.</p> <p>This GPU includes a major pivot from previous General Plans, moving away from street widenings to reallocations. Proposed reallocations must meet standard thresholds to ensure continue operation of the transportation network. Streets that are not recommended for reallocation do not meet best practices or typical thresholds for lane reductions.</p>	House Sacramento [21]
<p>The Mobility Chapter classifies 16th Street as an Arterial Street and North B Street as a Major Collector Street (see Map M-2b). We request that Bannon Street between Richards Boulevard and North B Street be reclassified in the General Plan as a "Major Collector" (like North B Street). This will allow for a continuation of industrial operations on Bannon Street to the BDG facility and other major industrial uses, including the Sims Metal Recycling Center and the City's own Sacramento River Treatment facility.</p>		Street classifications for these streets have been carried over from the 2035 General Plan.	Blue Diamond [57]
<p>Why does J Street transform itself from a small city street into a giant road here? This is an intimidating and dangerous intersection for all users, with out of place highway-style merges.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Nick Shepard [K-M-4]
<p>A 2-lane "arterial" paralleling I-5? Is there any reason for this designation?</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-4]
<p>Again, this section is a neighborhood main street. Reducing it to 2 lanes was great, and people from Land Park do drive downtown on it, but "arterials" call for limited access, no residential driveways, larger spacing between intersections...</p> <p>What is the reason for designating it arterial? What does the designation imply for small older roads so designated?</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-4]
<p>Prioritize Bike and Ped Facilities</p> <p>There are a number of residents that utilize this intersection and it would be great to see a higher focus on prioritizing the people that walk or roll along these corridors. Schools, restaurants, services and parks are all important to the community, let's focus on offering alternative modes of transportation by putting people first.</p>		Please see policy M-1.2 (User Prioritization).	Anonymous [K-M-4]
Map M-2b (Circulation Diagram - Downtown Inset)			
Lane Reduction			
<p>Thre is no need for 3 lane one ways anywhere in the central city</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-M-5]
<p>Second this. No need for 3+ lane streets, period.</p> <p>Please add text indicating this (removal of 3-lane streets in City Center) as one of the aims of this document (as part of overall support for multi-modality and active transportation).</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-M-5]
<p>Stockton is overly large and dangerous as is. It should have fewer lanes.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Nick Shepard [K-M-5]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The 34th/Stockton intersection crossing the light rail tracks is particularly precarious to bike through. The traffic signal does not have protected turn signals, there are no bike lanes, and the RR crossing gates are struck by trucks that can't make the turn. One of the railroad crossings should be close to reduce conflict points. Also, reduce Stockton to 2 lanes.		Please follow and participate in the Streets for People project, the City's Active Transportation Plan. See website here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Streets-For-People	Ian Treat [K-M-5]
There is no reason for 15th/16th to be 3 lanes. Drivers to not yield ROW to people in cross walks.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-5]
Second thsi! Suggestion to add additional bullet point to M-1.16: - Removal of extremely wide car thoroughfares in high pedestrian areas, including all 3-lane streets and roads in the Central City.		Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-M-5]
Truxel bridge should not include an general purpose lanes (transit & active transportation only). This is in alignment with climate goals.		Thank you for your comment.	Kevin Dumler [K-M-5]
Confirm with new Downtown Mobility Plan that this will still be 3 lanes (some of I St. is narrowing to 2).		Map M-2b revised to reflect I Street, from 12th to 21st with 2 lanes.	Matt A [K-M-5]
<i>Prioritize Bike and Ped Facilities</i>			
Pedestrianize capitol mall or at least add trees down the center. Festivals in the summer there suck because of all the asphalt and lack of tree coverage.		Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-M-5]
The city's website has three alternatives to redoing the Richards Blvd exit. The preferred one is the most pedestrian-aggressive because they continue to prioritize the movement of cars to people. Richards is a VERY busy area for pedestrians. Please reconsider the alternatives. Remember that unhoused people deserve to cross the street safely.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-5]
Really enjoying the new separated bike lane on 21st. Definitely still a lot of cars parking in the bike lane!		Thank you for your comment.	Aurora [K-M-5]
W and X Streets, both of them three lanes one way, pose a horrible barrier to pedestrians trying to go to between the Central City and the Broadway Corridor. Drivers treat them like they are freeways and turn around corners onto and off them recklessly and drivers making turns pay no attention to pedestrians trying to cross at traffic lights. The Broadway Corridor is in easy walking distance for many of us who live in the Central City, but W and X create an extremely dangerous barrier which needs to be looked at.		Please follow and participate in the Streets for People project, the City's Active Transportation Plan. See website here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Streets-For-People	Karen Jacques [K-M-5]
Suggestion to add additional bullet point to M-1.16: - Removal of extremely wide car thoroughfares in high pedestrian areas, including all 3-lane streets and roads in the Central City.		Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-M-5]
<i>Roadway Classification</i>			
Why would there be an Arterial through Downtown? This runs counter to the nature of the grid.		Thank you for your comment.	Nick Shepard [K-M-5]
Second this! Suggestion to add additional bullet point to M-1.16: - Removal of extremely wide roads in high pedestrian areas, including all 3-lane streets and roads in the Central City.		Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-M-5]
My understanding is that arterial roads are supposed to provide mobility with more limited access and higher speeds. There is a project going on right now to modify Broadway to discourage through traffic and reduce speeds. Is it really still classified arterial in that section? In general on this map, it looks like too many roads are classified as arterial. I'll point a few out...		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-5]
<i>Freeway Entrances/Exits</i>			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The city should consider reducing the number of entrances and exits to freeways. These dangerous merges create traffic backups on surface streets and on the freeways. Even better, look into ways to remove elevated freeways and cover trenched freeways.		Thank you for your comment.	Nick Shepard [K-M-5]
The worst being 15th and 16th street off ramps. The convenience to commuters that these provide are not worth how incredibly dangerous they are.		Thank you for your comment.	Austin [K-M-5]
They should close them for a week or a month and see what happens. Traffic on W/X would presumably increase, but I bet you wouldn't really notice.		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-5]
Consider reducing western portion of N Street to two lanes to accommodate protected bike lanes and make it consistent with eastern segment.		Thank you for your comment.	Doug Brown [K-M-5]
Street Classifications			
Arterials must be significantly rethought to effect any meaningful reduction in single occupancy vehicle use. Bus and bike lanes are an option, but only if they are given priority and enforced 24/7 with cameras.		Please follow and participate in the Streets for People project, the City Active Transportation Plan. See website here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Streets-For-People	Nick Shepard [K-M-6]
There are a lot of streets marked as arterials (Broadway, Freeport, Folsom Blvd west of 65th, or the lane-reduced section of Stockton), sections are commercial corridors and should no longer be optimized for "mobility": they primarily provide access. That they historically performed an arterial function is beside the point; this is the 2040 plan. After looking at the map some more, the red flag seems to be "2-lane (2-way) arterial". Unless they are actually limited-access expressways or highways, I suggest the categorization of those streets be changed to something more appropriate.		Please follow and participate in the Streets for People project, the City Active Transportation Plan. See website here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Streets-For-People	Sean [K-M-6]
Geometry of Successful Transit Service			
The true cost of driving as transportation is much higher than the cost for more frequent buses. Driving is just heavily subsidized at the expense of the state, city, and property costs for all the space taken up by roads and parking. This is a PR problem and should also be addressed by heavily increasing parking fees and implementing a road usage charge.		Thank you for your comment.	Jenny [K-M-6]
I mean...the Blue line's 3 northern-most stops are park and ride lots in the middle of I-80. That's just bad design.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-6]
A hub and spoke model can have the effect of separating places that are geographically close to each other. By pushing everyone down the same corridor you will create congestion. This is how our car-dependent networks are designed and it limits mobility and dense development opportunities. Transit sponsored sprawling is better than car dependent but still not good		Thank you for your comment.	ew [K-M-6]
That's why constructing the Green Line to the airport should be the #1 priority for the City's transportation plan. You have a large population and work center (downtown) and large transit and employment center (airport) at each end.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-6]
Refer to RT's High Capacity Bus Service Study (May 2021) https://www.sacrt.com/apps/wp-content/uploads/SacRT-Task-3.5-Final-Report_v3-Exhibit-A-High-Capacity-Bus.pdf		Thank you for your comment.	Jordan Grimaldi [K-M-6]
collaboration also with the County of Sacramento?		Please see policy M-5.1 (Regional Mobility System).	Susan Hida [K-M-6]
Transit connections are a penalty to riders. Bus riders like myself prefer to have one bus ride versus transferring to another bus, especially with SACRT's 30-minute headways.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-6]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Agreed. Need 15 minute frequency as well as more continuous routes to get people to shift from car to transit. And buses need to run all the time, not just office commuter schedule.		Thank you for your comment.	Jenny [K-M-6]
I agree that connections in the current system are agonizing, but if there is enough frequency they can really increase the amount of area you can cover with transit. This would require a wait time of no more than 4-5 minutes for connections and the advantage of transit not being stuck in car-based congestion to really start working well.		Thank you for your comment.	ew [K-M-6]
HAWK crossing are an abomination and do not really work that well. If a road "needs" a HAWK crossing the cars are going too fast. I would suggest removing any pictures of these because they totally suck. This is an example of car-orientated thinking that makes people the "visitor" and allows cars to dominate the space. Visibility is not why people get killed when a car hits them. Its the speed and momentum of the multiple thousand pound ball of metal that does the killing. Traffic calming to no higher than 20 mph is what is needed.	comment on photo	Thank you for your comment.	ew [K-M-6]
Clarify High Frequency Transit Corridor selection process. Its not clear how the High Frequency Transit Corridors were selected, or why some routes with existing high ridership were excluded. This includes Freeport Bouelvard and H/J Street.		Please see call-out box titled "Geometry of Successful Transit Service" on page 8-6 of the Mobility Element for more information about how the candidate high-frequency transit corridors were selected. Freeport Boulevard were not selected because it is not projected to have sufficient density to support headways of 15 minutes or less by 2040. J Street was not selected because it does not have an anchor at the east end, potentially taking away ridership from the R Street transit line and limiting its potential to provide frequent and reliable service.	House Sacramento [21]
Map M-3: Candidate High-Frequency Transit Corridors			
<i>Suggested Corridors</i>			
J Street should be a high-density, high-frequency transit corridor through East Sac: It is a perfect linear connection between regional destinations including downtown Sacramento, Sac Valley Station, multiple major hospitals, and CSUS.		Thank you for your comment. J Street was not selected because it does not have an anchor at the east end, potentially taking away ridership from the R Street transit line and limiting its potential to provide frequent and reliable service.	Darren [K-M-7]
The Stockton Blvd corridor needs to hit the hospitals here, and terminate at CRC.		Thank you for your comment. Please see call-out box titled "Geometry of Successful Transit Service" on page 8-6 of the Mobility Element for more information about how the candidate high-frequency transit corridors were selected.	Sean [K-M-7]
This transit corridor should extend down Howe to Sac State/65th Street LRT. It would serve a dense residential part of the county, shoppers, and students.		Thank you for your comment. Please see call-out box titled "Geometry of Successful Transit Service" on page 8-6 of the Mobility Element for more information about how the candidate high-frequency transit corridors were selected.	Sean [K-M-7]
City should consider incorporating draft corridors and potential related transit-supportive improvements outlined in SACOG Regional Transit Network (RTN) plan when finalizing Map M-3 (Candidate High-Frequency Transit Corridors).The RTN will be ready for public review late summer 2023. It will include near-term speed and reliability improvements, a defined long-term high-capacity network, and a list of prioritized high-capacity corridors intended to compliment existing services.		At time of reviewing comments, the Regional Transit Network (RTN) was not publicly available.	SACOG [2]
Recommend the City explore road reallocations (Map M-1) in all of its Vision Zero Top Ten Corridors as a means of reaching its active mode goals (M-1.11), reducing reliance on single-occupant vehicles (Goal M-2), prioritizing walking over vehicle modes (Policy M-1.2), and achieving the M-4 goal of "a safer transportation system."		Vision Zero Corridors were considered during the analysis and traffic modeling process to determine roadway reallocation segments.	SACOG [2]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>Map M-3: Candidate High-Frequency Transit Corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no background information provided on how the candidate transit corridors were selected. At this point, we support include more “candidate” corridors so these can be studied more extensively in the future. - We recommend including the following routes as candidate corridors --- J street, between Downtown and Sac State --- Freeport Boulevard, between Broadway and Florin Road - We recommend a larger radius or transit oriented development areas around transit corridors, including at the following locations --- Truxel and Gateway Park, to include all of the existing big-box retail areas (known as Sacramento Gateway, The Promenade at Sacramento, and Natomas Marketplace) --- The vicinity of the East Sacramento Gold Line Stops --- The existing big-box retail center in the Pocket (known as “Lake Crest Village”) --- The existing retail locations on Freeport boulevard, between Sutterville Road and Fruitridge Road --- The existing community and retail facilities located at the vicinity of the intersection of H, J, and Elvas, from 56th Street ot the American River. --- The Pocket Regional Bus Stop (known as “The Promanade” at the intersection of Rush River and Widnbridge) 		<p>Please see call-out box titled "Geometry of Successful Transit Service" on page 8-6 of the Mobility Element for more information about how the candidate high-frequency transit corridors were selected.</p> <p>Freeport Boulevard was not selected because it is not projected to have sufficient density to support headways of 15 minutes or less by 2040. J Street was not selected because it does not have an anchor at the east end, potentially taking away ridership from the R Street transit line and limiting its potential to provide frequent and reliable service.</p> <p>Policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development) revised to say: " The City shall encourage increased residential and commercial development intensity within one-quarter-mile ½-mile of existing high-frequency bus stops and existing and planned light rail stations and, commuter rail stations, and high-frequency bus stops to support more frequent, reliable transit service and vibrant, walkable neighborhoods."</p>	e
<p>Map M-3: The map is somewhat misleading, as it depicts the Gold Line and Blue Line light rail routes as “candidates” for high-frequency transit; however, they are already high-frequency transit corridors, not necessarily candidates for that level of service. Additionally, SacRT refers to “high-frequency” service as fixed-route service offered at headways of 15 minutes or better. As such, it may be helpful to better define what “high frequency” service means.</p>		<p>The General Plan glossary is aligned with the SacRT defintion of high-frequency service.</p> <p>"Geometry of Successful Transit Service" text box: move the last paragraph to the beginning and revise to say: "The General Plan seeks to focus new development along several key corridors, and has identified that are strong candidates for investing in existing and/or new frequent, reliable transit service routes (shown on Map M-3) based on their geometry and other factors (selections are shown on Map M-3)."</p>	SacRT [74]
Cap the Freeway			
Cap/remove the freeway and develop a high-density, high-frequency transit corridor on top		Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-M-7]
Transit-Oriented Development			
There needs to be a lot more transit-oriented development outside the central city if you want to meet climate goals		Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-M-7]
Would like to see the old Sac Bee offices transformed into dense living spaces with a new park.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-7]
Transit Connection and Frequency			
Sac State is ignored in this plan, and yet thousands of people commute here every day. There is an urgent need for a better and more frequent transit connection to campus.		Please see policies ES-LUP-1 (Sacramento State Connections), ES-M-1 (Sacramento State Pedestrian Connections), and ES-M-2 (Sacramento State Transport). Please also see Figure ES-9 (Circulation Plan for 65th Street/University Transit Village).	Nick Shepard [K-M-7]
The Emeryville shuttle from the BART has been very successful. Could something like that be implemented?		Thank you for your comment.	Jenny [K-M-7]
While light rail frequency through downtown is good, it is painfully slow due to sharing lanes with vehicles. It's a 15 minute ride from Sac Valley Station to 29th St. Trains should have exclusive ROW. The number of passengers on one train far exceeds the throughput of drivers at a couple traffic light cycles.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-7]
While West Sacramento is not part of Sacramento, Sacramento's transit strategy should plan to engage with the government of West Sacramento to offer better transit options into West Sacramento. As West Sacramento becomes increasingly dense, commuters into downtown Sacramento will require more transit resources, and it will be inefficient for those short-distance commuters to exclusively use highways. Additionally, transit should provide access to amenities such as Sutter Health Field.		Please see policy M-5.1 (Regional Mobility System).	Max Cassell [K-M-7]
I strongly agree. The streetcar is supposed to go exactly to the ballpark, but it should continue west and down Jefferson.		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-7]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
I am worried that the Green Line will take too long to be competitive with driving (or even busses) for airport transfers. We should reserve right of way for a future fast rail line from SVS to SMF. As Capitol Corridor and San Joaquin service improves, and North Valley Rail maybe becomes a thing, it would take something like 30,000 cars a day off the freeways.		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-7]
Pedestrian Safety			
Again let us know that corridor plans are being addressed holistically. Residents need to cross "the thumb" efficiently.		Please see policy M-5.1 (Regional Mobility System).	Susan Hida [K-M-7]
Ex Florin Mall seems to be a good nucleus for a dense node--Stockton and Florin corridors meet, and according to this tool (https://www.tomforth.co.uk/circlepopulations/) there are 100,000 people living within a 3km radius. This is as dense as a Dutch suburb.		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-7]
Other			
I know why Arden-Arcade was never annexed into the City--but not why this area wasn't.		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-7]
Electric Vehicles			
EVs are still single occupancy vehicles, so they do not help reduce traffic. Their heavier weight makes them more dangers when colliding with other vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians, and places greater strain on infrastructure. The city must prioritize discouraging single occupancy vehicle trips by removing such discounts.		Goal section M-1 encourages alternative modes of transportation which aim to move people from single-occupancy vehicles to other forms of transportation.	Nick Shepard [K-M-8]
Agreed. Most standard parking garages cannot would be over design load if filled with EVs. Need to disincentivize private vehicle trips rather than promote EVs.		Goal section M-1 encourages alternative modes of transportation which aim to move people from single-occupancy vehicles to other forms of transportation.	Jenny [K-M-8]
Agreed. Would like to see this reflected in the CAAP and GP.		Goal section M-1 encourages alternative modes of transportation which aim to move people from single-occupancy vehicles to other forms of transportation.	Matt A [K-M-8]
There is no mention of E scooters and bikes. These are promising as part of the climate and traffic solution as they are cheaper than cars to buy and run, accessible to many who cannot drive, and great at solving the last mile problem for transit. However, they can be a nuisance if not planned for and given space separate from pedestrian and vehicle areas (protected bike lanes are great!) These should be addressed as part of the plan.		Policy M-1.25 revised to say: "The City shall support "first-mile, last-mile solutions" such as e-bikes/e-scooters as well as multimodal transportation services, public realm improvements, and other innovations in the areas around transit stations and major bus stops (transit stops) to maximize multimodal connectivity and access for transit riders. Policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy) revised to say: "Program components could include the following: "...Managing rights-of-way to accommodate e-bike/e-scooter sharing services;..."	Jenny [K-M-8]
They do need to be planned for. I have been nearly hit by an electric scooter more than once while walking on the sidewalk.		Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacques [K-M-8]
Why did the GIG car share disappear then? We already tried that.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-8]
Maintenance and Funding			
I'd like to see the city prioritize maintaining infrastructure in areas with higher population density. Property taxes should be increased for single-family homes to account for the extra miles of roadway and utility services.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-8]
Could we make impact fees or other active transportation/road safety investments be required by default for new developments?		Policy PFS-3.3 (Development Impacts) will ensure that adequate public utilities and services are available to serve new development through the development review process, including through development impact fees and offsite improvements constructed by new development.	Jeffrey [K-M-9]
Goal M-1 (equitable, sustainable multimodal system)			
<i>System Planning, Design, and Operations</i>			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Policy M-1.1: Street Classification System: This language continues to prioritize the movement of cars over the safety of individuals. We recommend the following language: "The City shall maintain a street classification system that considers the role of streets corridors for movement but prioritizes Complete Streets concepts that enable connected, comfortable, and convenient travel for those walking, rolling, and taking transit."	M-1.1 (Street Classification System)	Policy M-1.1 (Street Classification System) revised to say: "...role of streets as corridors for movement but also prioritizes reflects a context-sensitive Complete Streets concept that..."	House Sacramento [21]
The Plan should connect the street standards for tree canopy (ERC-A.11), transit-only lanes (M-1.24), bicycle lanes (M-1.18), and sidewalk width with the Street Classification System established in M-1.1, such that different standards for transit, walkability, and canopy correspond with different street levels. This would allow improvements to be consistently applied throughout the City.		Thank you for your comment.	ECOS [42]
Suggestion: Add bullet points for what this actually means. "Prioritize pedestrians" is nebulous but does this mean transportation funding will be primarily dedicated towards pedestrian improvements? Will they receive transit signal priority? Will larger portions of the streetscape be dedicated to them?	M-1.2 (User Prioritization)	Refer to Streets for People Plan and Transportation Priorities Plan. Streets for People website can be found here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Streets-For-People Transportation Priorities Plan website can be found here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Transportation-Priorities-Plan	Matt A [K-M-9]
Thank you! It is scary to be a pedestrian or a cyclist in unprotected bike lanes because the flow of auto traffic is so fast.	M-1.2 (User Prioritization)	Thank you for your comment.	Matt Malkin [K-M-9]
Commend the policies and programs aimed at prioritizing walking, biking, and transit over automobile use through measures like road allocations (Map M-1), user prioritization (M-1.2), and station access improvements (M-1.12).		Thank you for your comment.	SACOG [2]
M-1.3 (Healthy Transportation System Options): Incentivizing non-Single Occupancy Vehicles (SOV), which includes both cars that use gasoline and electric cars such as ZEVs, is an important step in transforming the way residents move around, but this is diluted by including ZEVs in the list of investments. ZEVs should be their own line item, as there have been decades of infrastructure built around SOVs.	M-1.3 (Healthy Transportation System Options)	Policy M-1.3 (Healthy Transportation System Options) revised to say: "...that make active transportation, nonmotorized modes, high-occupancy, and zeroemission vehicles (ZEVs) viable, attractive alternatives to the-private automobiles that use internal combustion engines. "	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
The GP and CAAP need to specify specific funds that will go to projects that reduce reliance on cars and we need to start anywhere to shift how people move around the city. Let's start with closing streets like we did during the pandemic, and let people have the streets so we can shop, eat, and live safely.		Please see policies M-1.8 (Vacation of Public Right-of-Way), M-3.5 (Open Street Events), and M-3.6 (Outdoor Dining Program).	Kay Crumb [40]
Yes, more protected bike lanes please. If you can get enough people out of cars by giving them good alternatives, the roads will last longer and the bike lanes will pay for themselves.	M-1.2 (User Prioritization)	Please see policy M-1.17 (Improve Bicycling Connectivity), M-1.18 (Bicycling Safety). Please also see Downtown Mobility Project. Website can be found here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/public-works/engineering-services/projects/current-projects/downtown-mobility-project#:~:text=CENTRAL%20CITY%20MOBILITY%20PROJECT,travel%20options%20for%20all%20modes .	Jenny [K-M-9]
Agree with this prioritization. This prioritization should be reflected in city roadway design standards so that any re-pavement or road update projects automatically reconfigure existing streets to better reflect this prioritization.	User prioritization graphic	Thank you for your comment.	Jeffrey [K-M-9]
I love this prioritization. I think the City should actively seek more conversion of public right of way away from cars and towards active modes. This should include a serious exploration of more pedestrian streets as a city-led initiative rather than a reactive appeasing of the business interests on the street.	User prioritization graphic	Please see policies M-1.8 (Vacation of Public Right-of-Way), M-3.5 (Open Street Events), and M-3.6 (Outdoor Dining Program).	Dov Kadin [K-M-9]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Please consider city-funded tactical urbanism to quickly greenlight and pilot active transportation improvements. This would allow the city to try out the improvement and get feedback from citizens during the trial period. Another benefit is that active transport upgrades often require proof of existing pedestrian/cyclist use, but usage is low in the existing condition because people feel the risk of getting run over is too high to use that route. With a pilot project the city can get an idea of how many people would use it if it were safe.	User prioritization graphic	Please see policy M-2.12 (Innovative Mobility Solutions and Curb of the Future).	Jenny [K-M-9]
I agree that pedestrians should be prioritized. The city should consider raising the crosswalks. Raising the crosswalks would convert them into speed bumps, making pedestrians visible, forcing traffic to slow down, and making travel by sidewalk more equitable to those using wheelchairs.	User prioritization graphic	Thank you for your comment. The City is looking for opportunities to install raised crosswalks.	Jordan Leigh [K-M-9]
See this video on raised crosswalk design in Amsterdam: https://youtu.be/9OfBpQgLUc	User prioritization graphic	Thank you for your comment.	Jenny [K-M-9]
Fully support. We've already got a kickass humps, bumps, and lumps program - let's add this to the toolbox and require on appropriate streets.	User prioritization graphic	Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-M-9]
Very good prioritization that compliments the City's other goals to promote transit, pedestrian, and bicycle-oriented growth that will reduce air pollution and GHG emissions and save Sacramentans money. Thank you!	User prioritization graphic	Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-M-9]
M-1.27-38 are about vehicles, whereas, transit and pedestrians have fewer paragraphs. M-1.22 is kind of pathetic--it's just the city saying they want transit ridership to increase. The real meat of the mobility section does not reflect the User Prioritization pyramid.	User prioritization graphic	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-9]
Adopt or update street design standards to allow for more lane reductions and one-way to two-way conversions. Right now in many cases we're stuck with one-ways or stuck with excessive lanes because of archaic street design standards which are too restrictive. For example, the Freepoint Blvd lane reduction was vetoed before any public review just because somebody counted more than 20,000 average daily traffic (ADT) in a one-block segment. We can't let last century's street designs get in the way of saving lives, saving the planet, and saving money (more car infrastructure = greater maintenance liabilities).	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Please see implementing action M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update).	Troy [K-M-10]
Street design standards should feature protected facilities for peds and bikes by default. This is especially true for design standards applied to new developments (new developments should not be building based on designs that primarily prioritize vehicular traffic)	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Thank you for your comment.	Jeffrey [K-M-10]
Recommend adding "...incorporate green infrastructure..." as one of the goals listed here for street design standards. Items such as bulbouts for tree plantings should be a tool in the street design guideline toolbox.	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Please see policy M-3.2 (Street Design).	Matt A [K-M-10]
Consider updating the street design manual to include features from the Dutch CROW Manual or the NACTO Manual	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Thank you for your comment.	Francois Kaepelin [K-M-10]
Support. Include adopting NACTO guidance as primary official guiding document in place of MUTCD (to align with priorities above)	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-M-10]
Set actual speed limit goals that all streets in the city need to meet (20 mph is my suggestion) and state them explicitly here. This makes cars and car infrastructure explain why it is actually needed. If there are special circumstances that require a higher speed, that street will need special permission. This makes safety on streets standard and potentially dangerous situation case by case approvals. The city website has woeful information about speeds on our streets with traffic calming as an after thought. Traffic calming needs to be the standard approach and it is the engineer's responsibility to make it happen. This makes "I was just following the standard" result in safer places that will actually promote modes of transportation outside of a vehicle.	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Thank you for your comment.	ew [K-M-10]
Look at the Netherlands for Street design	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-M-10]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The traffic calming measures in north Midtown have transformed these communities into Sacramento's most walkable neighborhoods. The streets are now safer for pedestrians including children and promote more walking and biking. These type of treatments should be preserved and, where appropriate, available to other neighborhoods that want their streets to be safer for pedestrians and bicyclists.	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Please see policy M-3.2 (Street Design).	Corey Brown [K-M-10]
Per climate goals this should be applied to all neighborhoods.	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Please see policy M-3.2 (Street Design).	Jenny [K-M-10]
And very important for neighborhoods where we don't want the children to get run over. Which is again, all of them.	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Please see policy M-3.2 (Street Design).	Jenny [K-M-10]
I think crosswalk/curb rebuilds should use a bulb out design by default to shorten the crosswalk length and improve visibility. the option to retain a non bulb out design should be opt out only. I recently saw the county rebuild dozens of crosswalks on an entire stretch of road with only modest ada improvements, but otherwise the crosswalks remain largely unsafe and uncomfortable for folks on foot	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Please see policy LUP-8.14 (Streetscape Beautification).	Jeffrey [K-M-10]
Bulb out design would really help pedestrians safety in situations where a one way street turns onto another one way street. There are a lot of those in the Central City and drivers go at high speeds around those corners. As they turn the corner it apparently never occurs to them that they might be driving straight into a pedestrian who is trying to cross the street they are turning onto. It's very dangerous	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Please see policy LUP-8.14 (Streetscape Beautification).	Karen Jacque [K-M-10]
Street space is extremely limited in Sacramento, and it is not possible to make every street a complete street. Even so, the City needs to identify how they want people to travel and prioritize which street designs and standards are the most conducive to this (M-1.5: Street Design Standards).	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Policy M-1.5: Street Design Standards: This policy statement slightly conflicts with M-1.2 but not explicitly prioritizing non-automobile operations. This would better align with the General Plan Vision ("Pedestrian, bicycle and transit options will be prioritized over automobiles."). We recommend the following language: "The City shall maintain street design and operations standards that prioritize comfort and travel time for walking, bicycling, and transit while managing safe vehicle speeds and traffic volumes, updating them as best practices evolve."	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Policy M-1.5 (Street Design Standards) revised to say: "The City shall maintain street design and operations standards that prioritize comfort and travel time for walking, bicycling, and transit, while managing manage vehicle speeds and traffic volumes and provide for comfortable walking and bicycling travel , updating them as best practices evolve."	House Sacramento [21]
Policy M-1.5: Efficient transit operations is highly dependent on street design and infrastructure; therefore, SacRT believes that 'public transit' should also be included as a consideration in Street Design Standards, at least for the design of arterial streets.	M-1.5 (Street Design Standards)	Policy M-1.5 (Street Design Standards) revised to say: "The City shall maintain street design and operations standards that prioritize comfort and travel time for walk, bicycling, and transit, while managing manage vehicle speeds and traffic volumes and provide for comfortable walking and bicycling travel , updating them as best practices evolve."	SacRT [74]
This should also include better integration of the light-rail into neighborhoods. Zoning should also be changed to allow for community grocery stores, allowing easier access to foods for communities who would normally have to travel miles to access it.	M-1.6 (Transit Integration)	Policy M-1.6 (Transit Integration) revised to say: "Wherever feasible, the City shall design buildings, the public realm, streets, and pedestrian access to integrate transit into existing neighborhoods and proposed developments and destinations such as schools , employment centers, commercial centers, major attractions, and public walking spaces to improve access for users by transit."	Jordan Leigh [K-M-10]
Schools should be added to this list of daily/essential destinations as SCUSD and the majority of adjacent school districts currently offer little-to-no bussing for general education. This comment is particularly direct towards middle and high school students who rely on public transportation to get to school.	M-1.6 (Transit Integration)	Policy M-1.6 (Transit Integration) revised to say: "Wherever feasible, the City shall design buildings, the public realm, streets, and pedestrian access to integrate transit into existing neighborhoods and proposed developments and destinations such as schools , employment centers, commercial centers, major attractions, and public walking spaces to improve access for users by transit."	Jordan Grimaldi [K-M-10]
M-1.6 Transit Integration: Add schools to list of example essential destinations. This is especially critical as SCUSD and adjacent school districts do not offer general education bussing and many middle/high school students rely on transit to get to school. With the Ride Free RT program, students are one of the highest ridership groups of RT buses. Consulting with SacRT and SCUSD for appropriate siting of new bus stops to align with student needs may also be helpful.	M-1.6 (Transit Integration)	Policy M-1.6 (Transit Integration) revised to say: "Wherever feasible, the City shall design buildings, the public realm, streets, and pedestrian access to integrate transit into existing neighborhoods and proposed developments and destinations such as schools , employment centers, commercial centers, major attractions, and public walking spaces to improve access for users by transit."	Civic Thread [91]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
M-1.6 (Transit Integration) does not establish what the City will be willing to do to make these changes. While the City does not run SacRT, it is responsible for the streets and must work with SacRT to establish Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridors throughout the City. This is the only way to fulfill the City's goal to plan the transportation system with equitable outcomes and investments (M-1.9). The GP needs to commit to incentivizing transit use throughout Sacramento and return the streets to people.	M-1.6 (Transit Integration)	Thank you for your comment. Please also refer to Implementing Action M-A.8: Bus Rapid Transit.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
<i>Active Transportation</i>			
If Active Transportation (AT) is an earnest goal in the GP and in the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP), the city must invest heavily in bicycle and pedestrian walkways, make slow roads complete streets, and provide ample shade by planting trees along these paths. This includes more drastic changes such as: - Reducing street size in favor of creating cut outs to plant city trees in, - Implementing several traffic calming street designs for safety, - Increase separated bike lanes by use of bollards and curbs, - Increase bike parking availability, - Prioritize bikes, buses, and people by closing direct routes to cars (such as Stockton Blvd and Broadway), and - Connect major destinations, such as light rail stations, to bike and walking paths.		Please see policies M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. Please see goal section M-1 for policies that would support a multi-modal transportation system. Please see goal section M-4 for policies on creating a safer transportation system. Please also see goal sections LUP-4, LUP-5, and LUP-6 for policies that promote walkable, transit-oriented centers and corridors; attractive, thriving commercial centers; and healthy, livable complete neighborhoods with amenities within walking and biking distance. Additionally, Implementing Action M-A.10 directs the City to update the Street Design Standards and the City has initiated a study to update the Vehicle and Bicycle Parking requirements.	Kay Crumb [40]
Consider reviewing and increasing the active transportation targets. 6% won't get us to carbon-neutral, will continue to disproportionately impact disadvantaged communities (noise, particulate matter from increased EVs). If 6% is still deemed appropriate, please consider saying explicitly "triple active transportation mode share" as seems to be suggested by the calculations.		Thank you for your comment.	Matt Anderson [6]
The city needs more specific and better bike infrastructure design standards. The new central mobility project includes some poor design decisions, such as wide gutters in some portions of the new bike lanes (this is unsafe and unpleasant for cyclist). For example, the city should maintain some document that is referenced during all future bike project designs which minimizes street gutter pans in bike lanes.	M-1.11 (Increase Bicycling and Walking)	Please see policy M-1.5 (M-1.5 Street Design Standards) and implementing action M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update).	Jeffrey [K-M-10]
Yes! And make sure any utility lids or gratings are bike wheel safe.	M-1.11 (Increase Bicycling and Walking)	Please see policy M-1.5 (M-1.5 Street Design Standards) and implementing action M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update).	Jenny [K-M-10]
The City should consider reallocating roadway funding to the construction of pedestrian paths and protected bike lanes rather than relying solely on grant funding. The transition to a walkable city will be far too slow if the City doesn't commit actual dollars to the effort.	M-1.11 (Increase Bicycling and Walking)	Thank you for your comment.	Doug Brown [K-M-10]
Add in a part where the City will consider closing streets off (like R Street) to personal vehicle usage, making it accessible only for pedestrians, cyclists, trucks, and emergency vehicles. I'm thinking making them more like the strøget in Copenhagen	M-1.11 (Increase Bicycling and Walking)	Please see policies M-1.8 (Vacation of Public Right-of-Way), M-3.5 (Open Street Events), and M-3.6 (Outdoor Dining Program).	Francois Kaepelin [K-M-10]
M-1.11 (Increase Bicycling and Walking) ties into the action above by stating, "The City shall strive to increase bicycling and walking citywide so that it can meet its equity, reduced vehicle miles traveled, and sustainability goals." However, the wording for this item is extremely weak with the inclusion of "shall strive." The City must set specific, measurable goals to increase AT citywide.	M-1.11 (Increase Bicycling and Walking)	Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
LA Metro's new stations are beautiful. SACRT stations should be modeled after these.	M-1.12 (LRT Station Access Improvements)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-10]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
M-1.12 (Light Rail Transit (LRT) Station Access Improvements) is equally non-specific. It states "the City Shall foster additional walking and bicycling connections to light rail stations and strengthen existing connections to enhance first/last-mile connectivity..." and this is restated in M-1.25 (First/Last-Mile Solutions). The language used in this measurement is weakened by the use of "shall foster" instead of "will create" or "will prioritize."	M-1.12 (LRT Station Access Improvements)	Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
The ATC Recommends additional language to policy M-1.12 "Light Rail Transit (LRT) Station Access Improvements" "The city will place at high of active transportation priority to ensure sidewalks and lighting are present on all residential streets within a quarter mile of all light rail stations."	M-1.12 (LRT Station Access Improvements)	Revise to add a new final sentence to Policy M-1.12 (Light Rail Transit (LRT) Station Access Improvements)... As feasible, connections should include pedestrian-level streetlighting and tree shading.	ATC [26]
Raised crossing as a tool. It calms car traffic and eliminates pedestrian friction points that require special ramps that may be blocked in the future. Please include this in our toolbox of measures that aligns with the goals of putting pedestrians first.	M-1.13 (Walkability)	Thank you for your comment. The City is looking for opportunities to install raised crosswalks.	ew [K-M-11]
This is vital! The city should also consider placing Parking Lane Planters wherever possible. This also has the effect of calming traffic.	M-1.13 (Walkability)	Thank you for your comment.	Nick Shepard [K-M-11]
When considering shade trees please consider only the use of California Native Trees such as Oaks. Oak trees provide large shade canopies and do not have the same negative affect that we see from other invasive trees that snap and break, like we see with Bradford pears.	M-1.13 (Walkability)	Thank you for your comment.	Jordan Leigh [K-M-11]
Policy M-1.13: Walkability: This policy statement should be expanded to promote designs that provide separation from vehicles, such as planter strips and barrier curbs (versus attached sidewalks and rolled curbs)	M-1.13 (Walkability)	Bullet added to Policy M-1.13 (Walkability): " Separation from vehicle traffic; "	House Sacramento [21]
M-1.13 (Walkability) does not have language that commits to generating revenue for small businesses through walkability. Again, the City will "promote walking by including design elements" rather than prioritizing walking by implementing, wherever possible, the elements identified. Shade trees, wider sidewalks, and crossings are all part of walking facilities identified in M-1.14 (Walking Facilities). The City only identifies grant funding to build these features. If we only built or repaved roads with grant funding, we would have far fewer roads in our city and people would be severely hampered in traveling. Walking should be a priority, and walking should be safe.	M-1.13 (Walkability)	Policy M-1.13 (Walkability) revised to say: "The City shall design streets to promote prioritize walking by..."	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
With the Dept. of Urban Forestry being under the Director of Public WORKS, are trees at a disadvantage?	M-1.14 (Walking Facilities)	Thank you for your comment.	Susan Hida [K-M-11]
Policy M-1.14: Walking Facilities: This policy statement oddly precludes the use of CIP/General Funds/Sales Tax Revenue from building new sidewalks ("through development project improvements and grants"). We recommend the following: "The City shall work to complete the network of tree-shaded sidewalks throughout the City, to the greatest extent feasible, by building new sidewalks and crossing, especially within the high-injury network, in disadvantaged communities, near high-ridership transit stops, and near important destinations, such as schools, parks, and commercial areas. Walking facilities should incorporate shade trees."	M-1.14 (Walking Facilities)	Policy M-1.14 (Walking Facilities) revised to say: "... to the greatest extent feasible, through development project improvements and grant funding to by building new sidewalks and crossings, especially within the high-injury network..."	House Sacramento [21]
AT needs to be the highest funding priority. In M-1.4 (Designing to Move People), throughput is incentivized, but not specified. More concrete information is needed about what "prioritiz[ing] person throughput" means, what types of "more efficient travel modes" are, and what the threshold for success is. Unfortunately, the CAAP target date of 2045, is too far out to have a significant impact on the wellbeing of residents in the coming decades.		Please see policies M-1.7 (Fine-Grained Network), M-1.8 (Vacation of Public Right-of-Way), M-1.15 (Improve Walking Connectivity), M-1.16 (Barrier Removal), and M-1.17 (Improve Bicycling Connectivity).	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
No new single-family subdivisions. This only increases car dependency.	M-1.15 (Improve Walking Connectivity)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-11]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Sacramento needs a connected network of protected bike lanes. More bike/pedestrian bridges and safe crossing points for major streets.		Please see policies M-1.15 (Improve Walking Connectivity), M-1.16 (Barrier Removal), and M-1.17 (Improve Bicycling Connectivity)	Dave Morrow [1]
I would add a bullet point to this section: The City will identify streets (I suggest J, L, 19th, and 21st Streets) that remotely govern vehicle speed to the posted speed limit. Other cities have piloted this on city-owned fleet vehicles. If bike/scooter share programs are governed to 15-mph, there is no reason cars should not be governed to the grid's posted speed limit.	M-1.16 (Barrier Removal)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-11]
And also narrow streets so that the posted speed is the speed that feels natural in a car. Protected bike lanes with concrete barriers between bike and car facilities can achieve this. Painted bike gutters do not.	M-1.16 (Barrier Removal)	Thank you for your comment.	Jenny [K-M-11]
Suggestion to add additional bullet point: - Removal of extremely wide roads in high pedestrian areas, including all 3-lane streets and roads in the Central City.	M-1.16 (Barrier Removal)	Thank you for your comment.	Matt A [K-M-11]
This is really important. Walking should be a leisurely, low-stress activity. Having to check my shoulder every 50-100 feet of driveway entrance on a road takes away from that safety and peace of mind.	M-1.16 (Barrier Removal)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-11]
Highways and roads are barriers to mobility outside of a car. Removing these would align with the stated goals of increasing transport out of a car. Why are we not including it on our list of tools to make this happen? The expectation needs to be set that this is an option	M-1.16 (Barrier Removal)	Thank you for your comment.	ew [K-M-11]
This is crucial! There are a couple of great bike lines, but the lack of interconnection, particularly outside the grid makes long trips dangerous	M-1.17 (Improve Bicycling Connectivity)	Thank you for your comment.	Aurora [K-M-11]
Add creating an informational update for bicycle facilities inventory... a lot of the information available about bicycle parking is either inaccurate or outdated. Additionally, maybe add a section about how the City is going to create more bike parking spaces (maybe look at what Davis does in this regard).	M-1.17 (Improve Bicycling Connectivity)	Thank you for your comment. The City has initiated a study to update the Vehicle and Bicycle Parking requirements.	Francois Kaepelin [K-M-11]
Including across "the thumb"! Some come to work or school in the City of Sac while living in the County. Let's help them get to work/school safely.	M-1.17 (Improve Bicycling Connectivity)	Please see policy M-5.1 (Regional Mobility System).	Susan Hida [K-M-11]
The city should look for ways to connect low-traffic neighborhoods via pedestrian/cyclist-only passageways. Generally a very low traffic neighborhood street is going to be safer for cyclists than even a protected bike lane on a busy road. However, such streets are generally in confined neighborhoods that require going out to a busy road to travel more than several blocks. If these neighborhoods were connected by passageways for pedestrians and cyclists only, this would create large networks of safe streets for cyclists/pedestrians to use with minimal exposure to heavy auto traffic.	M-1.17 (Improve Bicycling Connectivity)	Thank you for your comment.	Devin Martin [K-M-11]
M-1.17 (Improve Bicycling Connectivity) and M-1.18 (Bicycling Safety) identify two other areas that limit bikability, but the commitment in the language is non-committal and vague. The City should prioritize funding from the general fund to build this infrastructure, the same way it does for roads used by SOVs. Likewise, M-1.18 must remove "whenever feasible" from the action item. Bikes and cars should be separated to prevent fatal injuries. This is vital for reaching our Vision Zero goals.	M-1.17 (Improve Bicycling Connectivity)	Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
More bike parking needs to be visible and available to prompt residents to bike instead of driving. Bike parking should follow best practices and be convenient.		The City has a bike parking program and installs bike parking in the public right-of-way. The City also requires new development to install long and short-term bike parking. The new update to the standards for development projects will consider visibility.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
There needs to be more maintenance of existing bike lanes. As an example, motor vehicles continue to use the Northern Sacramento Bike Trail as a roadway between C Street and the residential area and casino near 16th. There are no barriers to this and close calls with bikes and pedestrians is common. This has been reported multiple times in recent years. Many other examples exist.	M-1.18 (Bicycling Safety)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-M-11]
Bicycles should be prioritized as the future of individual transportation, and as such should have dedicated, and barrier protected lanes.	M-1.18 (Bicycling Safety)	Thank you for your comment.	Jordan Leigh [K-M-11]
I don't think "prioritize" is sufficient here. City design standards should include protected facilities for peds/cyclists by default, and any deviation from those standards should be on an opt out basis with robust justification	M-1.18 (Bicycling Safety)	Thank you for your comment.	Jeffrey [K-M-11]
This is very car-centric language and is the opposite of the point that is attempting to be made. "Visibility" is not what gets people killed. It's the multiple thousand pound ball of metal that is allowed to drive too fast that causes death. Any project that its goal is to "increase visibility" of people out of a car is a failure to the goals of this plan. Create a space that doesn't need "visibility" to save your life just for trying to get to a friends house. It is the car and drivers responsibility to not kill people. Not the pedestrian to be seen.	M-1.18 (Bicycling Safety)	Thank you for your comment.	ew [K-M-11]
If the car speed is over 20 mph a separate bike way should be required. Either slow cars or allow a safe place to bike. Standard.	M-1.18 (Bicycling Safety)	Please see policies M-1.5 (Street Design Standards), M-3.1 (Local Streets), and M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds).	ew [K-M-11]
The city should convert all crosswalks into raised crosswalks/speed bumps, thereby increasing visibility and slowing traffic down at intersections.	M-1.19 (Walking Safety)	Thank you for your comment. The City is looking for opportunities to install raised crosswalks.	Jordan Leigh [K-M-11]
If it is biking and walking safety, it is not "prioritize." You will make it a standard. Exceptions that may be detrimental to pedestrians or bikes will be analyzed for their impacts and have the burden of proof that impacts are limited or mitigated, not the other way around. We need to use language that in uncompromising for out of car safety.	M-1.19 (Walking Safety)	Thank you for your comment.	ew [K-M-11]
M-1.19 (Walking Safety) uses weak language that the City will "prioritize designs that encourage walking" rather than learning from the design principals for safe walking that other communities have identified, such as the Global Designing Cities Initiative.	M-1.19 (Walking Safety)	Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Transit Service			
Stronger partnerships with Sacramento Regional Transit to ensure equitable pedestrian and cyclist access to all transit stops and stations and promote overall connectivity between transit and land use. SacRT's ability to implement infrastructure improvements will be a critical piece to reach the ambitious transit mode share goals laid out in the Plan.		Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
SACRT's governing board of 11 members is made up of elected officials from the cities of Sacramento, Elk Grove, Citrus Heights, Rancho Cordova, and Folsom. Board members from Citrus Heights, Folsom, and Rancho Cordova represent a population less than 1/11th of the share of the county's population, thus giving them a skewed higher balance of control. Unincorporated Sac County fares the worst in this power distribution, especially since bus routes in Arden/Arcade and South Sac are some of the busiest in the system. While SACRT's governing board is out of the GP's purview, it would be useful for the city to take into account the skewed nature of the board when planning transit projects in the city. *forgot to include the 3 county commissioners in the municipality figures.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-12]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
10 minutes minimum	M-1.20 (High-Frequency Transit Service)	Thank you for your comment.	Austin Wilmoth [K-M-12]
Any route that runs less frequently than every 15 minutes will have worse ridership. People will just use a personal car or rideshare if they can afford it. Routes that are only available during commute hours are better than nothing but are overall inadequate access to transit for a neighborhood.	M-1.20 (High-Frequency Transit Service)	Thank you for your comment.	Matt Malkin [K-M-12]
Express routes during commute times would be excellent, particularly in bike friendly areas (users can bike and ride) or where there are Park and Rides.	M-1.20 (High-Frequency Transit Service)	Thank you for your comment.	Michelle Reynolds [K-M-12]
While transit oriented development is referenced in the map above, it may merit specific mention here or elsewhere. Extensions of service are appreciated, but such extensions must include appropriate land use around stations to foster transit use. Likewise, the existing RT system, particularly the light rail, already provides reliable and frequent service. However, poor land use around many stations results in low ridership, poor station access, and underutilization of this existing resource (see East Sac or Land/Curtis park adjacent stations as examples of poor land use around high frequency transit stops).	M-1.21 (Extension of Transit Service)	Please see policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development).	Jeffrey [K-M-12]
The 1980s-designed light rail system was built to serve car commuters with lots of park and ride lots. These lots should be fully repurposed for transit-oriented development.	M-1.21 (Extension of Transit Service)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-12]
The light-rail expansion to the North Natomas area would greatly increase the light-rails usability and reduce congestion to and from the airport.	M-1.21 (Extension of Transit Service)	Thank you for your comment.	Jordan Leigh [K-M-12]
The North Natomas area is in need of expanded transit services and better bus routes. Currently, for kids that attend Rio Linda there is no direct route to or from school and their neighborhoods in North Natomas. It is also quite difficult to take the bus in and out of the Natomas area to anywhere else without first having to take it down to the railyard and then elsewhere. For an area that borders the airport, we shouldn't need to take a bus first down to Sacramento, and then back up to the airport.	M-1.21 (Extension of Transit Service)	Thank you for your comment.	Jordan Leigh [K-M-12]
Policy M-1.21: SacRT suggests adding additional language to this policy, specifically that 'high density residential' should also be a consideration in planning for the extension of frequent transit service, rather than just specifically stating "areas with concentrated employment". While employment centers may justify the need for service expansion, high-density residential is an equally important consideration.	M-1.21 (Extension of Transit Service)	Thank you for your comment.	SacRT [74]
There should be a 5-year implementation plan for all bus routes to have these amenities.	M-1.23 (Transit Priority)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-12]
Transit-only lanes need more discussion and commitment, especially on congested corridors like J Street/L Street. Arguably some of the roadway allocations should give the space to dedicated transit lanes.	M-1.24 (Transit-Only Lanes)	Thank you for your comment.	Darren [K-M-12]
M-1.24 Transit-Only Lanes: This policy statement should be expanded to include light-rail, since it currently uses mixed-flow lanes in certain areas that would be better served by transit-only lanes and additional separation from vehicles.	M-1.24 (Transit-Only Lanes)	Policy M-1.24 (Transit-Only Lanes) revised to say: "Where appropriate, the City shall support implementation of transit-only lanes to facilitate high-frequency reliable bus and/or light rail service to and between major destinations, job centers, residential areas, and intermodal facilities in Sacramento."	House Sacramento [21]
M-1.25 First/Last-Mile Solutions: "Other innovations" lacks specificity. Add language calling out bicycle parking infrastructure as part of the innovations around transit stations and major bus stops. The City should take opportunities to find ROW near stations for bicycle infrastructure.	M-1.25 (First/Last-Mile Solutions)	Policy M-1.25 (First/Last-Mile Solutions) revised to say: "...public realm improvements (e.g., bicycle parking infrastructure), and other..."	Civic Thread [91]
I suggest we consider adding safe bike storage at the bus tops and perhaps electric bike and scooter parking to include folks with lower mobility. Let's also work toward on demand transit calling from each bus stop to allow folks to "flag" a smaller transit operator to pick up at the bus stop.	M-1.26 (Bus Stop Design)	Thank you for your comment. The City has initiated a study to update the Vehicle and Bicycle Parking requirements.	PATTY WAIT [K-M-12]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
SACRT's bus stop improvement plan (https://www.sacrt.com/apps/sacramento-regional-transit-district-bus-stop-improvement-plan/) is encouraging.	M-1.26 (Bus Stop Design)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-12]
M-1.26 Bus Stop Design; This policy statement absolves the city of their shared responsibility to implement better bus stops. We recommend the following: "The City shall work in partnership with the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT) to provide space and resources for well-designed transit stops that encourage transit use."	M-1.26 (Bus Stop Design)	Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
Policy M-1.26: SacRT recommends that this policy be strengthened with additional language reflecting all bus stop design criteria, rather than just specifically stating "bus shelter design". SacRT has an extensive Bus Stop Design Guidelines document, with bus shelters being just one of many design elements that encourage transit use. ADA-compliance, bus stop placement, and passenger safety are other elements that the City should not only encourage, but collaborate and assist with, when feasible.	M-1.26 (Bus Stop Design)	Policy M-1.26 (Bus Stop Design) has been revised to say: "The City shall encourage the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT) to implement bus shelter design that encourages transit use, informed by ADA-compliance, bus stop placement, and passenger safety best practices. Where feasible, the City should collaborate with SacRT on bus stop designs for major corridor improvement projects. "	SacRT [74]
M-1.26 Bus Stop Design: None of the Transit Service measures include Bus Stop infrastructure. M-1.26 "Bus Stop Design" encourages SacRT to implement bus shelter design that encourages transit use, but critical infrastructure improvements that are within the City's Right of Way (for example, shelter pads and ADA accessibility improvements) are a prerequisite to shelter installation. The City should work directly with SacRT to develop language around what partnership looks like for infrastructure improvements, whether these are spot improvements or part of larger corridor projects. Consistency with SacRT's Bus Stop Improvement Plan should be noted in this section as well. The City should coordinate with SacRT to identify locations where new shelter pads can be included in corridor projects.	M-1.26 (Bus Stop Design)	Policy M-1.26 (Bus Stop Design) has been revised to say: "The City shall encourage the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT) to implement bus shelter design that encourages transit use, informed by ADA-compliance, bus stop placement, and passenger safety best practices. Where feasible, the City should collaborate with SacRT on bus stop designs for major corridor improvement projects. "	Civic Thread [91]
<i>Zero- and Low-Emissions Vehicles</i>			
Judging by the active participation of other commenters, people don't seem to be interested in the city's efforts for ZEVs.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-12]
include electric bicycles which have many advantages over other vehicles for typical trips	M-1.28 (ZEV Capital)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-M-12]
Be more specific here... this seems vague. Would investments be involved? Would transportation funding be involved?	M-1.28 (ZEV Capital)	Policies M-1.27 through M-1.38, as well as M-2.15 (Incentives for ZEVs) provide more details about how ZEV infrastructure will be supported.	Francois Kaepelin [K-M-12]
I strongly support conveniently located shared EV's. If people could count on easy access to a shared EV for occasional trips or situations where where it's hard to get where you need to go or do what you need to do without a car, it would make it much easier to let go of the need to own a car.	M-1.29 (Shared ZEVs)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacque [K-M-13]
This should include public EV charging for electric bikes.	M-1.30 (Public EV Infrastructure Deployment)	Please see policy M-1.34 (Electric Mobility (E-Mobility) Hubs).	Doug Brown [K-M-13]
I honestly love the ebike share programs in the city. It's encouraging to see Lime and Bird maintaining their bikes and scooters better.	M-1.33 (EV Car Share and Electric Bike Share)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-13]
Improved safe bicycling infrastructure coupled with widely available e-bikes (see jump bike) will be a force multiplier in Sacramentans adopting active transportation as their primary method of mobility. This can be the beginning of something amazing if the city remains bold in their approach to safely connect all regions of the city through separated bike networks, safe crossings, concrete barriers for cycling along roads with cars, and road diets.	M-1.33 (EV Car Share and Electric Bike Share)	Thank you for your comment.	Brian Junio [K-M-13]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
I suggest changing "support" to "require." This is a crucial action to enable the City's residents to own and use EVs. No new development should occur that doesn't provide EV-supportive infrastructure.	M-1.36 (EVs in New Development)	Thank you for your comment.	Teri Duarte [K-M-14]
Electric bicycles are low hanging fruit for zero-emission transportation.		Please see policy M-1.33 (Electric Vehicle (EV) Car Share and Electric Bike Share).	Dave Morrow [1]
Promoting Shared ZEVs across Sacramento is a great bridge as we reduce the need to own an expensive SOV, and M-1.29 (Shared Zero-Emission Vehicles) identifies this. While the AAA Car Share program, also known as GIG, was successful in reducing VMT, the program has been terminated due to insufficient participation rates. Whatever support the City provided was not enough to make it commercially viable. Beyond the non-committal language in M-2.1 (Transportation Demand Management) and M-2.4 (Shared Shuttle) stating the City "should promote" use of alternative transportation, it ignores that 52% of all car trips in the US are 3 miles or less, and 28% of those are 1 mile or less (Bureau of Transportation).		Policy M-1.29 (Shared Zero-Emission Vehicles) has been revised to say: "The City shall promote shared ZEV options, especially for local trips, that can reduce vehicle trips and the need for personal vehicle ownership, prioritizing low-income and high-need neighborhoods lacking transit and other transportation options."	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Maintenance and Funding			
An equity component to this kind of street maintenance system would be great, as areas with increased poverty often are left behind.	M-1.39 (Maintain the Street System)	Please see policy M-A.1 (Transportation Investment Priorities) commits the city to use the Transportation Priorities Plan, which identifies priorities using Council-adopted criteria, including criteria that provides equitable investment.	Sacramento County Public Health [K-M-14]
M-1.39 Maintain the Street System: This policy statement ignores the fact that we don't have close to enough resources to maintain the street system and doesn't speak to how those limited resources should be prioritized. We recommend adding the following components: - The City shall have an open, public process for prioritizing street repaving - The City shall prioritize the maintenance of streets and paths that include bicycle facilities. - The City shall quickly repair infrastructure within bike lanes and paths that could pose a serious threat to cyclists, such as potholes and trench cuts. - The City shall prioritize the maintenance of streets and paths in an equitable manner, prioritizing investments within the high-injury network, in disadvantaged communities, and near high-ridership transit stops.	M-1.39 (Maintain the Street System)	Please see policy EJ-5.5 (Investment Prioritization) and the Transportation Priorities Plan.	House Sacramento [21]
M-1.39 (Maintain the Street System): To be able to fund shared use paths throughout Sacramento, the City must reduce lane miles to (1) encourage residents to use an alternative form of transportation, and (2) to reduce wear-and-tear on City roads.	M-1.39 (Maintain the Street System)	Please see goal section M-1 for policies on fostering a multi-modal transportation system, and M-2 for policies on reducing reliance on single-occupant vehicles.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
For Policy M-1.41 (Funding), recommend the city modify the language related to exploring "actions to ensure adequate shares of regional funding." Better phrasing for this Policy could be "actions to position the city to better capture sufficient funding through regional funding programs".	M-1.41 (Funding)	Thank you for your comment.	SACOG [2]
Funding is the biggest challenge the City faces for sustainable planning and development, and this is identified in M-1.41. Roads are expensive. At every opportunity the City should consider how to reduce spending on repaving roads, reduce lane miles and increase density. Alternate modes of transportation are encouraged by the actions set out in M-4.8 and YPRO-1.21. Comfortable detours would significantly reduce the burden on people using AT, and more trees would improve comfort while walking and biking, especially in historically disadvantaged neighborhoods.	M-1.41 (Funding)	Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Reliance on Single-Occupant Vehicles			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Or just remove some of the special privileges that cars get (especially for people who don't live here). A couple of ideas: remove highway metering in the city (increasing traffic will reduce single-occupant car rides), program all traffic lights in the city to prioritize pedestrians and bikes (make them immediately change when a pedestrian approaches), use traffic calming measures to reduce every street in the city 20 mph for cars (eliminate lanes, make the current ones narrower). These are simple and don't require some grand plan to start changing the behavior of people. If a car isn't the more convenient way to go, people will choose other options.		Thank you for your comment.	ew [K-M-15]
The street is the public space. Why confine people to the smallest section of the street just to accommodate cars. Change our language about cars here to show that we are actually serious about reducing our car-dependency. If you can't safely just walk across the street without thinking about it, you have a car problem.		Thank you for your comment.	ew [K-M-15]
Let's include in our tool box a ton of "pilot" programs. Make it a goal to test things out to see what works. Just analyzing what is happening now and trying to accommodate that will not reduce the dominance of cars. Test out places where cars are not allowed. Test out street vendors. Test out anything and see what happens		Please see policy M-2.12 (Innovative Mobility Solutions and Curb of the Future).	ew [K-M-15]
In order to achieve reductions in private vehicle use, "adequate" parking will need to be more narrowly defined and priced to encourage other forms of transportation.		Thank you for your comment.	Nick Shepard [K-M-15]
It's a hypothetical that doesn't belong in the GP. Driverless cars are not doing well in SF with calls for banning them altogether because they will stop in traffic lanes and block emergency vehicles. We already have a single-occupancy vehicle problem, we don't need to add zero-occupancy vehicles to the street.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-15]
What are the specifics of what the City will do to significantly decrease VMT to cultivate a safe and walkable City where residents are encouraged to window shop from the sidewalks and wander into businesses they would have passed if they were driving?		Please see goal sections M-1 and M-2 for policies that will foster a multi-modal transportation system and reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles. Please also see goal sections LUP-4, LUP-5, and LUP-6 for policies that promote walkable, transit-oriented centers and corridors; attractive, thriving commercial centers; and healthy, livable complete neighborhoods with amenities within walking and biking distance.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
To meet its housing needs and reduce overall reliance on cars (which allows the city to meet its VMT goals), the City must upzone/develop parking lots.		Please see policies LUP-5.1 (Evolving Regional Commercial Centers) and LUP-5.4 (Neighborhood Shopping Center Revitalization).	Kay Crumb [40]
Goal M-2 (reduced reliance on SOVs)			
<i>Transportation Demand Management</i>			
This is where the FAR maps from the Land Use and Placemaking section tie in. The city can induce demand to the transit system by building housing next to stations/bus stops.		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-16]
Shouldn't this be "mandate"? Cities are generally trending in the mandate direction, even in Marin County.	M-2.1 (TDM)	Thank you for your comment.	Francois Kaepelin [K-M-16]
M-2.1 TDM: Increase 17% mode share by 2030 to 23% by 2045 goal via non- Single- Occupancy Vehicles. Examples: - Denver- 15% mode share via bikes alone. - Seattle- 75% non-work trips and 65% work trips by 2035.	M-2.1 (TDM)	Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
This is a significant and important policy to evaluate new developments based on VMT and not on the traditional criteria that has induced sprawl for many years.	M-2.3 (VMT as Metric)	Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-M-16]
Agreed! This change is in line with outcomes that actually impact communities.	M-2.3 (VMT as Metric)	Thank you for your comment.	Troy [K-M-16]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
M-2.3 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as a Metric: This policy statement should be expanded beyond CEQA, to include City Departments when considering transportation alternatives and adjustments, even when that does not necessarily trigger CEQA. For example, Transportation Plans for corridors and neighborhoods should use VMT as a Metric, not LOS, during the initial study and outreach sessions (prior to the initialization of the CEQA process)	M-2.3 (VMT as Metric)	Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
I suggest focusing on lower income folks rather than age makes more sense for this benefit.	M-2.7 (Free or Discounted Transit Passes)	Thank you for your comment.	PATTY WAIT [K-M-16]
This was/is a good move. Free/discounted transit is such low-hanging fruit to encourage transportation mode shifts. Based on what I've read about public transit in general, fares only make up a fraction of revenue anyway.	M-2.7 (Free or Discounted Transit Passes)	Thank you for your comment.	Troy [K-M-16]
SACRT's RydeFree program for TK-12 students is envied by other transit agencies. I was so happy to see it renewed for another school year, and I hope this becomes a permanent staple for the fare structure. It's also an excellent way to build up a ridership pyramid by familiarizing young people with transit ridership and etiquette.	M-2.7 (Free or Discounted Transit Passes)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-16]
Passes should be dependent on income not age.	M-2.7 (Free or Discounted Transit Passes)	Thank you for your comment.	Anonymous [K-M-16]
Providing free or discounted fare for certain groups of transit riders, such as students, low-income residents, and seniors is a wonderful program, and the City should keep this as a priority to change how youths see transportation (M-2.7: Free or Discounted Transit Passes).	M-2.7 (Free or Discounted Transit Passes)	Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
SACRT's SmarT ride is almost too successful. It's often a 30-minute wait for a pickup.	M-2.8 (Micro-Transit Service)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-16]
Policy M-2.8: SacRT suggests additional language be added to this policy, that reflects the City to not only "encourage" microtransit service efforts, but also to 'support and assist' with these efforts, when feasible.	M-2.8 (Micro-Transit Service)	Thank you for your comment.	SacRT [74]
M-2.8 Micro-Transit Service: Stronger language is needed. City should "support", "partner", or "coordinate", rather than "encourage" SacRT to expand and enhance ondemand micro-transit service. The intent of micro-transit is to supplement areas without fixed-route service, which is somewhat stated in this measure, but it could be clearer. Suggest language such as "While expanding fixed route transit is the preferred option to serve disadvantaged communities, the City will coordinate with SacRT to expand on-demand services and improve connections to major transit stations where fixed route service is infeasible or limited".	M-2.8 (Micro-Transit Service)	Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
Boston/Cambridge, MA closed Memorial Dr along the Charles River to vehicles on weekends during the pandemic. As of August 2022, it was still in place, and it was very popular amongst residents. Car-free weekends on roads (ex. 20th/K St for Farmers Market weekends) would be wonderful.	M-2.9 (Advocacy and Events)	Please also see policies M-1.8 (Vacation of Public Right-of-Way), M-3.5 (Open Street Events), and M-3.6 (Outdoor Dining Program).	Ian Treat [K-M-17]
Policy M-2.9: Suggest adding "spare the air" days, or clean air days, as events for which agencies should promote and encourage the use of transit and active modes of transportation.	M-2.9 (Advocacy and Events)	Policy M-2.9 (Advocacy and Events) has been revised to say: "...Events may include May is Bike Month, Sunday Streets, Car-Free Saturdays, Spare the Air, and others."	SacRT [74]
Parking Management			
How about getting rid of free parking? Residents should have to pay for on-street permits - why should public space be given for free to house vehicles that spend most of their time unused?	M-2.14 (Parking Supply)	Thank you for your comment.	Jesse [K-M-17]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
We should eliminate parking minimums and institute parking maximums in new developments. Really push people to rely less on their cars from the beginning, especially multi-car households. Traffic is about number of vehicles, not number of people.	M-2.14 (Parking Supply)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;... "	Matt Malkin [K-M-17]
reducing free parking is important to reducing VMT. Increase the use of parking fees in city facilities for non-motorized transportation infrastructure.	M-2.14 (Parking Supply)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-M-17]
This incentive is misguided as it only encourages single occupancy vehicle use, more so as EVs become more prevalent.	M-2.15 (Incentives for ZEVs)	Thank you for your comment.	Nick Shepard [K-M-17]
The city should eliminate parking minimums and institute parking maximums. As described in the Wikipedia page for Donald Shoup's "The High Cost of Free Parking," the City should (1) charge fair market prices for curbside parking, (2) return parking revenue to neighborhoods for community investment, and (3) remove the requirements for off-street parking for new development."	M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;... "	Jack Barnes [K-M-18]
The city should eliminate parking minimums and institute parking maximums. The existing language here is too broad and should be re-phased to align with the language adopted by council in 2021. "The City shall eliminate parking minimums and institute parking maximums."	M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;... "	Kevin Dumler [K-M-18]
Do deploy a parking management strategy, but also just eliminate parking minimums anyway. We need to stop over-allocating parking ASAP. Parking maximums would be good to prevent overzealous developers from creating such destructive infrastructure that takes space away from trees, creates impervious surface, contributes to the urban heat island, hikes up the rent (one single parking stall costs up to \$80k to construct), and induces VMTs causing noise, air, and environmental pollution. Our high VMTs also contribute to so much traffic fatalities.	M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;... "	Troy [K-M-18]
The city SHOULD, not could, eliminate parking minimums and institute parking maximums. Make this language stronger!	M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;... "	Ansel Lundberg [K-M-18]
The city should eliminate parking minimums and institute parking maximums. This is how we can begin reducing VMT across Sacramento by reducing the supply of parking and creating the demand for more equitable and sustainable modes of transportation such as walking, biking, scooting, and public transportation.	M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;... "	Luis Romo [K-M-18]
Great goal. Eliminating parking requirements is one of the simplest, cheapest, and essential measures to encouraging more efficient, affordable, and less car-oriented development. Kudos for including this here.	M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;... "	Darren [K-M-18]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
This should be strengthened to say "eliminate parking minimums and instituting parking maximums"	M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces. This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:..." Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;...	Aurora [K-M-18]
Please add a policy that gives the City the ability to require or condition unbundled parking on projects in TOD areas! With the way Sacramento is built, parking will be always be a big part of new projects, but any new parking should be provided at a premium to those who think parking is worth the financial cost.	M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy)	Thank you for your comment. The City has initiated a study to update the Vehicle and Bicycle Parking requirements.	Anonymous [K-M-18]
M-2.17 Parking Management Strategy: Extend "improve branding, communications, and wayfinding" strategy to apply to active transportation policy goals. Consistent, high visibility, and human-scale wayfinding to pedestrian and bicycle facilities (i.e., bicycle boulevards, shared-use paths, etc.) is key to promoting active modes through improved navigability. Adding estimated walking and biking times to wayfinding signage will further encourage active modes.	M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy)	The City is investigating opportunities for funding for a wayfinding program.	Civic Thread [91]
M-2.17 Parking Management Strategy: The city should eliminate parking minimums and institute parking maximums. The existing language here is too broad (i.e. "could") and should be re-phased to align with the language adopted by council in 2021. "The City shall eliminate parking minimums and institute parking maximums."	M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy)	New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces. This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:..." Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;...	House Sacramento [21]
Eliminate parking minimums and institute parking maximums. Parking maximums help keep extremes in check and transition us towards a more sustainable future.		New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces. This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:..." Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;...	House Sacramento [5] [21]
To meet its housing needs and reduce overall reliance on cars (which allows the city to meet its VMT goals), the City must remove parking minimums (establish parking maximums).		Please see goal section M-1 for policies on fostering a multi-modal transportation system and goal section M-2 for policies on reducing reliance on single-occupant vehicles (such as through parking management), including a policy on removing minimum parking requirements.	Kay Crumb [40]
M-21 currently states that the Parking Management Strategy "could" eliminate City-mandated parking minimums and implement parking maximums along established transit corridors. This should be strengthened so that the General Plan commits to eliminating parking minimums Citywide and to establishing parking maximums and transportation demand management plans.		New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces. This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:..." Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;...	ECOS [42]
Policies M-2.16, and 2.17: SacRT supports these policies that will plan and manage parking strategies, including seeking options prior to allowing the construction of new parking facilities, and to implement parking maximums along established transit corridors. These strategies are useful ways which may help support the shift from single-occupant vehicle use to transit use.		Thank you for your comment.	SacRT [74]
Traffic Calming			
I have already noticed more cyclists on 19th and 21st Streets since the new protected bike lanes were striped in June. This should be expanded to 15th and 16th St.	separated bikeways photo	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-19]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
There is very little evidence that speed bumps/lumps/humps are effective at traffic calming, particularly on through streets. They should be deemphasized as a traffic calming measure and replaced with measures which have been proven to slow traffic and increase pedestrian safety, such as separated bikeways and narrower streets.	speed lumps photo	Please see policy M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds).	Max Cassell [K-M-19]
So important. I plan my bike routes in the summer almost exclusively on shaded streets.	tree-lined streets photo	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-19]
I plan my walking routes in the summer for shaded streets as much as possible. Shaded streets will become more and more important as heat increases due to climate change	tree-lined streets photo	See policies M-3.1 (Local Streets), M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-A.11 (Street Standards for Tree Canopy).	Karen Jacque [K-M-19]
I love these other elements, but "drive slowly" signs seem like wishful thinking at best. I'd really like to see constructed street bulb outs or barriers in this section instead.	signage photo	Please see policy LUP-8.14 (Streetscape Beautification).	Jenny [K-M-19]
Goal M-3 (Street design for quality of life)			
M-3 Neighborhood Streets as Places: Would like to see more policy goals and strategies toward opportunities for permanent street closures and quick build demonstrations/toolkits.	Goal M-3	Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
Glad to see reference to replacing existing street trees because that happens sometimes, but not always and I'm noticing more and more gaps where there used to be street trees and now there aren't. Far too many Sacramento neighborhoods do not have street trees, often because they do not have parkway strips. All neighborhoods should have street trees, whether in parkway strips or in front lawns areas where there are no parkway strips. Many of Sacramento's poorest neighborhoods lack street trees. This is an equity issue.	M-3.1 (Local Streets)	Please see ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion).	Karen Jacque [K-M-20]
I'd like to see the word "shall" instead of "should" in both occurrences in this policy.	M-3.1 (Local Streets)	Thank you for your comment.	Teri Duarte [K-M-20]
M-3.1 (Local Streets) Most neighborhoods are already established within Sacramento. Describe how street trees be included in neighborhoods that are already established, especially those in heat islands.	M-3.1 (Local Streets)	Please see policies ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion), ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection), ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance), and ERC-3.9 (Watering and Irrigation). Please also see implementing actions ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) and ERC-A.1 (Urban Forest Plan). Finally, please see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Any local street wider than around 32 (all central city local streets as well as many suburbs) should be reduce in width. adding larger sidewalks, street trees or increasing planter strip size	M-3.2 (Street Design)	Thank you for your comment.	Austin [K-M-20]
Or adding separated bike lanes. NOT painted bike gutters.	M-3.2 (Street Design)	Please see policy M-1.18 (Bicycling Safety).	Jenny [K-M-20]
Reduce motor vehicle speeds in the city for pedestrian and bike safety. Improve effectiveness and enforcement of existing traffic barriers which are commonly ignored by motor vehicles.	M-3.2 (Street Design)	Please see policy M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds).	Dale Steele [K-M-20]
Reduce car lanes enough to add bikeway protection. It doesn't have to look like Amsterdam but urban cycling should not be frightening for the average person. Also should use infrastructure like roundabouts to physically enforce slower traffic speeds instead of adding burden to law enforcement and traffic courts.	M-3.2 (Street Design)	Please see policy M-1.18 (Bicycling Safety).	Matt Malkin [K-M-20]
M-3.2 (Street Design), M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds) There must be goals for minimizing driver speeds. The City should set new speed limits for residential areas and the rest of the city to improve safety of AT. State what they will be.	M-3.2 (Street Design), M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds)	Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
M-3.2 Street Design: Add language to make 10' vehicle travel lanes allowable.	M-3.2 (Street Design)	Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Yes!	M-3.4 (Cul-de-Sacs)	Thank you for your comment.	Aurora [K-M-20]
Very on board with Open Streets events - this would be great to pair with First Fridays and/or Second Saturdays.	M-3.5 (Open Street Events)	Thank you for your comment.	Jordan Grimaldi [K-M-20]
This was so successful during COVID.	M-3.6 (Outdoor Dining Program)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-20]
Kudos!	M-3.6 (Outdoor Dining Program)	Thank you for your comment.	Nick Shepard [K-M-20]
The ATC Recommends the following new policy: "The City shall promote the permanent pedestrianization of city streets with the removal of regular through traffic; with a focus to be on streets in dining and entertainment corridors."		Please see policies M-1.8 (Vacation of Public Right-of-Way), M-3.5 (Open Street Events) and M-3.6 (Outdoor Dining Program).	ATC [26]
Mobility language must include language around ADA accessibility and prioritize safety for those who use mobility devices. ADA accessibility is safety and vice versa. Universal design promotes walkability and bikeability for all users.		Please see policy M-1.16 (Barrier Removal).	Civic Thread [91]
Safety			
I applaud the city for recognizing safety in this GP!		Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-21]
I wonder why a big effort was made to determine values and prioritize transportation projects--when the needs of Vision Zero weren't fully addressed. Seems to me that those resources could have been better spent on addressing more Vision Zero data points		Thank you for your comment.	Susan Hida [K-M-21]
Hoboken, NJ has not had a pedestrian fatality in years. Take lessons from them.	Vision Zero call-out box	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-21]
Traffic Operations: We recommend adding a policy statement regarding traffic operations explicitly, that promotes and prioritizes bicycle travel speeds for the synchronization of lights. Additionally, include the incorporation of standard practices in operations that increase bicycle and pedestrian safety, such as Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs) and an all-clear phase at the end of cycles. The City should also strive to eliminate the use of beg-buttons city wide, enabling automatic walk signals with every crossing. Lastly, intersections with high numbers of pedestrians, such as in Downtown and Midtown, should consider the use a exclusive pedestrian phasing (also known as scramble phasing)		Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
Double down on planning safe streets for pedestrians and people riding their bikes - don't be afraid to make drivers go slower. Need additional policies that enable us to slow down cars and specifically remove all metrics focused on vehicle speed or delay, such as LOS. Examples include: - Implementing policy to have traffic lights to be timed below the speed limit or timed to prioritize bicycle speeds. - Implementing policy to allow for an "all clear" phase with traffic signals citywide (a few seconds when all lights are red) - Policy to eliminate right turns on red - Policy to eliminate push ("beg") buttons and have traffic lights automatically change sequences - Map M-1: Ambitiously expand the Future Roadway Reallocation Segments to include all streets with excessive road capacity (i.e. 7th street) or excessive fatalities (most Vision Zero corridors) - Align Map M-1 with Map M-2: For example, 15th street is shown as 2 lanes on M-2, but not a roadway reallocation on M-1. - Policy M-1.1: Revise the policy to prioritize safety above mobility - Policy M-1.11: Add specific metrics and targets to our walking and biking goals		Please see Table 2-1 (Indicators) for Mode Share targets for metrics related to walking and biking goals.	House Sacramento [5]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Traffic Calming – State how the City will determine which methods are the best to use and establish a goal for traffic calming. FB-LUP We want safer, more walkable streets. As a positive example, North of 14th and Stockton, there are many stores that sit against the sidewalk. This is great! We need more of this so that people who walk can get to stores without having to cross hot, empty parking lots.		Please see policies LUP-4.8 (Buildings that Engage the Street), LUP-4.9 (Enhanced Pedestrian Environment), LUP-8.9 (People-Friendly Design), M-3.2 (Street Design), and M-3.3 (Traffic), as well as implementing action M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update).	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Sacramento's transportation priorities. The City has invested heavily in expensive, car-centric infrastructure over the past several decades. This has led to a less safe, less walkable, and less desirable downtown and city. Return streets to people.		Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Goal M-4 (safer transportation system)			
To enforce speed limits, use better street design instead of relying on overburdened law enforcement and traffic courts. Roundabouts, for example, are only biased against fast-moving or reckless vehicles, which is good for pedestrians, cyclists, and other drivers.	M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds)	Thank you for your comment.	Matt Malkin [K-M-22]
Bulb outs at corner cross walks also very helpful as are pedestrian islands. In the Central City corner bulb outs are particularly needed where a one way street turns onto a one way street. Drivers consistently drive to fast on one way streets and they go around corners at top speed, never considering that a pedestrian make be in a cross walk.	M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacque [K-M-22]
M-4.3 (Vision Zero): The City commonly cites its Vision Zero plan but does not identify clear steps or funding to reach that goal. Little work has been done to reduce speeds through slow street design features, the most effective way to make streets safer. The City has many streets that need improvements to make them safer.	M-4.3 (Vision Zero)	Please see implementing actions M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update) and M-A.1 (Transportation Investment Priorities), which references the Transportation Priorities Plan (TPP). TPP webpage can be found here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Transportation-Priorities-Plan	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Community input is important, it is necessary to call out separate organizations.	M-4.4 (Collaborative Safety Solutions)	Thank you for your comment.	Anonymous [K-M-22]
Passes should be dependent upon a simple income test, not age.	M-4.4 (Collaborative Safety Solutions)	Thank you for your comment.	Anonymous [K-M-22]
Increase the number of traffic enforcement officers to the number recommended by best practices.	M-4.5 (Safety-Related Training)	Please see implementation action PFS-A.2 (Police Master Strategic Plan).	Teri Duarte [K-M-22]
Include construction by others such as the levee work underway in many locations that post poorly identified or lacking alternatives such as the Army Corps levee work near Sutterville road.	M-4.8 (Detour Facilities)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-M-23]
Amen! Detour signs for cyclists to get around a construction site need to be continuous. One arrow at the beginning often isn't enough. There needs to be no doubt in the cyclist's mind of where to go next as the work zone might curve, turn, or have openings.	M-4.8 (Detour Facilities)	Thank you for your comment.	Susan Hida [K-M-23]
Did I really get through the entire safety section without reading a single word about traffic circles (aka roundabouts)? Traffic circles have been demonstrated over and over to reduce serious injuries and fatalities at intersections by 50-75%! They encourage traffic to slow down while approaching intersections, unlike stop lights which do exactly the opposite by encouraging people to speed up so as not to get "stuck at the light". And not only do they make intersections safer for all types of users, but they actually increase throughput by eliminating the dead time when nobody's going through the intersection because no traffic is coming from the direction with a green light.		Please see implementation action M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update).	Devin Martin [K-M-23]
What is the planned HSR alignment into Sacramento? Does the SVS plan accommodate an HSR terminal?	Regional Transit call-out box	Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-23]
Map M-4: Regional Connectivity			
I am aware that this alignment is necessary in 2023 due to reliance on UP rails, but this needs to be changed by 2040. This commuter rail service needs to go to SVS, and then people can take the bus or green line to the airport.		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-24]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Is there a plan for HSR alignment and platforms at SVS?		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-24]
Has a heavy rail alignment out of SVS along I-5 to the airport been considered? This would substantially improve fast rail access from the entire valley to SMF.		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-24]
Consider a future commuter rail stop at Sac State (continue to Elk Grove, Lodi, Stockton, etc). It could operate on the HSR corridor like CalTrain will. If this is the HSR corridor...		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-24]
Blue Line should extend to ARC.		Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-24]
Map M-4: Many regional transit providers offer commuter routes that serve downtown Sacramento, such as Roseville Transit, El Dorado Transit, and Yolobus; however, downtown Sacramento is not reflected as having any regional bus stops in the Regional Connectivity map. As such, SacRT recommends that the map be revised to reflect the Downtown core as having regional connectivity/stops.		Map M-4 (Regional Connectivity) revised to include commuter routes that serve downtown Sacramento.	SacRT [74]
Staff initiated revision to to Map M-4 (Regional Connectivity) for accuracy.		<p>Map M-4 (Regional Connectivity) revised as follows:</p> <p>Updated rail line: Rail line shown through SVS station site is not up to date. It no longer jogs down and parallel to I Street; it traverses the site diagonally to under the freeway where it turns to the bridge. (need data)</p> <p>Updated legend and index: The Map index for Valley Rail should have in parentheses: (San Joaquin and Altamont Commuter Express services). The map should also include a key for Proposed Valley Rail Stations. Right now, the map seems to use the black dot for Existing Light Rail Stations for the locations of some future Valley Rail Stops.</p> <p>Added future Valley Rail stops at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Sacramento City College (at the light rail station) add new Valley Rail dot, -Midtown between Q and P Streets, -Old North Town – change from black dot to Future Valley Rail, -the Natomas Station at Elk Horn Blvd – change black dot to Future Valley Rail. 	Staff
Goal M-5 (regional transportation network)			
<i>Regional Mobility</i>			
<p>Freeways and Regional Mobility: Unfortunately CalTrans continues to pursue projects that are counter to the City's climate and transportation goals. The City should add a policy statement using language such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The City shall oppose the expansion of freeway facilities within City Limits. The City shall support the conversion of existing lanes to a better managed system, such as high-occupancy tolling. - The City shall support the provision and redesign of infrastructure under Caltrans authority to eliminate barriers. This could include "capping" freeway facilities, reducing speeds and volumes and offramps, and the provision of new walkways over and under existing freeways. - The City shall encourage the joint-use or relinquishment of Caltrans right-of-way to provide additional space for parks, events, and/or housing. - The City shall support the re-connectivity of communities that were disconnected by the construction of freeway facilities 		<p>New policy added to goal section LUP-6: "Reconnecting Communities. The City shall support efforts and opportunities to reconnect communities that were disconnected by large infrastructure projects and developments, including but not limited to freeways, railways, and buildings."</p>	House Sacramento [21]
What about Sacramento County alone--in addition to SACOG? Seems to me that there are IIMPORTANT conversations that don't involve other counties--like mobility across the "thumb".	M-5.1 (Regional Mobility System)	Sacramento County would be involved when considering areas in unincorporated areas.	Susan Hida [K-M-25]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
SACRT is horribly underfunded. A quote from April's Transit Talk from SACRT CEO, Henry Li, "SacRT receives 1/6th of a penny in local sales tax funding, an amount that is approximately five times less than many of our west coast peers." Public transit is an essential service that should be adequately funded for the needs of the community.	M-5.1 (Regional Mobility System)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-25]
With transit as a major theme in reducing the city's dependence on single occupancy vehicles it is critical that we significantly increase funding allocation to SacRT. In order to get more people to use public transit we need high frequency headways so folks will not be concerned with long wait times in the event they miss a bus. Also, this general plan references the proposed green line to the airport many times. This project will not get off the ground without major support from the city as well (of course it will need funds from all levels of government but the city making it a priority should get give the project momentum).	M-5.1 (Regional Mobility System)	Thank you for your comment.	Brian Junio [K-M-25]
Put a lot of pressure on freight rail operators! They decide how many trains can run on their tracks. They have been a thorn in Amtrak's side ever since its inception in 1971.	M-5.1 (Regional Mobility System)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-25]
SVS was the 7th busiest Amtrak station in the country in 2019! That's something to be proud of!	M-5.2 (Sacramento Valley Station)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-25]
I'm curious about the plan to bring HSR into SVS. It looks like a tight fit...	M-5.2 (Sacramento Valley Station)	Thank you for your comment.	Sean [K-M-25]
Additional local bridges connecting West Sac and downtown will only enrich the region and should be actively developed.	M-5.3 (Bridges)	Thank you for your comment.	Nick Shepard [K-M-25]
New bridges should prioritize active transportation and transit and not increase single occupant vehicle use. Existing bridges should be retrofit to provide and prioritize active transportation and transit.	M-5.3 (Bridges)	Policy M-5.3 (Bridges) revised to say: "The City shall maintain existing bridges and plan and seek funding for new bridges, when appropriate, to improve multimodal connectivity and provide for emergency evacuation routes."	Dale Steele [K-M-25]
Any bridge required for Light Rail to get to the airport should be a priority.	M-5.3 (Bridges)	Thank you for your comment.	Susan Hida [K-M-25]
Really hoping the Broadway Bridge happens. I would use it instead of the freeway. Having a closer river crossing would let me use transit and bike to reach more places in West Sac.	M-5.3 (Bridges)	Thank you for your comment.	Matt Malkin [K-M-25]
Please add: The City shall prioritize widening I-5, improving or replacing the Highway 160 bridge over the American River, and elevating Northgate Blvd. between the Garden Highway and H-160 before constructing any new auto-serving bridges over the American River that would destroy natural areas in the American River Parkway.	M-5.3 (Bridges)	Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-M-25]
I disagree with the widening I5 part. Highway widening is not an effective way to reduce congestion and is very costly.	M-5.3 (Bridges)	Thank you for your comment.	Jenny [K-M-25]
Goods Movement			
Is there a way to incentivize warehouses with rail spurs? Transporting goods by rail is far more sustainable than by truck. Shifting freight transportation away from highways will reduce emissions and maintenance costs.	M-5.6 (Goods Movement Facilities)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-25]
Also consider implement more pick-up zones for freight in areas where trucks illegally park, and ensure that road treatments discourage trucks from parking on bike lanes	M-5.9 (Truck Route Design)	Thank you for your comment.	Francois Kaepelin [K-M-26]
M-5.9 Truck Route Design: Language should be added to consider re-routing truck routes to avoid Environmental Justice areas as a critical equity, air quality, and active transportation strategy.	M-5.9 (Truck Route Design)	Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
New Policy: Industrial and Major Employment Corridors. The City shall collaborate with major industrial and employment businesses to facilitate implementation of multi-modal Major Arterials, Minor Arterials, and Major Collectors that allow for the safe, comfortable, and efficient travel of all users, including semi-trailers and delivery vehicles that access and support these businesses.		Thank you for your comment.	Blue Diamond [57]
Aviation			
It was disappointing to read there were no provisions for public transit included in the new \$1.3B SMForward expansion project. Can the city lobby the County airport system to earmark funds for the Green Line?	M-5.11 (Aviation Services)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-26]
Supporting Goals through Data, Technology, and Innovation			
Dedicated parking with docking stations for bike share bikes is needed to ensure bikes are always charged and ready to use, locatable, and not parked in areas that impede pedestrians and cyclists parking their own bikes.	on photo	Please see policy M-1.33 (Electric Vehicle (EV) Car Share and Electric Bike Share).	Michelle Reynolds [K-M-27]
Goal M-6 (data, technology, and innovation)			
The City seems to prioritize total numbers of traffic incidents instead of per capita numbers. Solutions for dangerous (higher per capita) corridors and intersections on major/minor collectors are cheaper to solve than major arterial redevelopment plans and will prevent higher number as the road infrastructure gets stressed with population growth. In other words, residents want safe streets where they live, not just where they commute.	M-6.5 (Data-Driven Prioritization)	Thank you for your comment.	Matt Malkin [K-M-28]
M-6.5 Data-Driven Prioritization: Add language to include open access and availability of data and methodology used to inform prioritization. Additionally, add language around various qualitative forms of data to ensure community members' lived experiences are included in prioritization processes.	M-6.5 (Data-Driven Prioritization)	Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
Consider alternate or additional tracking opportunities for the (currently) 6% KPI (traffic cameras that are used to track cars approaching intersections can also be used to track/estimate bicycle counts. The City of Sacramento already has these cameras at some intersections and would likely only need a software upgrade.)		Thank you for your comment.	Matt Anderson [6]
Implementing Actions			
Does this mean the staff recommended list of priority projects adopted in November 2022 is subject to change?	M-A.1 (Transportation Investment Priorities)	The Transportation Priorities Plan was adopted by City Council in November 2022.	Jordan Grimaldi [K-M-28]
Can the city forward police reports from traffic and pedestrian fatalities to the City Attorney? These crash scenes should not just be swept up and returned to normal. People will continue to die on our city streets unless action is taken to apply lessons learned to the city infrastructure, and that may include legal action.	M-A.3 (High Injury Network)	Thank you for your comment.	Ian Treat [K-M-28]
Why is anything to do with Vision Zero under "Planning" and not "Programming"?	M-A.3 (High Injury Network)	Thank you for your comment.	Susan Hida [K-M-28]
M-A.3 (High Injury Network) We have studies from Vision Zero, but these corridors are dangerous and continue to be dangerous year after year. Please do something about it instead of studying it yet again. Bollards. Cones. Anything.	M-A.3 (High Injury Network)	Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
For action M-A.5, recommend the city add language that commits to coordinating with regional, and potentially state partners in this effort.	M-A.5 (Regional VMT Mitigation)	Implementing action M-A.5 (Regional VMT Mitigation) revised to say: "The City shall complete a study, with input from regional and state partners, to assess the feasibility of regional VMT mitigation measures, including banks, exchanges, and impact fees."	SACOG [2]
Agree with this	M-A.8 (Bus Rapid Transit)	Thank you for your comment.	Jeffrey [K-M-29]
City should also look at Bus Rapid Transit to the airport. It is more cost effective than light rail and could be implemented much sooner	M-A.8 (Bus Rapid Transit)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacque [K-M-29]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
We agree that the City must prioritize collaborating with SacRT and provide the public infrastructure to support high-frequency transit service in the community. The City can implement street designs, etc. to get riders (M-1.20: High-Frequency Transit Service). The City cannot meet its goals in M-1.22 (Increase Transit Ridership) if it does not take drastic steps to improve the streets for transit. We need better than just "supporting transit by incorporating features" that will improve transit reliability. We need a firm investment in transit priority infrastructure (M-1.23: Transit Priority and M-1.24: Transit-Only Lanes). M-A.8 addresses BRT down Stockton Boulevard which is the sort of vision we need in order to adjust how we move around the City. Unfortunately, this goal is caveated by "as funding is available." This is an area where the City needs to change priorities and change what types of transportation it invests in. Reforming our current infrastructure to prioritize non-SOV transportation is not only vital for improving safety, but it is the fiscally responsible decision. The vision for Stockton Boulevard should be implemented to other major corridors, such as Fruitridge Road, Broadway, and Del Paso Boulevard.	M-A.8 (Bus Rapid Transit)	Implementing Action M-A.8 revised to say: "As funding is available, the City shall study implementation of Bus Rapid Transit along corridors, such as Stockton Boulevard..."	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
M-A.8: Bus Rapid Transit: This should be expanded to allow for future studies of other corridors in addition to Stockton Boulevard	M-A.8 (Bus Rapid Transit)	Implementing Action M-A.8 revised to say: "As funding is available, the City shall study implementation of Bus Rapid Transit along corridors, such as Stockton Boulevard..."	House Sacramento [21]
Policy M-A.8: The Bus Rapid Transit policy is specific to Stockton Boulevard, which is logical due to recent studies and efforts for rapid transit planning along the corridor; however, SacRT has completed a high-level conceptual planning study that identifies several BRT corridors besides Stockton Boulevard. SacRT suggests additional language to reflect that a High-Capacity Bus Study exists. Although Stockton Boulevard is the priority corridor that is near-ready for implementation, it should also be clear that others have been studied and identified as "BRT candidates."	M-A.8 (Bus Rapid Transit)	Implementing Action M-A.8 revised to say: "As funding is available, the City shall study implementation of Bus Rapid Transit along corridors, such as Stockton Boulevard..."	SacRT [74]
M-A.8 Bus Rapid Transit: It's worth mentioning that other corridors have also been studied in addition to Stockton Blvd for the implementation of BRT, including Florin, Sunrise, and Arden which have segments that are within the City of Sacramento's jurisdiction. Please reference the High Capacity Corridors Plan. BRT on Florin is called out in Community Plans South Area Section (pg. 11-SA-4) of the General Plan but should also be noted in M-A.8.	M-A.8 (Bus Rapid Transit)	Implementing Action M-A.8 revised to say: "As funding is available, the City shall study implementation of Bus Rapid Transit along corridors, such as Stockton Boulevard..."	Civic Thread [91]
This implementation action should be moved up in priority. The way streets are designed today are not conducive to the type of travel we are envisioning. We need standards and practices that are more conducive to the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists than the safety of speeding drivers.	M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update)	Implementing action M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update) timeframe updated to near-term.	Anonymous [K-M-29]
Yes, this can and should be a 2025-2026 deadline.	M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update)	Implementing action M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update) timeframe updated to near-term.	Jenny [K-M-29]
This is a slow timeline for a straightforward process that will surely borrow much from other cities worldwide.	M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update)	Implementing action M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update) timeframe updated to near-term.	Nick Shepard [K-M-29]
M-A.10: Street Design Standards Update: The implementation timeline for this is too slow. This should be a near-term priority, since the street design standards are critically deficient and dated. This should also be a recurring task, where we have a process for updating street design standards to stay in accordance with best practices. We recommend the street standards be revisited no less than every 5 years.	M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update)	Implementing Action M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update) timeline updated to near-term.	House Sacramento [21]
M-A.10 Street Design Standards: Recommendation to bump up timeline for updates in short term. Last update was 2009. Tie updates to traffic safety trends to ensure appropriate facilities are standardized to protect vulnerable road users.	M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update)	Implementing Action M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update) timeline updated to near-term.	Civic Thread [91]
M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update) Addresses street design standards. The City must ensure these design standards are aggressive to address the heat island effect and the safety of cyclists, walkers, and other AT.	M-A.10 (Street Design Standards Update)	Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Do these goals and key moves help to move Sacramento closer to being national model of sustainable, equitable growth and community development?			
No. North Natomas still has super-wide, high-speed streets.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Natomas Central Drive should not be an arterial. It doesn't function as one. Instead, a collector. This is the time to fix it.		Thank you for your comment. This GPU includes a major pivot from previous General Plans, moving away from street widenings to reallocations. Proposed reallocations must meet standard thresholds to ensure continue operation of the transportation network. Streets that are not recommended for reallocation do not meet best practices or typical thresholds for lane reductions.	Station Board [K-M-1]
Put Natomas Crossing overpass back in the map. Costco is going to turn Arena into a mess and we need more connectivity, not less		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
Overall a great set of goals and policies. Especially like: ending parking reqs; discouraging cul-de-sacs; safety over speed.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
Cars are pervasive in Sacramento. This report does not describe actions significant enough to change this.		Please see goal sections M-1 and M-2, which foster a multi-modal transportation system and aim to reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles.	Station Board [K-M-1]
Love the encouragement of non-driving uses of public space, eg. dining!		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
65th Street Expressway (between 21st Street and Fruitridge Road) desperately needs sidewalks for the safety of pedestrians.		Please follow and participate in the Streets for People project. The City Active Transportation Plan. See website here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Streets-For-People	Station Board [K-M-1]
Yes, but what about placing sidewalks and bike lanes all the way down 65th Exp? College and hs students use as corridor		Please follow and participate in the Streets for People project. The City Active Transportation Plan. See website here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Streets-For-People	Station Board [K-M-1]
Yes		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
Public transit needs efficient land use at transit stations (i.e. dense & mixed use), but that was not mentioned here		Please see policy LUP-4.1 (Transit-Supportive Development).	Station Board [K-M-1]
Yes. However, electric bike sharing and buying freight rail ROWs for electrified commuter service deserve more attention.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
Thisbisbgratm need city buy in from street and engineering		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
The abject failure of the City over the past 50 years to complete the Sacramento River Parkway is key detriment these goals.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
These goals would be furthered if the City eliminated parking minimums and instituted parking maximums.		New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces. This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "...Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City mandated parking minimums; ..."	Station Board [K-M-1]
I'm concerned about the lack of new funding mechanisms for bike infrastructure in particular		Thank you for your comment. The City has initiated a study to update the Vehicle and Bicycle Parking requirements.	Station Board [K-M-1]
These goals would be furthered if the City eliminated parking minimums and instituted parking maximums.		New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces. This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "...Program components could include the following:... Eliminating City mandated parking minimums; ..."	Station Board [K-M-1]
No, continuing to subsidize EV infrastructure does nothing to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips. FUND SACRT!		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
This is good. we need consistent funding source for active transportation and projects which promote safer road use by all		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
These goals would be furthered if the City eliminated parking minimums and instituted parking maximums, at least in the grid.		New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:..." Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;... "	Station Board [K-M-1]
These goals would be furthered if the City eliminated parking minimums and instituted parking maximums.		New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:..." Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;... "	Station Board [K-M-1]
Yes. Transit-only lanes and high-frequency reliable bus service should be a top priority for our city.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
There should be a policy in the GP that allows the City to require or condition unbundled parking (parking for fee) in TOD areas		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
Street design will be essential to increase safety. Drivers slow down for narrow roads, curves, and raised crosswalks, not signs		Please see policy M-3.2 (Street Design). Additionally, the City is looking for opportunities to install raised crosswalks.	Station Board [K-M-1]
first mile, last mile solutions aren't as necessary if the transit station is a block away instead of a mile.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
I want more details on implementation most especially about funding. Please tell me we're taxing the rich and defunding police.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
These key moves need to be more aggressive. By WHEN are these things happening?		Please see implementing actions for timeframes.	Station Board [K-M-1]
These goals do not outline a plan for Safe Routes to School--we need long term designs for walking/biking/bussing to school		New policy added in goal section M-4: "Safe Routes to School. The City shall assess opportunities to develop and support Safe Routes to School programming."	Station Board [K-M-1]
Yes, I live in Colonial Heights and there is a great need for safer modes of travel for cyclists and pedestrians on Stockton blv		Please see policies M-1.18 (Bicycling Safety) and M-1.19 (Walking Safety).	Station Board [K-M-1]
Current bus and light rail are not safe encouraging single occupancy cars and single occupancy Uber/ Lyft		Please see goal section M-2 for policies that reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles.	Station Board [K-M-1]
I would like to see things to discourage driving, such as eliminating parking minimums and reallocation of street parking.		New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:..." Eliminating City-mandated parking minimums;... "	Station Board [K-M-1]
No		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
No. Putting light rail on truxel south of i-80 would destroy a now tree lined street and the quality of life in that neighborhood		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
The support for EVs does not address that neighborhoods are not walkable, and only further solidifies car dependent design		Please see goal section M-1 for policies on fostering a multi-modal transportation system.	Station Board [K-M-1]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Suggest including an additional Move: Study feasibility of reallocating some roadway funding to bike lane construction.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
Yes. Prioritizing walking and bicycling over cars would mean funding a low-stress bicycle network where car speeds were lower.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
Cul-de-sacs would be good if they had access to a greenway/trail that was a shortcut for walking/biking, like City of Davis has		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
Besides adopting TSM ordinance for employers, City must enforce it. Employers then actively promote biking/carpools/transit.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
These goals would be furthered if the City eliminated parking minimums and instituted parking maximums.		New policy added LUP-4.14: Elimination of Parking Minimums. The City shall not require new or existing development projects to provide a minimum number of off-street parking spaces." This new policy is paired with a revision to policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy), which is revised to say: "... Program components could include the following:..." Eliminating City mandated parking minimums;... "	Station Board [K-M-1]
I'm curious why there is no transit corridor between Sac State/65th street, along Howe, to the Arden Fair/Point West area		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
ACE Rail service is not shown. The city should help move its terminus to Sac Valley Station and build the LRT Green Line		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
Active transportation needs to be increased and prioritized (actual protected and painted mobility lanes)		Please follow and participate in the Streets for People project, the City's Active Transportation Plan. See website here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Streets-For-People	Station Board [K-M-1]
Please have city staff go to Amsterdam and see how well bikes can work. Sac is flat and bikeable!		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]
eScooters should be dockable and charge while they dock. This is sooo easy		Policy M-1.25 revised to say: "The City shall support "first-mile, last-mile solutions" such as e-bike/e-scooter as well as multimodal transportation services, public realm improvements, and other innovations in the areas around transit stations and major bus stops (transit stops) to maximize multimodal connectivity and access for transit riders. Policy M-2.17 (Parking Management Strategy) revised to say: "Program components could include the following: "...Managing rights-of-way to accommodate e-bike/e-scooter sharing services;..."	Station Board [K-M-1]
Work with max 2 scooter companies and scale them, but they need to have the same homologation for brakes. Lime and Bird are diff		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-M-1]

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SAFETY ELEMENT

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Introduction			
Sacramento is increasing becoming a dangerous place to walk. Young kids often speed along sidewalks on their electrified scooters and skateboards. One must be careful when exiting a business as you can easily get hit by someone who shouldn't be riding on the sidewalk and isn't paying attention.		Thank you for your comment.	Richard Watson [K-PFS-2]
Law Enforcement and Crime Prevention			
You must absolutely enforce crimes at every level, and this is not happening. This has resulted in a visit to a market such as Safeway feeling like you are entering a well-guarded bank. I was recently in Vacaville and saw an undercover officer arrest someone at a Nugget. Regardless of whether the DA will choose to prosecute, at least the message gets out that you will be arrested if you commit any crime and have to spend a night in jail. That is vitally important, because the rest of us are wondering why we should continue to do things like pay property taxes, utilities and so forth while others rampage at will along city streets.		Thank you for your comment.	Richard Watson [K-PFS-2]
Please make it illegal to send police if the caller says not to send them. Police escalate almost all incidents that they show up to and instead someone with de-escalation training and empathy should show up instead.	Community-Oriented Policing Initiatives box	Thank you for your comment.	Liz [K-PFS-3]
Law Enforcement and Crime Prevention (Page 9-2): Coupling a tech-driven "smart city" approach with policing seems concerning, given the potential for increased surveillance. While there are potential upsides to technology reducing bias by automating certain police functions to reduce interactions between PD and members of the community, technology must be incredibly well-vetted before being deployed. Smart city technologies should be deployed transparently and with significant input from community members. We also generally advocate for reduction in investment for enforcement (particularly for non-violent crime) and more investment in services as a crime prevention strategy instead.		Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
Goal PFS-1 (public safety)			
<i>Law Enforcement and Crime Prevention</i>			
Sacramentans have never seen responsive police, other places have 4-6 minute response times, no matter what is happening. Police should be nice to anyone who is not being aggressive- this would be healthier for both the police officers and the community.	PFS-1	Thank you for your comment.	BPat [K-PFS-4]
PFS-1.1 Law Enforcement and Crime Prevention: The language in this policy says "...protects the longterm health, safety, and well-being of the community". There is an opportunity to state intent to reduce bias in policing, with one path to support implementation being to remove pretextual traffic stops from SacPD's enforcement portfolio. While high level, stating this intent explicitly in the General Plan will set a good foundation for updating the Police Master Strategic Plan.	PFS-1.1 (Crime and Law Enforcement)	Please see policies EJ-5.1 (Equity Education), EJ-5.4 (Racial, Gender, and LGBTQ+ Equity), and EJ-5.6 (Embedding Racial Equity).	Civic Thread [91]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The City's "Problem Oriented Policing" program made a significant difference resolving two significant safety issues in our neighborhood. The "POP" officers worked very effectively with neighbors to resolve public safety problems that otherwise would not have been resolved without the POP program. This program should be expanded to help additional neighborhoods that have persistent public safety problems that traditional policing strategies are usually not capable of resolving. Community-based policing is also an important strategy to build ongoing communication and positive working relationships between neighbors and officers.	PFS-1.2 (Community-Based Policing)	Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-PFS-4]
Or instead provide people with resources instead of punishing them. The majority of crime is caused by poverty which can be solved with resources. Punishment does not work as a detractor to crime and to still be trying this method is a sign of ignorance and/or maliciousness.	PFS-1.2 (Community-Based Policing)	Thank you for your comment.	Liz [K-PFS-4]
PFS-1.2 Community-Based Policing: Neighborhood Watch Programs are often tools of white supremacy - "community surveillance" can be abused and people of color are targeted.	PFS-1.2 (Community-Based Policing)	Thank you for your comment. Please see policy EJ-5.1 Equity Education.	Civic Thread [91]
The best preventer of crime is resources. Give the police budget to helping people instead of punishing the poor and marginalized.	PFS-1.5 (CPTED Strategies)	Thank you for your comment.	Liz [K-PFS-4]
PFS-1.5 CPTED Strategies: While there are many valuable design strategies included in the CPTED framework that can support placemaking, we also encourage the City to refer to resources on the "dark side of CPTED"1. We recommend including language noting importance to employ best practice CPTED strategies that align with general urban design best practices but do not encourage exclusionary community space that makes existing in public space MORE dangerous for people of color. We also suggest some language around ensuring that hostile architecture (i.e. design strategies that prevent unhoused people from utilizing public space) is NOT employed as a CPTED strategy.	PFS-1.5 (CPTED Strategies)	Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
Fire Prevention and Protection			
I was surprised to learn how much fire is arson. More public education might help.	PFS-1.6 (Fire Prevention Programs and Suppression)	Thank you for your comment.	BPat [K-PFS-4]
Efficient Delivery of Services			
The competition between department is detrimental to our society. Co-location and cooperation between services and the community would be helpful.	PFS-1.10 (Co-Location of Facilities)	Thank you for your comment.	BPat [K-PFS-5]
The police only exist to protect private property. Because of this they can never provide mutual aid. Mutual aid requires putting peoples lives above private property for which they are designed to do the opposite of.	PFS-1.12 (Cooperative Delivery of Services)	Thank you for your comment.	Liz [K-PFS-5]
All our emergency rooms are usually at or near capacity, other ways of providing services are needed. I think innovation is needed, more of the same, will beget more of the same-mental health services prior to a crisis and accessible health services other than emergency rooms...maybe free online services to get people away from crisis interventions.	PFS-1.12 (Cooperative Delivery of Services)	Thank you for your comment.	BPat [K-PFS-5]
Free stable internet and online services help with less car travel easing aggression, air pollution, and congestion and as people become more self-sufficient and less reliant on the municipality.	PFS-1.13 (Technology to Improve Public Safety)	Thank you for your comment.	BPat [K-PFS-5]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Goal PFS-2 (emergency preparedness)			
Add an additional policy providing: Wildfire Management and Response: The City shall increase training and update wildfire management and response strategies related to the American River Parkway and adjacent areas to better protect fish, wildlife, habitat, and recreational resources and to reduce damage caused when responding to wildfires.	Goal PFS-2	Please see the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) which has been adopted and is being incorporated into the 2040 General Plan. The LHMP identifies wildfire vulnerabilities, existing plans and ordinances in place to reduce hazard impacts. https://waterresources.saccounty.gov/Documents/2020%20Local%20Hazard%20Mitigation%20Plan/Draft%20Report/Annexes/Sacramento%20County%20LHMP%20Update%20Annex%20F%20City%20of%20Sacramento.pdf	Corey Brown [K-PFS-6]
Must include climate change considerations as extreme heat, mega-storms, flooding, wildfires increase. Don't rely on past practice for future readiness solutions.	Goal PFS-2	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-PFS-6]
How well are we passing on lessons learned from previous events? We learned a lot from covid. Large casualty events in the past had helicopters being unable to land and needing to refuel with patients onboard, people were running from hospital to hospital trying to find injured family members (E.R. staff and police should be able to have pictures to identify people) .	PFS-2.2 (Critical Infrastructure)	Thank you for your comment.	BPat [K-PFS-6]
I have absolutely no hope that anyone has solved the problem of getting evacuating cars to move on out at the freedom end - all I see is people stuck in an endless line of cars. Is there a solution? PSAs on how to?	PFS-2.3 (Evacuation Routes)	Thank you for your comment.	BPat [K-PFS-6]
Are there caches of state supplies to be called of in an emergency? Like a few warehouses in different places with 40 inflatable boats for floods, that type of thing?	PFS-2.8 (Emergency Preparedness Programs)	Thank you for your comment.	BPat [K-PFS-7]
Various public service announcements for online instructional videos could cover a lot of ground; preparedness, when to wait/when to go, evacuation routes, etc	PFS-2.9 (Neighborhood Preparedness)	Please see PFS-2.8 (Emergency Preparedness Programs).	BPat [K-PFS-7]
make sure to include backup system if these methods fail such as sirens etc.	PFS-2.10 (Sacramento Alert)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-PFS-7]
Goal PFS-3 (high quality utility infrastructure and services)			
PFS-3 Efficient, high quality utility infrastructure and services to meet the needs of residents and business throughout the city: There is an opportunity to state intent via an additional policy to provide utilities and services to unhoused community to facilitate cleanliness and sanitation in encampments and reduce cleanliness complaints from housed residents.	Goal PFS-3	Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
Utility Infrastructure/Service			
The City should lead the coordination and replacement of utilities by multiple providers to occur simultaneously, especially before repaving. This limits impacts to residents and creates more efficiencies for all providers.		This is a part of regular City operations.	House Sacramento [21]
add "and minimize"	PFS-3.9 (Methane Recovery)	Policy PFS-3.9 (Methane Recovery) revised to say: "The City shall support the efforts of the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (Regional San) to develop and maintain methane recovery facilities and coordinate efforts to evaluate and minimize methane emissions. "	Dale Steele [K-PFS-8]
Location and Design of Facilities			
Strike "consider the" and insert: avoid adverse impacts, whenever possible, to..." and strike "on"	PFS-3.13 (Impacts to Environmentally Sensitive Lands)	Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-PFS-9]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Absolutely love these!	on photo	Thank you for your comment.	Liz [K-PFS-9]
Goal PFS-4 (reliable supply of high-quality water)			
PFS-4 Water Supply: Recommendation to couple water supply strategies with Mobility Element M-2 Parking (eliminate unnecessary car parking and replace with greenspace/bioswales/permeable pavement) to increase rainwater capture; "depave" movement	Goal PFS-4	Thank you for your comment. The City is open to minimizing pavement and pavement treatments where feasible and fundable.	Civic Thread [91]
Reno and other cities are moving forward with facilities that will provide recycled water for drinking etc.	PFS-4.6 (Recycled Water)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-PFS-11]
Goal PFS-5 (waste management)			
<i>Solid Waste</i>			
No mention of plastics and the role they play in pollution and waste problems? There should be specific coverage of this issue including city measures to reduce and remove single use plastic, incentives for alternatives, etc	general comment	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-PFS-12]
PFS-5 Solid Waste Management: Explicit policy should be added that states future solid waste disposal sites shall NOT be sited in/near EJ communities.		Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
Some visual PSAs of landfill, compost, and recycling issues might help us understand the importance of less garbage/waste/less consuming.	PFS-5.3 (Mixed and Organic Recycling)	Please see policy PFS-5.2 (Solid Waste Reduction) which focuses on programs and information available to local residents and businesses.	BPat [K-PFS-12]
The City should add a policy statement to facilitate the consolidation and placement of waste receptacles (trash bins) outside of bike infrastructure		Thank you for your comment.	House Sacramento [21]
Goal PFS-6 (telecommunication infrastructure)			
PFS-6 Telecommunications: Policy should be added that states the City will coordinate with RT to increase WiFi access at transit stops/stations.	Goal PFS-6	Policy PFS-6.5 (Broadband Access) revised to say: "...Expanding the availability of free Wi-Fi in City parks, libraries, community centers, transit stops , and other publicly accessible facilities;..."	Civic Thread [91]
Municipal broadband is an excellent opportunity to improve equitable access to the internet, with potential to utilize funds from the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (see section Sec. 60102)	Goal PFS-6	Add 6th bullet to PFS-6.5 (Broadband Access): " Pursuing funding opportunities, including but not limited to federal grants. "	Sacramento County Public Health [K-PFS-13]
prioritize environmental justice considerations.	PFS-6.3 (Adequate Facilities and Service)	Please see EJ-5.5 (Investment Prioritization).	Dale Steele [K-PFS-15]
also evaluate and reduce issues related to current agreements	PFS-6.6 (Net Neutrality)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-PFS-15]
Implementation Actions			
PFS-A.2 Police Master Strategic Plan: Police Strategic Master Plan should have HEAVY community involvement in the planning process.	PFS-A.2 (Police Master Strategic Plan)	Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]
PFS-A.4 Stormwater Master Planning: Policy should be added to integrate greenspaces/bioswales/depaving as much as possible.	PFS-A.4 (Stormwater Master Planning)	Implementing action PFS-A.4 (Stormwater Master Planning) incorporates the use of "green infrastructure" and Low Impact Development techniques.	Civic Thread [91]
Do these goals and key moves help to move Sacramento closer to being national model of sustainable, equitable growth and community development?			
Yes		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-PFS-1]
Absolutely not.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-PFS-1]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The us vs them mentality of the Sacramento police is detrimental to public safety; that needs to change for us all to be safer.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-PFS-1]
SMUD is such a valuable community resource, follow their lead in planning.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-PFS-1]
Please allow for more fire personnel and water storage and fire fighting alternatives to water as it is so scarce.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-PFS-1]
"Co-location"-departments are too siloed, after covid, disaster planning is not coordinated enough between all the different pla		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-PFS-1]
Recent dropping of 911 calls due to inadequate cell tower coverage is a public safety hazard		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-PFS-1]
We need resiliency hubs that are microgrids and we need to have cleaner streets there's so much trash everywhere		Please see policy ERC-9.6 (Resiliency Hubs).	Station Board [K-PFS-1]

YOUTH, PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>Introduction</p> <p>Human linkage between parks and bicycle and pedestrian linkage within greater Sacramento's neighborhood areas is NON existent, human scale through the city isn't even third rate its even lower quality and out right poor! Sacramento lives in the past and not moving forward "except in downtown, again and again", with and forgetting the wider city needs. The leaders need to stop acting like ostrich with there heads in the dirt. Concentrate on the big picture, and solid movement forward not in the 100 year time frame!</p>	<p>on photo</p>	<p>Please see YPRO-1.11 (Enhancing Access to Parks), YPRO-1.15 (Path Connections), ES-M-1 (Sacramento State Pedestrian Connection), SN-M-4 (American River Parkway Connections) for policies that specifically address connectivity. Please also see for supporting policies in goal section LUP-6 and M-1.</p>	<p>Tim Ellison [K-YPRO-1]</p>
<p>I suggest we become more inclusive in the Parks plan. The city of Sacramento has a large and growing OlderAdult population. Science has shown that Parks and Recreation and inclusion are vital to this groups health and wellbeing. Yet our parks and recreation plans rarely consider the fastest growing part of our population. A multigenerational approach would include all.</p>		<p>Both the Parks Plan 2040 and Age-Friendly Action Plan are underway. Additionally, policies in goal section YPRO-3 are age-inclusive.</p>	<p>PATTY WAIT [K-YPRO-1]</p>
<p>Parks and green space are extremely important to a livable city. The more dense the City becomes the more important green space becomes. Public parks provide an opportunity for increasing the tree canopy. Community gardens where people who live in apartments or condominiums can have a place to garden can play an important role in improving city life. Playgrounds and public parks are especially important to children who live in apartments or condos and don't have space to play outdoors. Public swimming pools will become increasingly important as temperatures increase. Roof top gardens are an important source of open space and should be encouraged or better yet, required in large apartment and condo projects.</p>		<p>Please see goal section YPRO-1, which supports an integrated system of parks, open space areas, and recreational areas that are accessible to all communities. Please specifically note policies YPRO-1.10 (Parkland Access Standard) and YPRO-1.11 (Enhancing Access to Parks).</p>	<p>Karen Jacques [52]</p>
<p>Civic Thread in particular appreciates the inclusion of the following policies as being in support of equitable and healthy communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YRPO-1.5 Incentivizing Onsite Public Facilities • YRPO-1.6 Underutilized Land • YRPO-1.7 Co-Located Joint-Use Facilities • YRPO-1.8 non-conventional parks in highly developed areas • YRPO-1.11 Non-Conventional Park Solutions • YRPO-1.20 Sustainable Design-1.22 Community Input • YRPO-2.1 Access to Quality Public Facilities and Programs • YRPO-2.3 School Facilities • YRPO-2.7 Child/Older Adult Care • YRPO-3.5 Youth Participation • YPRO-A.5 Youth Violence Prevention & Youth Development • YPRO-A.6 Joint-Use Standards • YRPO-A.7 Performance-Based Prioritization 		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>Civic Thread [91]</p>

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Staff initiated policy revision for consistency with Parks Plan 2040.		<p>Under "Parks and Open Space System" heading, revised to say: "The city of Sacramento strives to maintain a goal of 8.50 acres per thousand residents of neighborhood and community parks, regional parks, parkways and open space. With plans to add over 648 acres to the existing 4,330 acres of public parkland, the service level would be 7.64 acres of park land per thousand residents in 2040. The City Code requires that new residential developments either dedicate land for new park facilities or pay an in-lieu fee that can be used for acquisition of new parkland. Additionally, new development is subject to a Park Development Impact Fee (PIF), which can be used to finance the development of new or existing neighborhood and community parks within the service area of the development's project site and regional parks and citywide facilities. The PIF funds 5.0 acres of park land per thousand residents within the majority of the city, comprised of 3.5 acres of neighborhood and community parks and 1.5 acres of citywide parks and open spaces. Within the Central City, the PIF funds 3.25 acres of park and open space per thousand residents, comprised of 1.75 acres of neighborhood and community parks and 1.5 acres of citywide parks and open spaces. However, in order to maintain the 8.50 acres per thousand residents level of service for all parkland, the City will need to seek additional sources of funding for acquisition and development of parkland.</p> <p>Sacramento has established a standard of providing 5 acres of City park and open space land per thousand residents citywide, comprised of 3.5 acres of neighborhood and community parks and 1.5 acres of citywide parks and open spaces. Recognizing that land is at a premium within the Central City, the standard applicable within that area is 3.25 acres of park and open space per thousand residents, comprised of 1.75 acres of neighborhood and community parks and 1.5 acres of citywide parks and open spaces. The City is currently providing 7.34 acres of park and open space land per thousand residents citywide, with plans to add 248 acres of new facilities in the coming years. The City Code requires that new residential developments either dedicate land for new park facilities or pay an in-lieu fee that can be used for acquisition of parkland. Additionally, new development is subject to a Park Impact Fee (PIF), which can be used to finance the development of new neighborhood and community parks within the service area of the project site. This will ensure at least 6.32 acres of park land per thousand residents in 2040, which is higher than the citywide park and open space standards."</p>	Staff
Map YPRO-1: Walking Access to Parks and Open Space Facilities			
<i>Park Site Suggestions</i>			
Convert capital mall into a park. Remove all the west to east car lanes and some of the north to south. This is a location that is used for festivals and in the summer it is incredibly unpleasant to be there due to the heat. Turning this into a park with lots of trees and even having it set up to accommodate festivals would make a huge difference. Add that to the fact that the goal of this plan is to turn Downtown into a neighborhood this would make it a much more livable place.		Thank you for your comment.	Austin [K-YPRO-3]
We really need a park near the restaurants in The Promenade shopping center. We get food there all the time, and it would be nice to walk to a park for a picnic and let our toddler run around and play. The existing fountain area is nice, but not very engaging for a toddler.		Thank you for your comment.	Andrew Wallick [K-YPRO-3]
<i>Existing Parks</i>			
It is criminal to consider Sutter's Landing regional park an "existing park" as portrayed on the map. This area has great potential for improvement and use ability especially being near the river. A beach water park would be an incredible idea and addition to Sac.		Thank you for your comment.	J Moore [K-YPRO-3]
Please update the footprint of Sutter's Landing Park in this and all other relevant maps.		Maps updated to reflect West Sutter's Landing Park.	Corey Brown [K-YPRO-3]
<p>The playground in the shopping center with Sushi Elite, Coldstone, and Monsoon Burger is in poor condition. That is a public area, and I'd like to see some maintenance done on it. Our toddler started playing on it but it was unsafe for her. There's a whole area that's covered by a big piece of plywood.</p> <p>We were excited to be able to eat our food and let the toddler run around (with us trading off playing with her), but it being unsafe made this plan not work out.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Andrew Wallick [K-YPRO-3]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Include Sacramento River Parkway existing and future potential park features and services		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-YPRO-3]
<i>Street Trees</i>			
Add street trees down the middle of the streets used for the midtown farmers market. This would help slow cars in off times and make the market or any other event there much more pleasant in the summer		M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) provide guidance for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Additionally, the Urban Forest Master Plan is underway. Please see project website for updates. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/About-Urban-Forestry/Urban-Forest-Master-Plan	Austin [K-YPRO-3]
Goal YPRO-1 (integrated park system)			
<i>Parks and Open Space System</i>			
Insert 2035 GP policy ERC 2.2.8 (Capital Investment Priorities). At the end of the first bullet, insert “with a priority on facilities that will serve disadvantaged communities.” At end of the second bullet, insert: “including areas like Sutter’s Landing Park.”	Goal YPRO-1	Please see Implementation Action YPRO-A.1: Youth, Parks, & Community Enrichment (YPCE) Parks Plan Update, and YPRO-A.7: Performance-Based Prioritization.	Corey Brown [K-YPRO-4]
<p>RATIONALE FOR A NATURAL AREAS PROGRAM</p> <p>Before the City of Sacramento was settled, the region was occupied by indigenous people associated with the tribes of the Nisenan, Southern Maidu, Valley and Plains Miwok, and Patwin Wintun.¹ Natural habitats included perennial grasslands, riparian woodlands, oak woodlands, creeks and rivers, freshwater marshes, ponds, and vernal pools.² As the “American Period” commenced in 18483, the ecological wealth of Sacramento and the North Delta was exploited in favor of gold and aggregate mining; the construction of water supply and flood control facilities; the industrialization of agriculture; the siting and operation of military and aerospace installations; and the development of roads, freeways, and the attendant urban and suburban settlement.</p> <p>Natural habitats were fragmented and obliterated, and no longer defined the landscapes of the region. From a global perspective, the natural habitats characterizing the Sacramento Region are part of the California Floristic Province (CFP), a zone of Mediterranean-type climate where summers are hot and dry, and winters are cool and wet. The CFP is one of only 33 “biodiversity hotspots” worldwide where the survival of an exceptionally rich assemblage of plants and animals has been placed at extreme risk by a complex assortment of human-induced (anthropogenic) stressors.⁴</p>	YPRO-1.1 (Range of Experiences)	Thank you for your comment. At this time, the 2040 General Plan has no plans to include a Natural Area designation. Please follow updates for the forthcoming Parks Plan 2040 for additional details on how the City will plan for green areas and open space.	Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]
<p>(cont.) As of 2023, natural areas persist within neighborhood and regional parks across the City of Sacramento, some by design and others by chance. While the City’s 2035 General Plan calls for protecting and enhancing open space and natural areas for the sake of sustainability and the regional ecosystem⁵, the City has never established a systematic way to evaluate, catalogue, protect, nor provide access to the natural areas that are essential elements of the City’s municipal park system. And while the City’s draft 2040 Parks Plan⁶ suggests “directions” providing people access nature and connected trails, the document should boldly recommend establishing Natural Areas Program to ensure there are mechanisms and priorities in place for identifying, securing, and stewarding Natural Areas forever.</p> <p>The Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS) is urging the City to designate a network of natural areas across the eight Council Districts, and to establish a Natural Areas Program to administer the natural areas network. There are numerous examples of commendable natural area programs across cities of the Western United States⁷, and the City of Sacramento could use them as models for establishing a Natural Areas Program tailored to the unique and vibrant natural features, cultures, and ethnicities of the City. Doing so would be consistent with the City’s 2035 General Plan and Climate Action & Adaptation Plan⁸, the City Parks Plan 2040, the California Biodiversity Initiative⁹, and the California 30x30 Initiative¹⁰.</p>			(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>(cont.) New funding from public and private sources would be required to establish a Natural Areas Program, and funding mechanisms used by other cities will need to be explored. Also, the City will need to hire individuals with expertise in ecological restoration, wildlife management, and environmental education to staff the new Program. While some opposition to such a Program can be expected, there is much to lose with inaction, and the time is now for Sacramento to distinguish itself among the other cities in the Central Valley as a leader in protecting nature in the city¹¹.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <p>1. Establish a Citywide Natural Areas Program: Consistent with Key Direction #4 within Park Plan 204012, establish a Natural Areas Program (Program) to protect and manage representative examples of the aquatic and terrestrial habitats characteristic of the southern Sacramento Valley. Establish one or more designated Natural Areas within each Council District. Create a network of Natural Areas by connecting them with recreational trails, wildlife corridors, and waterways.</p> <p>2. Implement Plans & Policies: Establishing and operating a citywide Natural Areas Program would implement the policies for Environmental Resources promulgated under the City's 2035 General Plan¹³, and the Carbon Sequestration Strategy recommended in the draft Climate Action & Adaptation Plan¹⁴.</p>			(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]
<p>(cont.) 3. Interim Measures Needed to Support a Natural Areas Program: Assign one or more Park planners to begin designing the Program, and model it after successful programs elsewhere in the West. Also, assign one or more maintenance professionals to focus completely on the stewardship of designated Natural Areas. Prioritize weed eradication, the removal of encampments, and trash removal.</p> <p>4. Signage: Install signage at every designated Natural Area and post the relevant municipal codes pertaining to prohibitions on camping, dumping, parking, etc.</p> <p>5. Training: Require that City staff, contractors, and lessees earn an Environmental Conservation Certificate¹⁵ before being allowed to operate mowers, string-trimmers, and heavy equipment in natural habitats.</p> <p>6. Poisons: Prohibit the use of herbicides, pesticides, and rodenticides in natural habitats by anyone other than a licensed applicator.</p> <p>7. Build upon Existing Municipal Codes and Scale-up Enforcement: Build upon the Code for safeguarding Natural Areas at Del Paso Regional Park¹⁶, and scale-up both the Code and enforcement measures to protect Natural Areas citywide.</p>			(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]
<p>(cont.) 8. Master Plan for Intensive Recreation: Do not build high-intensity recreational elements within the boundaries of designated Natural Areas, e.g., courses for BMX, disc golf, and orienteering¹⁷. These pursuits displace other park users who already enjoy and value these areas, and the facilities and patterns of use can irreversibly degrade the ecological integrity of the habitat¹⁸. Prepare a citywide Master Plan to site these elements on more durable and/or blighted parcels, and enhance their recreational and environmental value with native landscaping.</p> <p>9. Long-term Measures Needed to Run a Natural Areas Program: Explore potential ballot measures for raising revenue¹⁹ to support the Program. Recruit and hire diverse candidates with expertise in fields such as botany, cartography, economics, forestry, geography, grazing (rangeland management), hydro- geomorphology, land-use law, nature education, ornithology, restoration ecology, weed eradication, wetlands management, and wildlife biology.</p>			(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>(cont.) WHAT IS A "NATURAL AREA"?</p> <p>Well before the "American Period" commenced in 1848 (20), the floor of the southern Sacramento Valley was characterized by a diverse and beautiful mosaic of natural habitats that were managed by diverse populations of indigenous people. The landscapes were resplendent with dense riparian forests, vast swaths of tidally- influenced and freshwater wetlands, oak savanna and woodlands, expansive grasslands, and seasonal lagoons and vernal pools²¹.</p> <p>In just 175 years, these seemingly indestructible land- and waterscapes have been plundered, fragmented, degraded, and almost completely erased by development driven by human settlers. In the City of Sacramento, as of 2023, all that remains of the original mosaic are patches of habitat here and there on private and public lands. These remnant habitats are essential to the survival of resident and migratory wildlife²², and to the health and well-being of human populations²³.</p> <p>Where these patches occur on public land, every effort must be made to rescue them from further degradation, and set the stage for their perpetual protection.</p> <p>The goal of this Campaign is to compel the City of Sacramento to designate Natural Areas across the City and the park system to conserve and reconnect the patches of habitat into a robust network of Natural Areas that serves all Sacramentans and sets an example for what can be accomplished by a municipality in the Central Valley. Landscapes and waterscapes eligible for designation can range from relatively intact habitats to significantly degraded areas with restoration potential. Within designated Natural Areas, human activities should be limited to low-intensity, leave-no-trace activities such as hiking, nature appreciation, scientific study, bird watching (birding), on-leash dog walking, and habitat restoration.</p>			(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]
<p>(cont.) REFERENCES</p> <p>1 Land Acknowledgement; City of Sacramento. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/Mayor/Land-Acknowledgement-Text.pdf?la=en</p> <p>2 City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan; CHAPTER 6: Environmental Resources; page 6-13. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/General-Plan/2035-GP/Chapter-6---Environmental-Resources.pdf?la=en</p> <p>3 The History of Oak Woodlands in California, Part II: The Native American and Historic Period; Scott Mensing; UNR; The California Geographer Volume 46, 2006. https://scholarworks.calstate.edu/downloads/sn00b2449</p> <p>4 Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF). https://www.cepf.net/our-work/biodiversity-hotspots/california-floristic-province/</p> <p>5 City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan; CITYWIDE GOALS AND POLICIES; Biological Resources; page 2-315 to 319. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/General-Plan/2035-GP/Environmental-Resources.pdf?la=en</p> <p>6 SACRAMENTO PARKS: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/ParksandRec/Parks</p>			(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>(cont.) 7 Municipal Natural Area Programs in the West City of Eugene: https://www.eugene-or.gov/DocumentCenter/View/68225/COE-Parks-and-Open-Space-Annual-Report-FY2022. City of Fort Collins: https://www.fcgov.com/naturalareas/pdf/nad-master-plan-draft8-14.pdf City of Greeley: https://greeleygov.com/docs/default-source/natural-areas/get-outdoors-greeley-strategic-plan--02-02-21.pdf City and County of Los Angeles: https://planning.lacounty.gov/site/sea/home/ City of Portland: https://www.portland.gov/parks/nature/natural-areas City of San Francisco: https://sfrecpark.org/DocumentCenter/View/8556/01-SNRAMP_ExecSummary</p> <p>Regional Natural Areas Programs in the West East Bay Regional Park District: https://www.ebparks.org/ Mid-Peninsula Open Space District: https://www.openspace.org/</p> <p>8 City of Sacramento Climate Action & Adaptation Plan: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Major-Projects/General-Plan/About-The-Project/Climate_Change</p> <p>9 California Biodiversity Initiative: https://californiabiodiversityinitiative.org/</p> <p>10 Pathways to 30x30 California: Accelerating Conservation of California's Nature: https://resources.ca.gov/-/media/CNRA-Website/Files/Initiatives/30-by-30/Final_Pathwaysto30x30_042022_508.pdf</p>			(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]
<p>(cont.) 11 MAKING NATURE'S CITY: A science-based framework for building urban biodiversity: https://www.sfei.org/projects/making-natures-city</p> <p>12 Park Plan 2040 Key Direction #4: Enhance Connections to Nature and Trails. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/ParksandRec/parks-planning/PMP2040_Staff_Report-I2_Update.pdf?la=en Trail connectivity and access to nature are key community interests, as well as the protection and management of natural areas to support climate resiliency. However, various City departments and other partners share responsibilities for natural resources and pedestrian and bicycle paths and routes. YPCE will play a stronger role in coordinating with other City departments and entities to improve park access, parkway use, and recreation via trails. New projects, programs and policies may be needed to support natural resource protection in parks, parkways, and open space, including increasing urban greening and enhancing the urban tree canopy.</p> <p>13 City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan, Policies for Environmental Resources. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/General-Plan/2035-GP/Environmental-Resources.pdf?la=en</p>			(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>(cont.) Policies Regarding Water and Biological Resources</p> <p>ER 1.1.1 Conservation of Open Space Areas. The City shall conserve and where feasible create or restore areas that provide important water quality benefits such as riparian corridors, buffer zones, wetlands, undeveloped open space areas, levees, and drainage canals for the purpose of protecting water resources in the city's watershed, creeks, and the Sacramento and American rivers. (RDR/ MPSP)</p> <p>ER 2.1.2 Conservation of Open Space. The City shall continue to preserve, protect, and provide appropriate access to designated open space areas along the American and Sacramento Rivers, floodways, and undevelopable floodplains, provided access would not disturb sensitive habitats or species. (MPSP/IGC)</p> <p>ER 2.1.3 Natural Lands Management. The City shall promote the preservation and restoration of contiguous areas of natural habitat throughout the city and support their integration with existing and future regional preserves. (RDR/IGC)</p> <p>ER 2.1.4 Retain Habitat Areas. The City shall retain plant and wildlife habitat areas where there are known sensitive resources (e.g., sensitive habitats, special-status, threatened, endangered, candidate species, and species of concern). Particular attention shall be focused on retaining habitat areas that are contiguous with other existing natural areas and/or wildlife movement corridors. (RDR/IGC)</p> <p>ER 2.1.5 Riparian Habitat Integrity. The City shall preserve the ecological integrity of creek corridors, canals, and drainage ditches that support riparian resources by preserving native plants and, to the extent feasible, removing invasive nonnative plants. If not feasible, adverse impacts on riparian habitat shall be mitigated by the preservation and/or restoration of this habitat in compliance with State and Federal regulations or at a minimum 1:1 ratio, in perpetuity. (RDR/IGC)</p>		<p>The title of ERC-2.1 has been revised to say: "ERC-2.1 Conservation of Water Resources in Open Space Areas."</p> <p>The following ER policies from the 2035 GP have been carried over to the 2040 GP into goal section ERC-2:</p> <p>ER 2.1.6 Wetland Protection. The City shall preserve and protect wetland resources including creeks, rivers, ponds, marshes, vernal pools, and other seasonal wetlands, to the extent feasible. If not feasible, the mitigation of all adverse impacts on wetland resources shall be required in compliance with State and Federal regulations protecting wetland resources, and if applicable, threatened or endangered species. Additionally, the City shall require either on- or off-site permanent preservation of an equivalent amount of wetland habitat to ensure no-netloss of value and/or function.</p> <p>ER 2.1.7 Annual Grasslands. The City shall preserve and protect native grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species. If not feasible, the mitigation of all adverse impacts on annual grasslands shall comply with State and Federal regulations protecting foraging habitat for those species known to utilize this habitat.</p>	<p>(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]</p>
<p>(cont.) ER 2.1.6 Wetland Protection. The City shall preserve and protect wetland resources including creeks, rivers, ponds, marshes, vernal pools, and other seasonal wetlands, to the extent feasible. If not feasible, the mitigation of all adverse impacts on wetland resources shall be required in compliance with State and Federal regulations protecting wetland resources, and if applicable, threatened or endangered species. Additionally, the City shall require either on- or off-site permanent preservation of an equivalent amount of wetland habitat to ensure no-net- loss of value and/or function. (RDR/IGC)</p> <p>ER 2.1.7 Annual Grasslands. The City shall preserve and protect native grasslands and vernal pools that provide habitat for rare and endangered species. If not feasible, the mitigation of all adverse impacts on annual grasslands shall comply with State and Federal regulations protecting foraging habitat for those species known to utilize this habitat. (RDR/IGC)</p> <p>ER 2.1.8 Oak Woodlands. The City shall preserve and protect oak woodlands, heritage oaks, and/or significant stands of oak trees in the city that provide habitat for common native, and special-status wildlife species, and shall address all adverse impacts on oak woodlands in accordance with the City's Heritage Tree Ordinance. (RDR)</p> <p>14 City of Sacramento Climate Action and Adaptation Plan. Public Review Draft April 2023. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/-/media/Corporate/Files/CDD/Planning/Major-Projects/generalPlan/Climate-Action-and-Adaptation-Plan---April-28--2023.pdf?la=en</p>		<p>(cont.) ER 2.1.9 Wildlife Corridors. The City shall preserve, protect, and avoid impacts to natural, undisturbed habitats that provides movement corridors for sensitive wildlife species. If corridors are adversely affected, damaged habitat shall, be replaced with habitat of equivalent value or enhanced to enable the continued movement of species.</p> <p>ER 2.1.10 Habitat Assessments. The City shall consider the potential impact on sensitive plants and wildlife for each project requiring discretionary approval. If site conditions are such that potential habitat for sensitive plant and/or wildlife species may be present, the City shall require habitat assessments, prepared by a qualified biologist, for sensitive plant and wildlife species. If the habitat assessment determines that suitable habitat for sensitive plant and/or wildlife species is present, then either (1) protocol-level surveys shall be conducted (where survey protocol has been established by a resource agency), or, in the absence of established survey protocol, a focused survey shall be conducted consistent with industry-recognized best practices; or (2) suitable habitat and presence of the species shall be assumed to occur within all potential habitat locations identified on the project site. Survey Reports shall be prepared and submitted to the City and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (depending on the species) for further consultation and development of avoidance and/ or mitigation measures consistent with state and federal law.</p>	<p>(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]</p>

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>(cont.) CS-1: Increase urban tree canopy cover to 25% by 2030 and 35% by 2045: A focus on carbon sequestration has the added benefit of increasing green-space for more robust local habitats, reducing urban heat island effects, and beautifying Sacramento, especially in historically underserved communities. This CAAP measure is consistent with the Mayors' Commission on Climate Change strategy to expand green infrastructure to ensure that all neighborhoods, starting with historically under-resourced communities and neighborhoods with low canopy cover, have access to green-space and tree canopy shade (community health and resiliency recommendation #1).</p> <p>15 Associate in Science (A.S.) degree in General Science: Environmental Conservation Certificate. https://arc.losrios.edu/academics/programs-and-majors/natural-resources</p> <p>16 Sacramento City Code § 12.72.060 AA re: to Del Paso Regional Park. https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_72- article_iii-12_72_060 http://sacramento.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php? view_id=36&clip_id=3883&meta_id=483800 https://sacramento.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php? view_id=22&clip_id=3926&meta_id=489628 No person shall (e)nter the designated natural habitat areas within Del Paso Regional Park, except for the following activities: (1) Horseback riding on the designated trails; (2) Walking or using a non-motorized bicycle on the designated trails; and (3) Using the areas for scientific, environmental, educational, or maintenance purposes, if granted permission to do so by the city manager. (Ord. 2022-0012 § 1; Ord. 2020-0001 § 5; Ord. 2017-0004 § 1; Ord. 2012-042 § 5).</p> <p>17 Orienteering. http://baoc.org/wiki/images/9/9d/JMP_POC_Instructions_190718.pdf</p>		<p>(cont.) ER 2.1.11 Agency Coordination. The City shall coordinate with State and Federal resource agencies (e.g., California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to protect areas containing rare or endangered species of plants and animals.</p> <p>ER 2.1.12 Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan. The City shall continue to participate in and support the policies of the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan for the protection of biological resources in the Natomas Basin.</p> <p>ER 2.1.13 Support Habitat Conservation Plan Efforts. The City shall encourage and support regional habitat conservation planning efforts to conserve and manage habitat for special status species. New or amended Habitat Conservation Plans should provide a robust adaptive management component sufficient to ensure that habitat preserves are resilient to climate change effects/impacts and to ensure their mitigation value over time. Provisions should include, but are not limited to: greater habitat ranges and diversity; corridors and transition zones to accommodate retreat or spatial shifts in natural areas; redundant water supply; elevated topography to accommodate extreme flooding; and flexible management and fee structure.</p>	(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]
<p>(cont.) 18 Wilcox, Joshua Robert. "An assessment of the relevance of landscape architecture and disc golf." (2015).</p> <p>Leung, Yu-Fai, Chelsey Walden-Schreiner, Craig Samuel Matisoff, Michael Naber and Jessica M. Robinson. "A two-pronged approach to evaluating environmental concerns of disc golf as emerging recreation in urban natural areas." <i>Managing Leisure</i> 18 (2013): 273 - 285.</p> <p>Trendafilova, Sylvia & Waller, Steven. (2011). Assessing the Ecological Impact Due to Disc Golf. <i>International Journal of Sport Management, Recreation and Tourism</i>. 8. 35-64. 10.5199/ijsmart-1791-874X-8c.</p> <p>Meanwhile, in Placer County, the City Council of Folsom rejected proposed amendments to the Master Plan for building a tournament-level disc golf course at Nisenan Community Park on 01/22/19 (hearing begins at minute 53:09); and controversy surrounded the proposed construction of a disc golf course within the Auburn Ravine Nature Preserve.</p> <p>19 Examples of Ballot Measures Designed to Protect and Restore Natural Areas City of Fort Collins (City and County Sales Tax) City of Greeley (5-year Strategic Plan for Natural Areas and Sustainable Funding) City of Oakland (Measure DD) County of Sonoma (Measure M) East Bay Regional Park District (Measure FF) Mid-peninsula Open Space District (Parcel Tax)</p> <p>20 Mensing, S.A. 2006. The History of oak woodlands in California, Part II: the Native American and historic period. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232041282_The_History_of_Oak_Woodlands_in_California_Part_II_The_Native_American_and_Historic_Period</p>		<p>(cont.) ER 2.1.14 Climate Change-related Habitat Shifts. The City shall support the efforts of The Natomas Basin Conservancy and other habitat preserve managers to adaptively manage wildlife preserves to ensure adequate connectivity, habitat range, and diversity of topographic and climatic conditions are provided for species to move as climate shifts.</p> <p>ER 2.1.15 Climate Change-related Habitat Restoration and Enhancement. The City shall support active habitat restoration and enhancement to reduce impact of climate change stressors and improve overall resilience of habitat within existing parks and open space in the city. The City shall support the efforts of Sacramento County to improve the resilience of habitat areas in the American River Parkway.</p>	(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>(cont.) 21 Whipple, A.; Grossinger, R. M.; Rankin, D.; Stanford, B.; Askevold, R. A. 2012. Sacramento- San Joaquin Delta Historical Ecology Investigation: Exploring Pattern and Process. SFEI Contribution No. 672. SFEI: Richmond. https://www.sfei.org/documents/sacramento-san-joaquin-delta-historical-ecology-investigation-exploring-pattern-and-proces</p> <p>22 Wintle, B. A., Kujala, H., Whitehead, A., Cameron, A., Veloz, S., Kukkala, A., Moilanen, A., Gordon, A., Lentini, P. E., Cadenhead, N. C. R., & Bekessy, S. A. (2019). Global synthesis of conservation studies reveals the importance of small habitat patches for biodiversity. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 116(3), 909–914. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1813051115. https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1813051115</p> <p>23 Marselle, M.R., Lindley, S.J., Cook, P.A. et al. Biodiversity and Health in the Urban Environment. Curr Envir Health Rpt 8, 146–156 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40572-021-00313-9. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40572-021-00313-9#citeas</p>			(cont.) Tim Vendlinski [K-YPRO-4]
<p>city parks and other existing open spaces provide valuable wildlife habitat and viewing. Establish an education and management program focusing on these resources and enhancing them.</p>	YPRO-1.1 (Range of Experiences)	Policies LUP-11.4 (Community Education), ERC-2.4 (Native and Climate-Adapted Plants), ERC-3.8 (Public Education), and ERC-A.2: (Tree Education) support efforts to educate members of the public on the value of natural spaces and strategies for how to add, preserve, regenerate, protect these spaces.	Dale Steele [K-YPRO-4]
<p>There needs to be a recognition of existing Natural Areas within the City that provide nature connections and biodiversity that are very important but are difficult to find in urban areas. Some of the existing City parks and open space areas that contain significant natural areas include: Del Paso Regional Park, Fisherman’s Lake, Bannon Creek Parkway, Sutter’s Landing Regional Park, Tretheway Oak Preserve, William Charley’s Park, Granite Regional Park, Reichmuth Park and North Laguna Creek Park. The City needs to designate existing Natural Areas within the City to conserve and reconnect the existing patches of natural habitat into a robust network of Natural Areas that serve all Sacramentans. These existing natural areas need to be properly protected, conserved and enhanced. The City needs to have qualified staff to manage these natural areas.</p>	YPRO-1.1 (Range of Experiences)	Thank you for your comment. At this time, the 2040 General Plan has no plans to include a Natural Area designation. Please follow updates for the forthcoming Parks Plan 2040 for additional details on how the City will plan for green areas and open space.	Dan Meier [K-YPRO-4]
<p>City parks provide a great opportunity to bring nature to the city. Parks can accommodate large native trees such oaks that support a wide variety of wildlife. Locally adapted native plants save water, require little or no fertilizers, herbicides or pesticides, and importantly provide habitat for native birds, bees and butterflies. This doesn’t require a wholesale change in local park landscaping but would require a shift by the City to take advantage of opportunities to add native plants whenever possible. Opportunities for native plants at parks could include pollinator gardens (alone or in combination with Community vegetable gardens), replacement of trees lost through attrition (age, disease, storms, etc.) and addition of trees and other native plants within existing riparian and open space areas. Consider the concept of adding “habitat islands” within parks. These are groupings of native plants chosen for aesthetics, habitat value, and low water and maintenance needs.</p>	YPRO-1.1 (Range of Experiences)	Please see forthcoming Parks Plan 2040.	Dan Meier [K-YPRO-4]
<p>Staff initiated policy revision for consistency with Parks Plan 2040.</p>	YPRO-1.3 (Parkland Service Standard)	Policy YPRO 1.3 (Parkland Service Standard) revised to say: "The City shall evaluate, as needed, the equitable increase of public park acreage to serve the needs of the current and future residents with high-quality facilities. The City shall continue to strive to achieve a parkland service standard of 8.5 acres of neighborhood and community parkland per 1,000 residents, which includes neighborhood parks, community parks, regional parks, open space, and parkways."	Staff
<p>Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.</p>	YPRO-1.4 (Parkland Requirements)	Policy YPRO 1.4 (Parkland Dedication Requirements) revised to say: "The City shall continue to require that new residential development projects contribute toward the provision of adequate parks and recreational facilities to serve the new residents, either through the dedication of parkland, the construction of public and/or private recreation facilities, or the payment of parkland in-lieu fees, consistent with the Quimby Ordinance. To achieve the level of service for all parkland in all areas of the city, the City shall seek other funding resources to prioritize park needs in park deficit areas. "	Staff

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.6 (Underutilized Land)	Policy YPRO 1.6 (Underutilized Land) revised to say: "As feasible, the City shall acquire, lease, or otherwise obtain rights to the use of odd-shaped or underutilized vacant parcels for park or open space, focusing efforts first in underserved-disadvantaged-park deficient communities."	Staff
High schools have swimming pools, but not just youth need and want to swim! Lap swimming is one of the best and simple (no equipment necessary) forms of exercise. Let's take advantage of the facilities when not in use by the high school. Public swimming at Sac City College might be another opportunity.	YPRO-1.7 (Co-Located Joint-Use Facilities)	Facilities with swimming pools would also be considered in YPRO-1.7.	Susan Hida [K-YPRO-5]
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.7 (Co-Located Joint-Use Facilities)	Policy YPRO 1.7 (Co-Located Joint-Use Facilities) revised to say: "The City shall continue to facilitate the development of new parks or expansion of existing parks and recreational facilities by co-locating with and joint use of new or existing public and institutional facilities (e.g., schools, libraries, cultural facilities, and stormwater detention basins) in order to efficiently provide for community needs and offset operations and maintenance costs, prioritizing disadvantaged communities with an existing deficit of park or recreation facilities."	Staff
Add environmental and nature education. City parks and other existing open spaces provide valuable wildlife habitat and viewing. Establish an education and management program focusing on these resources and enhancing them	YPRO-1.8 (Non-Conventional Park Solutions)	Policies LUP-11.4 (Community Education), ERC-2.4 (Native and Climate-Adapted Plants), ERC-3.8 (Public Education), and ERC-A.2: (Tree Education) support efforts to educate members of the public on the value of natural spaces and strategies for how to add, preserve, regenerate, protect these spaces.	Dale Steele [K-YPRO-5]
I like this a lot. There is so much excess right of way that is given to cars and not to people. Parents should feel safe letting there kids play in the street and when the street is only made for cars this can never be possible. Reduce the width and put parks in the middle of the streets that restrict car through traffic but not people. Almost all neighborhoods could use this but the central city suffers from this the worst with its massive 50ft right of way given to cars. So much area for green space. All local streets in the central city should look at least like those in poverty ridge.	YPRO-1.8 (Non-Conventional Park Solutions)	Thank you for your comment.	Austin [K-YPRO-5]
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.8 (Non-Conventional Park Solutions)	Policy YPRO 1.8 (Non-Conventional Park Solutions) revised to say: "In densely built out urban areas of the city where the provision of large park spaces is not feasible, the City shall explore creative solutions to provide neighborhood park and recreation facilities that serve the needs of local residents and employees. Such solutions may include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publicly accessible, privately-owned open spaces and plazas; • Rooftop play courts and gardens; • Freeway underpass, and utility corridor, and wide landscape medians; • Conversion of rails to rails with trails; • Pocket parks/small public places and pedestrian areas in the public right-of-way; and • The provision of neighborhood and community-serving recreational facilities in regional parks." 	Staff
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.9 (Timing of Services)	Policy YPRO 1.9 (Timing of Services) revised to say: "The City shall monitor the pace and location of new development through the development review process and long-range planning efforts to strive to ensure that development of parks and community and , recreation programming, and community-serving facilities and services -keeps pace with growth."	Staff

Facility Access, Programming, and Safety

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.10 (Parkland Access Standard)	Policy YPRO 1.10 (Parkland Access Standard) revised to say: "In residential areas that do not have an accessible park or recreational open space within a 10-minute walk, the City shall evaluate the equitable increase of public park acreage, prioritizing communities with an existing deficit of high-quality facilities. The City shall strive to provide accessible public park or recreational open space within 10-minute walk of all residences in Sacramento. "	Staff
Adding gates that open into Leataata Floyd Elementary School from the mills would make this school much more accessible to the community	YPRO-1.11 (Enhancing Access to Parks)	Thank you for your comment.	Austin [K-YPRO-5]
Add environmental and nature education. City parks and other existing open spaces provide valuable wildlife habitat and viewing. Establish an education and management program focusing on these resources and enhancing them	YPRO-1.12 (Parks Programming)	Please see policies LUP-11.4 (Community Education), ERC-2.4 (Native and Climate-Adapted Plants), ERC-3.8 (Public Education), and ERC-A.2: (Tree Education) support efforts to educate members of the public on the value of natural spaces and strategies for how to add, preserve, regenerate, protect these spaces.	Dale Steele [K-YPRO-6]
Strongly agree	YPRO-1.12 (Parks Programming)	Thank you for your comment.	Karen Jacque [K-YPRO-6]
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.12 (Parks Programming)	Policy YPRO 1.12 (Parks Programming) revised to say: "The City shall continue to create high-quality, equitable inclusive programming that encourages the use of the park facilities by a variety of users, including older adults, youth, and people with disabilities throughout the day and evenings. Programming should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organized sports, • Fitness, • Youth leadership and workforce development, • Volunteer activities, and • Arts and cultural activities catering to the interests of the community that the park facilities serve. Opportunities should be taken to incorporate local Native American heritage and culture."	Staff
Please address safety with respect to off-leash dogs.	YPRO-1.13 (Park Safety)	Thank you for your comment.	Susan Hida [K-YPRO-6]
Add something about Traffic calming around parks and getting to parks safely in YPRO-1.13 (Park Safety) - not just "Stranger danger" safety but safety from vehicles		Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa and Troy [3]
YPRO-1.13 Park Safety: Prioritization of CPTED strategies to promote park safety must be met with understanding that without local community input and involvement can take one inherently harmful outcomes. Please see within Public Facilities and Safety recommendation item PFS-1.5 CPTED Strategies	YPRO-1.13 (Park Safety)	Policy YPRO 1.13 (Park Safety) revised to say: "The City shall continue to use Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) landscaping and lighting, among other techniques and efforts that support the Park Ranger program, to ensure that parks and open spaces are designed and maintained with safety as a priority without compromising accessible and inclusionary design to maximize the personal safety of users and maintain the visibility of play areas.	Civic Thread [91]
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.13 (Park Safety)	Policy YPRO 1.13 (Park Safety) revised to say: "The City shall continue to use Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) landscaping and lighting, among other techniques and efforts that support the Park Ranger program, to ensure that parks and open spaces are designed and maintained with safety as a priority without compromising accessible and inclusionary design.	Staff
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.14 (Collaborative Efforts)	Policy YPRO 1.14 (Collaborative Efforts) revised to say: "The City shall implement community-based crime prevention strategies and recreation programming in coordination with the City's Park Ranger program, neighborhood groups, local residents, and Property and Business Improvement Districts (PBIDs), concurrent with the city's Public Safety Services resolution to help improve safety and encourage positive use activation of parks and facilities.	Staff

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.15 (Path Connections)	Policy YPRO 1.15 (Path Connections) revised to say: "The City shall preserve maintain existing and pursue new connections to local and regional, and state shared-use paths, especially when connecting to public parkland."	Staff
Maintaining and enhancing the American River and Sacramento River Parkways should including funding and staffing to address litter, invasive plants and habitat restoration needs.	YPRO-1.16 (River Parkways)	Thank you for your comment.	Dan Meier [K-YPRO-6]
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.16 (River Parkways)	Policy YPRO 1.16 (River Parkways) revised to say: "The City shall coordinate collaborate with the Park Ranger program, with the Sacramento County Department of Regional Parks, and other agencies and organizations to secure funding to increase ranger patrols and maintain and enhance the American River and Sacramento River parkways and multi-use shared path corridors."	Staff
Very good policy. Suggest adding the following: After "state agencies", insert "nonprofit and community groups"; after "preserve", insert "restore,"; and after "passive recreation" insert "and habitat values."	YPRO-1.17 (Waterway Recreation and Access)	Policy YPRO-1.17 (Waterway Recreation and Access) revised to say: "...state agencies, nonprofit and community groups,...preserve, restore, ...passive recreation and habitat values."	Corey Brown [K-YPRO-6]
At the end of this section, add: "Priority shall be placed on improving public access and the protection and restoration of habitat values at locations like Sutter's Landing Park.	YPRO-1.17 (Waterway Recreation and Access)	Thank you for your comment.	Corey Brown [K-YPRO-6]
Add the following two policies from the 2035 GP: ERC2.4.4 (Setbacks from Rivers and Creeks); ERC 2.5.2 (River Parkways); and ERC 2.5.3 (Property Acquisition). In 2.4.4, at the end, insert: "The City shall ensure that development projects adjacent to or near the American River Parkway that require City approval are consistent with the American River Parkway Plan and the Urban American River Parkway Preservation Act (commencing with Section 5840 of the Public Resources Code). In policy ERC 2.5.2, after "maintain", insert "restore,"; and after "American and Sacramento Rivers", insert "and adjacent lands including Sutter's Landing Park."		2035 General Plan policy ERC 2.4.4 (Setbacks from Rivers and Creeks) added back into 2040 General Plan goal section LUP-8: "Setbacks from Rivers and Creeks. The City shall ensure adequate building setbacks from rivers and creeks, increasing them where possible to protect natural resources." 2035 General Plan policy ERC 2.5.2 is policy YPRO-1.16 (River Parkways) in the 2040 General Plan. 2035 General Plan policy ERC 2.5.3 is policy YPRO-1.30 (Park Financing Strategies) in the 2040 General Plan.	Corey Brown [K-YPRO-6]
I have seen that there are two optional plans. One that creates a swimming area and one that maintains all the marina for storing boats. Please go with the first one. To cave to the needs of rich people who own boats over creating a greatly needed public space for everyone in the city would be absolutely silly.	YPRO-1.18 (Miller Regional Park/Sacramento Marina)	Thank you for your comment. The West Broadway Specific Plan will begin implementation in 2024, which includes a feasibility study for this area.	Austin [K-YPRO-6]
<i>Design, Amenities, and Programming</i>			
After "context", insert "protect and provide access to nature,".	YPRO-1.19 (Integrated Parks and Recreation System)	Policy YPRO-1.19 (Integrated Parks and Recreation System) revised to say: "...context, protect and provide access to nature,..."	Corey Brown [K-YPRO-6]
include educational information about nature, environmental services, Native American culture and other locally based details developed in collaboration with local communities and non-profit volunteer organizations.	YPRO-1.20 (Sustainable Design)	Please see LUP-11.3 (Local Human and Ecological Context) and LUP-11.6 (Community Connection) for policies that support interconnection of development, historical context, and culture.	Dale Steele [K-YPRO-6]
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.21 (Climate-Resilient Design)	Policy YPRO-1.21 (Climate-Resilient Design) revised to say: "The City shall ensure that the design of parks and open spaces balances sunlight access with trees , climate-adaptive design, such as resilient landscaping in place of impervious surfaces, climate-adaptive tree canopy, shade structures, drinking fountains, and cooling amenities, such as water spray areas, that provide respite from higher temperatures to reduce urban heat islands and overexposure to heat."	Staff
Sacramentos park and recreation facilities are currently heavily weighted toward youth. An equitable approach would provide greater interest and participation in parks by Older Adults. Perhaps even multigenerational activity areas.	YPRO-1.23 (Organized Sports and Recreational Facilities)	Please see goal section YPRO-3 for policies that support programming for residents of all ages.	Anonymous [K-YPRO-7]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.23 (Organized Sports and Recreational Facilities)	Policy YPRO 1.23 (Organized Sports and Recreational Facilities) revised to say: "The City shall develop and maintain quality facilities (e.g., multi-field and multi-court sports complexes, skateparks, pump tracks, and challenge courses) for a variety of organized and recreational sports, prioritizing the needs of youth between the ages of 10 and 24, and particularly for youth in disadvantaged communities, in order to ensure opportunities for youth development, recreation, social development, and life and wellness skill building."	Staff
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.24 (Welcoming Amenities)	Policy YPRO 1.24 (Welcoming Amenities) revised to say: "In its parks and recreational facilities, the City shall incorporate amenities that invite the use of park facilities by all community members, including benches, accessible park paths and facilities , shaded seating, pathway lighting , and restrooms that make it easier for older adults and families to enjoy the facilities."	Staff
The presently closed public course near Campus Commons along the American River Parkway should be relocated and the land converted back to wildlife habitat and passive recreation use.	YPRO-1.25 (Municipal Golf Courses)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-YPRO-7]
I want to respect all peoples hobbies but golf courses are incredibly bad for the environment and waste space that could be used as a park or contain housing. Mini golf or driving ranges are okay within the city but full golf courses should not and should be replaced with actual parks with mixes of amenities or greatly needed housing.	YPRO-1.25 (Municipal Golf Courses)	Thank you for your comment.	Austin [K-YPRO-7]
Golf courses in Sacramento are not good candidates for conversion to parks or housing. The only argument I could see is for Land Park GC, but that is already open and integrated with the larger park. No real conversion needed. Golf Courses CAN be issues, but in general are a boogie man blown out of proportion.	YPRO-1.25 (Municipal Golf Courses)	Thank you for your comment.	Matthew [K-YPRO-7]
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.27 (Volunteer Programs)	Policy YPRO 1.27 (Volunteer Programs) revised to say: "The City shall continue to engage local residents, businesses, and community-based organizations in the stewardship and maintenance of parks and facilities through the Park Volunteer Program, Earth Day , Adopt-a-Park, Creek Week programs, and other collaborative partnerships and initiatives."	Staff
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.28 (Fee Benchmarking)	Policy YPRO 1.28 (Fee Benchmarking) revised to say: "The City shall periodically review Quimby in-lieu parkland dedication fees, park development impact fees, application review fees , and user fees and charges to ensure they are adequately providing for community needs and are competitive within the region."	Staff
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-1.29 (Leveraging Grant Funds)	Policy YPRO 1.29 (Leveraging Grant Funds) revised to say: "The City shall leverage municipal funds to access grants for the acquisition of parkland in park deficient areas, planning , construction and maintenance of parks and recreational facilities in underserved, disadvantaged communities from federal and state government agencies , philanthropic organizations, and private partners."	Staff
Goal YPRO-2 (public facilities)			
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-2.2 (Co-Location of Community-Serving Facilities)	Policy YPRO 2.2 (Co-Location of Community-Serving Facilities) revised to say: "Whenever feasible, the City shall co-locate City facilities with other public facilities (schools, post offices, hospitals/clinics, libraries, drainage facilities, utility providers) so that multiple services may be delivered from a single location."	

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
This should be changed from "Locate elementary schools on sites that are safely and conveniently accessible,..." to "Convert sites around elementary schools to be safely and conveniently accessible, ...". As it currently is, YPRO-2.3 only addresses NEW schools which basically makes this goal useless. There isn't a demand for new schools and thus, very few situations in which this situation applies. It's not about locating schools in safe, low-noise, low-traffic neighborhoods; it's about actually CONVERTING neighborhoods around schools. If this goal stays at is, it actually exacerbates environmental injustice by ensuring that only the places that already have these amenities get schools that feel safe and pleasant and ecological for kids.	YPRO-2.3 (School Facilities)	Please see goal section M-4 for policies that support a safer transportation system. Policy M-4.4 (Collaborative Safety Solutions) specifically supports the development and implementation of programs and improvements that increase safety and encourage the use of active transportation and transit modes.	Alyssa Lee [K-YPRO-8]
Same for this one. Instead of "Locate schools in areas where established and/or planned walkways, bicycle paths, or greenways link schools with surrounding uses", this should be changed to "Plan and establish walkways, bicycle paths, or greenways around schools that link with surrounding uses." See previous comment.	YPRO-2.3 (School Facilities)	Please see goal section M-1 for policies that support a multi-modal, connected transportation system. Policies M-1.13 (Walkability) and M-1.17 (Improve Bicycling Connectivity) specifically address connectivity to destinations throughout the city.	Alyssa Lee [K-YPRO-8]
This goal could be improved by also explicitly mentioning "The City shall work with local groups and develop partnerships to establish a Safe Routes to Schools program to help achieve this goal."	YPRO-2.3 (School Facilities)	New policy added in goal section M-4: "Safe Routes to School. The City shall assess opportunities to develop and support Safe Routes to School programming."	Alyssa Lee [K-YPRO-8]
Policy YPRO-2.3 (School Facilities) only addresses new schools. The number of students is decreasing. It's not about locating schools in safe, low-noise, low-traffic neighborhoods; it's about actually CONVERTING neighborhoods around schools. This exacerbates environmental injustice by ensuring that only the places that already have these amenities get schools that feel safe and pleasant and ecological for kids.	YPRO-2.3 (School Facilities)	Please see goal section M-4 for policies that support a safer transportation system. Policy M-4.4 (Collaborative Safety Solutions) specifically supports the development and implementation of programs and improvements that increase safety and encourage the use of active transportation and transit modes.	Alyssa and Troy [3]
libraries are key community resources and should receive increased funding to support new and expanding programs	YPRO-2.4 (Library Services)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-YPRO-8]
Libraries should be open later. Also increase the library of things program	YPRO-2.4 (Library Services)	Thank you for your comment.	Austin [K-YPRO-8]
Equally important is to actively include older adults in city decision making, committees, commissions and city events.. Care facilities would be less needed if there were more affordable housing options, and low cost home repair programs.	YPRO-2.7 (Child/Older Adult Care)	Thank you for your comment.	PATTY WAIT [K-YPRO-10]
Map YPRO-2: Community Centers, Aquatic Facilities, and Libraries in Sacramento			
<i>Sites</i>			
Library in this area	Greater Land Park	Thank you for your comment.	Austin [K-YPRO-9]
Library in this area	River District/Railyards	Thank you for your comment.	Austin [K-YPRO-9]
This facility is underused. It could be the hub of the cities multigenerational volunteer/intern efforts. Let's resuscitate it and offer options for our citizens to support the variety of city efforts.	Coloma Community Center	Thank you for your comment.	PATTY WAIT [K-YPRO-9]
<i>Amenities</i>			
Adults need access to lap-swimming without joining a "club". Let's have the high school swimming pools available when not in use by PE classes, swim teams, and swim lessons for youth. A city the size of Sacramento needs more options than provided here: http://www.cityofsacramento.org/ParksandRec/Recreation/Aquatics/Programming/Lap-Swim		Please see policy YPRO-2.2 (Co-Location of Community-Serving Facilities) which supports co-location of public facilities.	Susan Hida [K-YPRO-9]
Community Enrichment			
Perhaps Sacramento should consider an Older Adult Commission. Many cities have benefited from such an organization; Davis Berkeley, Fremont ,Lafayette, Pasadena, Oakland, San Rafael, Roseville, San Fransisco....	Sacramento Youth Commission call-out box	Thank you for your comment.	Anonymous [K-YPRO-11]
Goal YPRO-3 (healthy lifestyles and health equity)			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Sacramento County has a Department of Health Services (DHS). Public Health is a division within DHS, i.e., it should read Sacramento County Department of Health Services, Division of Public health or simply Sacramento County Public Health.	YPRO-3.1 (Health Data and Programming)	Policy YPRO-3.1 (Health Data and Programming) revised to say: "...with the Sacramento County Department of Public Health and Health Services to monitor..."	Sacramento County Public Health [K-YPRO-11]
The library offers so many amazing benefits that I think most community members are unaware of. Access to a curated library of Coursera courses has been great for me personally, and I think other services (72-hour NY Times access, etc.) can be better advertised.	YPRO-3.2 (Health Information)	Policy revision to YPRO-3.2 (Health Information): "The City should provide and promote courses, seminars..."	Sacramento County Public Health [K-YPRO-11]
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-3.8 (Cooling Centers)	Policy YPRO 3.8 (Cooling Centers) revised to say: "The City shall continue to activate cooling centers at the community centers, aquatic centers, and water spray parks to help residents cope with higher temperatures. City parks shall be designed with materials and other strategies that offer cooling benefits to the residents."	Staff
Goal YPRO-4 (arts, culture, learning)			
The efforts of the city to enhance and promote the health of our youth is terrific. Let's not forget the ever growing Older Adult cohort.	YPRO-4.2 (Recreational Programs)	Please see goal section YPRO-3 for policies that support programming for residents of all ages. Please also see forthcoming Age-Friendly Action Plan.	Anonymous [K-YPRO-12]
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-4.2 (Recreational Programs)	Policy YPRO 4.2 (Recreational Programs) revised to say: "The City shall endeavor to provide youth development, leadership , recreation, and community enrichment programs that promote wellness, social interaction, lifelong learning, skill development, personal enrichment, and positive relationships."	Staff
Implementing Actions			
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-A.1 (Yourth, Parks, & Community Enrichment (YPCE) Parks Plan Update)	YPRO-A.1 (Yourth, Parks, & Community Enrichment (YPCE) Parks Plan Update) revised to say: " The Parks Plan 2040 shall provide policy recommendations toward meeting the city's parkland and facility level of service goals; incorporate design guideline standards for park and recreation facilities; and strengthen access to parks and recreational facilities. The update should incorporate key priorities, implementation actions, and funding mechanisms and be undertaken with robust community engagement. The City shall update the YPCE Parks Plan to identify locations for new neighborhood and community parks as needed to satisfy community needs; incorporate standards for new non-conventional park facilities; and strengthen access to parks and recreational facilities by transit. The update should incorporate priorities, phasing, and funding mechanisms and be undertaken with robust community engagement. "	Staff
YRPO-A.2 Park Audits: Eliminate or substitute police departments from conducting park audits. The inclusion of police in park audits presents several problems, not least of all the potential for racial bias to produce negative outcomes but additionally, the presence of police alone can, depending on the community create tension and invoke traumatic stress responses from past direct or indirect trauma. Consideration should be given to community engagement teams or laterally suited personnel. Park audits should not only assess safety conditions AT the park but also TO the park (safe walking/rolling routes to parks).	YPRO-A.2 (Park Audits)	Thank you for your comment.	Civic Thread [91]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-A.2 (Park Audits)	YPRO-A.2 (Park Audits) revised to say: "The City shall collaborate and support community-based organizations and neighborhood groups to conduct safety, maintenance , and access audits in City parks and recreational facilities. The community park audits should be conducted in neighborhoods throughout the city with the participation of Youth, Parks, & Community Enrichment (YPCE), Police Department, and other relevant City staff to identify and prioritize park safety and access improvements."	Staff
Sacramento County Department of Health Services	YPRO-A.3 (Mobile Health Clinics)	YPRO-A.3 (Mobile Health Clinics) revised to say: "...Sacramento County Department of Health Services ..."	Sacramento County Public Health [K-YPRO-13]
YPRO-A.3 Mobile Health Clinics: In support of mobile health clinics idea - recommendation to apply this model to healthy food access as well - pilot mobile grocery stores as well in EJ areas where food deserts are prevalent	YPRO-A.3 (Mobile Health Clinics)	Implementing action YPRO-A.3 (Mobile Health Clinics) revised to say: "Mobile Wellness Health Clinics. Explore the feasibility of a neighborhood program that provides mobile health services clinics, healthy food , or workshops in disadvantaged communities, run by medical service providers or Sacramento County Health Services, but hosted in local neighborhood facilities such as schools, parks, community centers, and library parking lots."	Civic Thread [91]
Consider creating opportunities for older adults to both intern and mentor.	YPRO-A.4 (Youth Internships)	Thank you for your comment.	PATTY WAIT [K-YPRO-14]
I recommend making it more clear that "park safety" is not just about "stranger danger" but also about traffic calming. Vehicles are a much more salient threat to children and families. I recommend adding this sentence: "The City shall also promote traffic calming measures, such as roundabouts, sidewalk bulb-outs, bollards, as well as vehicle reduction measures such as filtered permeability or car-free streets around parks."	YPRO-A.4 (Youth Internships)	Thank you for your comment.	Alyssa Lee [K-YPRO-14]
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	YPRO-A.7 (Performance-Based Prioritization)	YPRO-A.7 (Performance-Based Prioritization) revised to say: " The Department of Youth, Parks, & Community Enrichment (YPCE) shall update the park project programming guide to incorporate a performance-based system for equitably prioritizing parks and recreation investments that links facility improvement priorities to safety standards, funding availability, disadvantaged communities, public health, and recreational goals through a ranking scale that includes measured public health outcomes."	Staff
There is a huge lack of public space that is safe for anyone let alone kids. This is because a majority of it is given to cars. This makes it unsafe for kids to have any level of autonomy and become reliant on their parents or stuck inside there homes. There is also almost no indoor public space for people but specifically kids to exist at. And those that do exist close early like the library.		Please see policy YPRO-2.2 (Co-Location of Community-Serving Facilities) which supports co-location of public facilities, including indoor public facilities.	Austin [K-YPRO-14]
Do these goals and key moves help to move Sacramento closer to being national model of sustainable, equitable growth and community development?			
I suggest increasing opportunities for meaningfully engaging all rather than only the youth. Multigenerational events preferred		Please see goal section YPRO-3 for policies that support programming for residents of all ages.	Station Board [K-YPRO-1]
Love the goals! I wish they were more inclusive. Older Adults are often just as much at risk as the youth. Let's include.		Please see goal section YPRO-3 for policies that support programming for residents of all ages.	Station Board [K-YPRO-1]
Not quite: Let's add an awareness of how Parks/Recreation/Inclusion can enhance our older adult lives.		Please see goal section YPRO-3 for policies that support programming for residents of all ages.	Station Board [K-YPRO-1]
Make parks and walkways safe from noise and pollution by switching from gas to electric lawn care tools at city facilities.		Please see policies ERC-4.6 (Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment) and ERC-A.6 (Landscape Maintenance Ordinance).	Station Board [K-YPRO-1]
City policy of higher residential density does not encourage open space, parks and recreational facilities		The City maintains a parkland service standard (YPRO-1.3) which ensures that increased population should be supported by increased parkland.	Station Board [K-YPRO-1]
We have too many golf courses and small airports / military bases... they should be rewilded to parks		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-YPRO-1]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Committer/Organization
Stop charging money to park at parks it is weird		Thank you for your comments.	Station Board [K-YPRO-1]

COMMUNITY PLAN AREAS

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Committer/Organization
Introduction			
What are the plans for South Natomas?		The link to the South Natomas Community Plan was located in Station 10.	Roslyn Bell [K-CPA-Introduction-1]
Where is the South Natomas Community Plan?		The link to the South Natomas Community Plan was located in Station 10.	North Area Team [K-CPA-Introduction-1]
I feel it would be beneficial to our City to be able to extend the green line all the way to the airport		Thank you for your comment.	AMANDA OSTERHOUT [K-CPA-Introduction-2]
timing is critical to increasing participation and input. also consider providing ongoing services such as childcare, space, snacks etc to reduce challenges of being able to participate.		Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-CPA-Introduction-4]
Arden Arcade			
Your population figures are not aligned with the US Census numbers for 2020. Please fix that.		Thank you for your comment.	Michael Seaman [K-CPA-Arden Arcade-3]
Del Paso Regional Park is surrounded by unincorporated neighborhoods and is barely used by City of Sacramento residents. Law enforcement at the park is problematic b/c when citizens call about a LE problem, the City's LE people aren't sure they have to respond to calls from unincorporated area residents and the Sheriff doesn't want to have to do the city's job. The park has been left to deteriorate by the city, which accurately reflects the city's level of concern. Homeless encampments are now actively threatening the sensitive environmental areas. The park should be de-annexed from the City of Sacramento and turned over to the County or the local recreation and park district.		Thank you for your comment.	Michael Seaman [K-CPA-Arden Arcade-3]
Staff initiated revision to introductory text to clarify the neighborhoods of Arden Arcade.		Page 11-AA-3, "Development and Planning History", bottom of first column above the photo, revised to say: "Incorporated Arden Arcade is made up of nine neighborhoods (Del Paso Park, Ben Ali, Swanston Estates, Arden Fair, Point West, Cal Expo, Campus Commons, and Sierra Oaks), office and retail space..."	Staff
Concerns About Annexation			
I have lived in my home in Arden Arcade for 39 years and pled that the City of Sacramento keep your hands away from Co. Government. I am strongly for our own Cityhood but for now, stay away.		Thank you for your comment.	Thomas Smith [9]
I live in Arden Arcade and want the City of Sacramento to stay out of our community. We don't need rules and regulations of the City of Sacramento. You can't even run the City correctly. Stay out of our area and businesses.		Thank you for your comment.	Lucinda Seaton [24]
Campus Commons			
707 Commons Drive			
Please turn down the proposed high density housing Project Z22-079 for 707 Commons Drive. 707 Commons Drive was one of the first buildings built back in 1966 as part of a planned integrated housing community called Campus Commons by architect Charles Warren Callister. Had Callister been asked to design residential housing instead of an office building, he would have continued the planned low density residential housing surrounding 707 Commons Drive from across the street, to the left and right of 707 Commons Drive. The 707 Commons Drive office building should be given historic preservation status and a bill should be introduced and put on the ballot to provide funding for a redo and to transform it into both a live/work environment. The high density townhouses violate all of the development guidelines for residential housing and would destroy the existing peace and tranquility of the Campus Commons neighborhood. If this development does get approved, it will traumatize the surrounding residents and its buildings will forever be an eyesore and source of perpetual stress. I understand a completed 523 Form application has been submitted but the Preservation Committee has not had a chance to evaluate. Please make this possible.		Thank you for your comment.	MK Hickox [89]
Need for Special Planning Area			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>It can't be denied that Campus Commons is a rare urban masterpiece where density living accords with nature, with a nod to California's indigenous. That is to say its 2nd Bay Tradition Architecture works with nature, not against it. It is an historical and cultural wonder separate from Sacramento and needs to be recognized as such, as what one Community member refers to as a Subset of Sacramento. This includes University Ave where the 2nd Bay Tradition is seamless with Campus Commons. Campus Commons Subset needs to have its own Dedicated City Planning. Plans for the rest of the City of Sacramento can't be conflated with Campus Commons.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Elizabeth Georgis [83]
<p>It is clear from previous and existing planning materials as well as the intact and highly cohesive landscape and architectural features throughout present day Campus Commons and its immediate and adjacent office and commercial areas, that the community is replete with features that set it apart as a unique sub-community within the City. It is qualified for and should be recognized as a separate sub-community or special planning area.</p> <p>Campus Commons-Nepenthe should be designated as a Special Study Area in all of the maps across the GP.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Nancy Comstock [84]
<p>The 2040 proposed plan blatantly dismisses anything historic is the Arden – Arcade area. Given studies commissioned by or on behalf of the City of Sacramento there is an ongoing open discussion regarding this question. Campus Commons may not be Gold Rush/Railroad history, however, unique planning concepts and design may very well qualify.</p> <p>It would benefit the City and the General Plan to add a new action LUP-A.1 designating Campus Commons a Special Study area with the qualifications that it is uniquely design, has a particular important significant heritage tree forest and was created by a Master Plan concept that was by use permit and should be an example of how to cluster housing and provide walk-able park-like open space.</p>		Please see policy HCR-1.5 (Historic Surveys and Context Statements).	Howard Levine [76]
<p>Office Mixed Use is defined (on page 3-14) with good transportation options which are not identified in this current plan. This zoning does not reflect the realities in the Campus Commons Master Plan and should not be applied in this area. Special Study Area (defined on page 3-17) should be applied to the Campus Commons Master Plan Area. Suggestion to change the land use to RMU and SSA overlay.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Howard Levine [77]
<p>Page 3-35: The Campus Commons Master Plan community is a specific and distinct place. The way the GP is identify sense of place this should qualify the area as a Special Designated Area.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Howard Levine [77]
<p>LUP8.7 (Distinctive Urban Skyline) is another indication of the need for the Special Study Area. The Campus Commons Master Plan Area is unique, clustered, a great deal of green space and urban forest, walkable and is mid-height. It is integrated with employment immediately adjacent and should add to carbon neutral development of the future.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Howard Levine [77]
<p>It is clear from the existing planning materials as well as the intact and highly cohesive landscape and architectural features throughout present day Campus Commons and its immediately adjacent office and commercial areas, that the community is replete with features that set it apart as a unique sub-community within the City. Campus Commons and the surrounding area is eminently qualified for recognition as a separate sub-community or special planning area. A special planning area is needed for the entire area from Fair Oaks Blvd. on the west to Howe Ave. on the east to the American River so that development is consistent within these boundaries. This might take the form of a Special Planning District or a Specific Plan District.</p> <p>Vice Mayor Guerra's office and planning staff should enter prompt, active discussions with Campus Commons and Nepenthe regarding development of a special planning area. The East Ranch and Sierra Oaks communities were also part of the areas envisioned in the original community planning for what was the Horst Hop Ranch, so consideration may be given to including these areas as well.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Carr Kunze [87]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>In researching Sacramento's Title 17 (planning code) and carefully reading the few documents in the City's files related to the Campus Commons Planned Unit Development, I am afraid that unless there is some provision to protect the Campus Commons vision in the 2040 General Plan, the near perfect gem of the Campus Commons neighborhood will be greatly and adversely affected. I am asking that the entire area covered by the CCPUD be considered a special area. There are over 1000 homes in this area that were bought with the understanding that this area was covered and protected by a PUD. It appears that the detailed PUD records that would have protected our area were not kept by the City. The residents' copies were destroyed in a clubhouse fire.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Inderjit Rye [88]
<i>Historic Preservation</i>			
<p>As it stands, the current General Plan allows for the adjacent commercial PUD area to be developed parcel by parcel along University Avenue with insufficient restrictions as to architectural character and design guidelines, setbacks, urban forestry and landscaping, and related matters that are specific to this community as it was envisioned, while being able to accommodate inevitable future development. Accordingly, such a special planning area should also fold in a Campus Commons Historic District together with an Urban Design Plan and improved district design guidelines.</p>		Please see policy HCR-1.5 (Historic Surveys and Context Statements).	Carr Kunze [87]
<p>I note as well the many inconsistencies in the proposed General Plan elements, particularly those as to Land Use and Cultural and Historic Preservation. I endorse and please see the notations in these regards by Howard Levine. The EIR notes several Historic elements that while important and desirable are otherwise annotated to the effect of 'unrealizable'. (The annotations are less than clear.) The City should strive to undo and resolve this inconsistency. Otherwise, the GP's many exhortations of intent to do 'good things' with regards to preserving important cultural and historic resource buildings and districts of the City or nothing more than gratuitous pablum.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Carr Kunze [87]
<p>Historic Preservation of mid-century developments in Sacramento is not adequately addressed in terms of the need for historical research. Historic Preservation should have an action plan that prioritizes early studies of building architecture and design as significant contributors to the history of Sacramento.</p>		Please see policy HCR-1.5 (Historic Surveys and Context Statements).	Ann Alter [79]
<p>This page of the DEIR 2040 Sacramento GP illustrates by photo the unique character of the Campus Common PUD development style (referencing photo used on page 11-AA-15). It is an area that had specific concepts regarding cluster housing and open space that is a cultural resource. It has been recommended by two studies for further review. Campus Commons has a well-maintained urban forest, with hundreds of significant trees, which is uniquely supported by private property owners.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Howard Levine [77]
<p>Page 11-AA-15, referring to the HCR resources, the document dismisses the fact that there are not resources. In truth, there are City studies that recommend that Campus Commons Master Plan area be studied by the City and possible include it as a possible historical or specific area to retain in its current form. There is also a building recently nominated by Preservation Sacramento to be included in the historical register.</p>		Please see policy HCR-1.5 (Historic Surveys and Context Statements).	Howard Levine [77]
<p>The GP historical map (Map HCR-1 (Historic Districts and Landmark Parcels)) is myopic. It addresses what is Gold Rush, Locomotive history; as this map shows city centric oriented. Ideas and planned areas of the 1960s, and 70's should be considered. The City has not demonstrated a desire to be proactive in saving its out-of-core historical areas.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Howard Levine [77]
<p>HCR 1.3 (Compatibility with Historic Context) has not been truly executed. When developments were proposed in the Campus Commons Master Plan area as should have been the case.</p>		Thank you for your comment.	Howard Levine [77]
<i>Opposition to Increased Intensity</i>			
<p>Since we moved here 6 years ago we have already witnessed the expansion of building in this area, causing an exponential increase in traffic in one of the highest traffic areas in Sacramento. To allow high rise office or condo-type buildings on University would be disastrous. The noise and traffic alone would add a dimension of unhealthy air quality that is already at its peak.</p>		The 2040 General Plan maintains the minimum density requirements and minimum/maximum FAR requirements from the 2035 General Plan, including along University Avenue.	Brenda Nasser and Ed Cline [90]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Committer/Organization
I understand that as we concerned residents of Campus Commons continue to work for drastic changes to the development proposal for 707 Commons Drive, it is now incumbent upon us to also address the General Plan that is the road map for development in Sacramento because the Campus Commons-Nepenthe PUD future is outlined in that plan.		The 2040 General Plan does not change the Campus Commons-Nepenthe PUD.	Nancy Comstock [84]
The Land Use section of the plan calls for development that would dramatically change the character along the periphery of Campus Commons-Nepenthe, especially on University Avenue. Please consider using these points regarding our neighborhood as the basis for your comments on the 2040 General Plan.		The 2040 General Plan maintains the minimum density requirements and minimum/maximum FAR requirements from the 2035 General Plan, including along University Avenue.	Nancy Comstock [84]
The floor area ratio does not limit the height of buildings adjacent to the Campus Commons-Nepenthe area and is not compatible with the building heights, design and character of the Campus Commons-Nepenthe Planned Unit Development. The building height requirement on University Avenue should be adjusted to complement the Campus Commons-Nepenthe neighborhood.		The 2040 General Plan maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 2.0 in the OMU-designated areas in Campus Commons is the same as that required in the 2035 General Plan. The 2040 General Plan assigns a maximum FAR of 1.0 to the remaining neighborhood areas of Campus Commons. A max FAR of 1.0 is the lowest citywide.	Ann Alter [79]; Nancy Comstock [84]
The allowable dwelling units per acre is not compatible with the existing density and the Planned Unit Development open space design in the Campus Commons neighborhood. The density should be changed to be compatible with the cluster housing concept of the Campus Commons-Nepenthe Planned Unit Development.		The 2040 General Plan minimum residential density for Campus Commons is the same as the minimum residential density required in the 2035 General Plan.	Ann Alter [79]; Nancy Comstock [84]
Higher residential density for the Campus Commons-Nepenthe neighborhood can't work without additional transit, which is not called for in the General Plan.		Thank you for your comment.	Ann Alter [79]; Nancy Comstock [84]
Residential Mixed Use is a more appropriate land use designation than Office Mixed Use for Campus Commons- Nepenthe. The Office Mixed Use designation permits development that is too dense to conform to the open space norms in the Campus Commons-Nepenthe area.		The 2040 General Plan land use designation of Office Mixed Use aligns with areas previously designated Employment Center Mid Rise in the 2035 General Plan.	Ann Alter [79]; Nancy Comstock [84]
Campus Commons is designated as Employment Center - Office. However, as defined in the 2040 proposed plan, Employment Center does not include residential (screenshot of page 3-12 and Map LUP-4 (Land Use Concept) provided). Residential Mixed Use is a more appropriate zoning for the Campus Commons Master Planned area as prescribed in the Use Permits applicable to this area. This EMU zoning is destructive to the Campus Commons Master Planned community and should be replaced as Residential Mixed Use zoning. This map (screenshot of LUP-5 (Land Use Diagram)) designates Campus Commons as Employment Center and residential. Employment Center is not mixed use. This is to say there is not a difference between this plan does not change the 2035 plan, however the 2035 plan is interpreting this Employment Center as mixed use.		The Campus Commons area land use designations (Neighborhood (N) and Office Mixed Use (OMU)), as shown in Map LUP-5 (Land Use Diagram), reflect existing uses. In the 2040 General Plan, both designations allow for a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses.	Howard Levine [77]
This map (LUP-6 (Maximum FAR)) allows the Campus Commons Master Plan Area as an unfettered 2.0 FAR. On University, this would allow as much as a four-story complex that is not compatible with the adjacent with the Campus Commons height and density and must be remediated by limitations.		The areas designated OMU have the same allowed intensity as the 2035 General Plan. The areas designated N have a max intensity of 1.0 FAR.	Howard Levine [77]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
This map (LUP-8 (Minimum Residential Density) exceeds dwelling units in the Campus Commons at minimum 18 units per acre. This density is not compatible with the PUD and the area needs to be reassigned as a Special Study Area. Map M-3 (Candidate High-Frequency Transit Corridors) shows there is no adequate transportation currently planned for the near future in the Howe-Fair Oaks area near the Campus Commons PUD. Without transportation the ability to transition to higher density is impossible to accommodate. There should not be a push in this area to create a higher density.		In most areas of Campus Commons designated Neighborhood, minimum density is 3 dwelling units per acre, although some require a minimum of 7 du/ac and some others require a minimum of 15 du/ac. In areas designated Office Mixed Use, which allows higher-density residential, a minimum of 18 du/ac is required.	Howard Levine [77]
Figure AA-2 (2035 GP) differs from LUP-1 as it designates the Campus Commons area as N and Employment Center without OMU. The designation OMU allows higher density dwelling units which can over dominate the Campus Commons Master Plan and current neighborhood strengths. The area, again, should be a land use designation of RMU.		Thank you for your comment.	Howard Levine [77]
The Floor Area Ratio in the Campus Commons Master Plan Area can overwhelm some of the areas and needs to be either reduced or shown as low rise no more than two stories adjacent to the residential areas.		Thank you for your comment.	Howard Levine [77]
LUP-3.4 (Minimum Density) is not consistent with the land use realities in the Campus Commons Master Plan Area. It creates the possibility of overwhelming the Campus Commons by not having a compatible height limit.		In most areas of Campus Commons designated Neighborhood, minimum density is 3 dwelling units per acre, although some require a minimum of 7 du/ac and some others require a minimum of 15 du/ac. In areas designated Office Mixed Use, which allows higher-density residential, a minimum of 18 du/ac is required.	Howard Levine [77]
<i>Inconsistent Land Use Maps</i>			
Land use designations are not consistent across different maps in the 2040 General Plan. Some land use designations have similar descriptions but different names and different color labels, leading to confusion. Land use designations and maps for Campus Commons appear to conflict with the designations and maps for the Arden Arcade special study area. Land use designations should be consistent across all maps.		Map LUP-5 (General Plan Land Use Diagram) shows and 2040 General Plan land use designations. Map LUP-6 through Map LUP-8 show allowable development intensity throughout the city.	Ann Alter [79]; Nancy Comstock [84]
Map LUP-2 (City Structure) shows the Campus Commons Area with Employment and Residential. Employment does not include residential in its land use. Part of this area is being represented as Mixed Use which is a different zoning and it is different in the Arden-Arcade area study.		The Campus Commons area land use designations (Neighborhood (N) and Office Mixed Use (OMU)), as shown in Map LUP-5 (Land Use Diagram), reflect existing uses. In the 2040 General Plan, both designations allow for a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses.	Howard Levine [77]
Map LUP-4 (Land Use Structure) shows Campus Commons as Employment - Production which is not what it is and not consistent with other maps.		Map LUP-4 (Land Use Structure) is a simplified representation of the General Plan Land Use Map (LUP-5). This illustration provides an overall idea of how the city will look in 2040.	Howard Levine [77]
Map LUP-6 (Land Use Diagram) shows zoning map at the Campus Commons Master Plan area as Employment Mixed Use as defined on page 3-14 and does not include housing.		The Campus Commons area land use designations (Neighborhood (N) and Office Mixed Use (OMU)), as shown in Map LUP-5 (Land Use Diagram), reflect existing uses. In the 2040 General Plan, both designations allow for a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses.	Howard Levine [77]
<i>Urban Forest</i>			
The many large trees in this area also would be sacrificed in a city that prides itself on its trees. This parklike setting is one of the main reasons we chose this particular area of Sacramento. We felt like we had won the lottery when we discovered Campus Commons and we knew this would be the perfect place for us to spend our retirement, living out the rest of our lives in such a peaceful community.		Please see policies ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion), ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection), ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance), and ERC-3.9 (Watering and Irrigation). Please also see implementing actions ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) and ERC-A.1 (Urban Forest Plan). Finally, please see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Brenda Nasser and Ed Cline [90]
The Urban Forest section of the 2040 General Plan does not adequately address preservation of significant or historic trees. The Climate Action Plan should have a more aggressive tree protection policy that is transparent and easily understood.		Please see policies ERC-3.2 (Tree Canopy Expansion), ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection), ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance), and ERC-3.9 (Watering and Irrigation). Please also see implementing actions ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) and ERC-A.1 (Urban Forest Plan). Finally, please see City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Ann Alter [79]; Nancy Comstock [84]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>The Urban Forest language does not have any meaningful language to preserve the urban forest. The forest management is in conflict with the city ordinance which is confusing and allow an interpretation that development can not be stopped as long as mitigation is paid. The mitigation does not maintain significant trees. The significant tree loss changes neighborhoods, is adverse to climate policy and in a biologic disaster. In ERC 3.3 the word “encourage” is a disgrace and have specific limits on tree removal (arborist determination the tree is dying or unhealthy and/or it is destroying the foundation of a building. Private Protected trees must be protected and the language is “fuzzy”, non-specific subject to a number of interpretations.</p>		<p>ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see policy ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection) and City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050</p>	<p>Howard Levine [77]</p>
<p>“hoping for wind to fly a kite” and should be “provide leadership and specifics” to retain trees of significance. Also in 3.7 “appropriate remediation” does not remedy the area of loss and the carbon neutral qualities in the area. Trees of Significance are not replacable.</p>		<p>Please see policy ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection) and the forthcoming Urban Forest Plan.</p>	<p>Howard Levine [77]</p>
<p>This map shows the importance of trees and those that are significant. In the Campus Commons Master Planned area show a significant temperature difference and should be an example of how to plant for the future. Another reason for Special Study Area designation. Also, this Urban Forest is privately maintained.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>Howard Levine [77]</p>
<i>Threats to Community Character</i>			
<p>You all are trying to design a plan that will forever change the Campus Commons-Nepenthe area. Is there anyone on this project who is willing to address this fact and take our needs, wants and concerns into consideration? Campus Commons is a beautiful area that current developers apparently don't care about and don't want to address the concerns of many existing homeowners. Many of us have sent letters addressing the 707 Commons Drive project and the many problems this will bring to us, and it appears you want to bring more problems to us by way of the 2040 General Plan. The City speaks about the Urban Forest yet wants to come into the Campus Commons-Nepenthe area and eliminate many established trees in our area that have stood for years providing a canopy. The City thinks nothing about changing the established look of this area by not limiting the height of buildings adjacent to Campus Commons-Nepenthe and is therefore creating a look that is not compatible with the building heights, design and character of the Campus Commons-Nepenthe Planned Unit Development. I ask you to please come and really look at this area, talk with the residents and try to understand, from our perspective, why we are so concerned with what you are doing. I, and many like myself, do not feel we are being heard. Please listen to us. Surely there is a way we can come together and find a workable solution.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>Ann Alter [79]</p>
<p>LUP-3.8 (Interim Zoning Inconsistency) arguably changes the intent of the GP and may be interpreted as opening development opportunities on parcels that should not be redeveloped. It may destroy the neighborhood character. Other concepts on this page may give “carte blanche” to developers as well and not allow neighborhoods to have an opportunity to challenge a development.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>Howard Levine [77]</p>
<p>LUP4.6 (Compatibility with Adjacent Uses) does not assure compatibility within a neighborhood. An existing community such as Campus Commons has a Master Plan that addresses the issues such as set-backs, urban forests, berms, walkability; however, it comes into conflict with minimum set back requirements, grading, planting. The GP is non-specific and inconsistent in discretionary direction.</p>		<p>All regulatory standards in the Planning and Development Code also apply to Campus Commons.</p>	<p>Howard Levine [77]</p>
<p>LUP6.1 (Neighborhood as a Basic Unit) does not give protection to established neighborhoods. Given that the world is filled with NIMBY's it is important to establish immediately that the building being removed are not a necessary part of the neighborhood and what is to replace it is specific and designed to conform including historic heritage trees, grading, density and style.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>Howard Levine [77]</p>

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
HCR1.11 (Energy Retrofits of Historic Resources) should also require an imbedded-energy audit before demolition and not re-use. Every build through its assorted materials has an energy coefficient that can be measured. Removal adds to the energy investment. This should be considered before a new energy-imbedded building replaces it.		Please see policies LUP-10.1 (Existing Structure Reuse) and LUP-11.8 (Construction Processes).	Howard Levine [77]
Central City			
There is no mention of the American River Parkway which is a popular park amenity (natural area) at the border of the Central City. Please add a mention.		Central City Community Plan, "Community Location" sub-section revised to include mention of American River Parkway at end of paragraph: "The most prominent landmarks within Arden Arcade are Point West, Arden Fair Mall, the American River Parkway , and Cal Expo, which has been home to the California State Fair since 1968."	Dan Meier [K-CPA-Central City-6]
Add the American River Parkway Combining Zone (Overlay Zone) since this give a more accurate indication of development restrictions and limitations for parcels bordering the American River Parkway.	Map CP-CC-2 (Land Use)	Thank you for your comment.	Dan Meier [K-CPA-Central City-9]
Make any map adjustments necessary to reflect the accurate boundaries of Sutter's Landing Regional Park and the open space/habitat zoning of any adjacent properties such as Blue Diamond, SMUD, Dellar, and the skateboard park (grandfathered use).	Map CP-CC-2 (Land Use)	Map updated to reflect West Sutter's Landing Park.	Dan Meier [K-CPA-Central City-9]
What is this future roadway? It looks like a spur from 50.	Map CP-CC-6 (Roadway Reallocation); on the future roadway reallocation segment along Stockton Boulevard	This is a segment of existing roadway identified as a potential area for roadway reallocation in the future.	Anonymous [K-CPA-Central City-14]
Staff initiated revision to Map CP-CC-7 (Park Access)	Map CP-CC-6 (Park Access)	Map CP-CC-7 (Park Access) updated to not include irrevocable offer of dedication (IOD) site.	Staff
Include policies regarding the protection of the American River Parkway, along with support for maintenance and restoration of the Parkway. Both Sutter's Landing and Discovery Park receive significant visitor use and contain significant natural resources. There should be acknowledgement of the American River Parkway Zone (PC Overlay Zone) which includes limitations and restrictions on development adjoining the American River Parkway in order to protect this Parkway for the enjoyment of City residents and visitors.		Thank you for your comment.	Dan Meier [K-CPA-Central City-17]
Planned Infrastructure			
The Central City Community Plan makes little mention of the planned Broadway and Truxel Bridges, besides both routes being suggested as High-Frequency Transit in Map CP-CC-6 of Central City Roadway Reallocations. We encourage the Plan to be forthcoming about these planned bridges.		The routes shown as Candidate High-Frequency Transit Corridors reflect a long-term view of connecting the Central City across the two rivers. In the future additional plans and studies will be undertaken as funding and resources are available.	ECOS [42]
Land Use and Placemaking			
New Policy: The City should encourage the development of light industrial, employment, mixed-use, and multi-family residential uses in the River District.		Most of the River District is designated Residential Mixed Use or Employment Mixed Use. Combined, these designations allow for light industrial, employment, mixed-use, and multi-family residential uses in the River District.	Blue Diamond [57]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Committer/Organization
New Policy: The City shall incorporate appropriate design guidelines and development standards to ensure compatibility between light industrial and larger employment uses and surrounding residential uses.		New policy added in goal section LUP-4: " Compatibility Between Light Industrial and Residential Uses. The City shall develop appropriate design guidelines and development standards to promote compatibility between light industrial and larger employment uses and surrounding residential uses. " Additionally, policy LUP-7.5 (Industrial Aesthetics) revised to say: "The City shall encourage the development and maintenance of well-designed industrial and light industrial properties and structures that meet adopted standards for visual quality and design, especially where interfacing with other uses. "	Blue Diamond [57]
Staff initiated development of new policy to limit temporary alley closures in the Central City.		New policy in Central City CP LUP section after CC-LUP-7 (Old Sacramento Cultural Arts District): " Temporary Alley Closures. The City shall discourage temporary alley closures for private use in an effort to develop an active and cohesive alley system that better integrates pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular access. "	Staff
Economic Development			
New Policy: The City should encourage public-private partnerships to leverage resources and expertise for economic development in the urban core. This could involve joint investments in infrastructure, business incubators, or marketing campaigns to promote the area.		Please see policies E-3.2 (Innovation and Growth), E-3.4 (Shared Infrastructure), E-3.5 (Local Business Coordination), and E-3.6 (Economic Gardening).	Blue Diamond [57]
Mobility			
New Policy: The City should encourage complete streets that allow access for all types of users, including industrial uses in the area. This should include flexible center turn lanes automobiles for semi-trailers, landscaping that does not interfere with taller vehicles and semi-trailers, and turning radii that allow safe bus and truck movement through intersections.		Please see policy M-5.9 (Truck Route Design).	Blue Diamond [57]
Youth, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Policies			
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	CC-YPRO-2 (Activate Existing Parks)	CC-YPRO-2 (Activate Existing Parks) revised to say: "The City shall continue developing the Sutter's Landing Regional Park as active with recreation uses and enhancing existing neighborhood parks serving the R Street Corridor (Southside, Roosevelt, Fremont, Winn) with recreation amenities and facilities to serve future residents."	Staff
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	CC-YPRO-3 (Sacramento River Waterfront Recreation and Access)	CC-YPRO-3 (Sacramento River Waterfront Recreation and Access) revised to say: "The City shall continue to collaborate with regional partners , State agencies, private landowners, business districts, civic institutions, and other stakeholders to manage, preserve, improve, and enhance recreation and access along the Sacramento River waterfront from Tiscornia Park to Frederick Miller Regional Park."	Staff
Please also add considering multigenerational facilities to enhance participation by both older and younger adults.	CC-YPRO-4 (Park Amenities)	Please see goal section YPRO-3 for policies that address programming for residents of all ages.	Anonymous [K-CPA-Central City-19]
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	CC-YPRO-5 (Organized Sports and Recreational Facilities)	CC-YPRO-5 (Organized Sports and Recreational Facilities) revised to say: "The City shall develop and maintain quality facilities (including multi-use sports courts and fields) for a variety of organized sports to ensure active recreation opportunities are met for the growing community needs in the Central City."	Staff
East Sacramento			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>Several areas along the American River Parkway are being denuded and rip rapped, further reducing the park access to the neighborhood.</p> <p>The city has failed East Sac, missing opportunities to increase our available park space when the areas of McKinley Village and Sutter Park were allowed to be developed with mere postage stamps for open space.</p> <p>I don't understand why McKinley Park isn't a part of East Sac as it has always been historically.</p> <p>There ought to be a partnership between Sac City Unified and the city to make school campuses available for recreation.</p> <p>Many used to be open but fears of vandalism have resulted in campuses being closed. How can this be addressed to afford more recreation spaces to East Sac residents?</p>	Map CP-ES-7 (Park Access)	Please see policies YPRO-1.7 (Co-Located Joint-Use Facilities) and YPRO-2.2 (Co-Location of Community-Serving Facilities).	Kate Len [K-CPA-East Sacramento-15]
ESCA supports the updated East Sacramento Community Plan, in particular the emphasis on connections to Sacramento State.		Thank you for your comment.	ESCA [39]
Staff initiated replacement of photos that were not in East Sacramento.		<p>Following photos were replaced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Page 11-ES-1, banner -Page 11-ES-4, middle and bottom -Page 11-ES-12, top photo 	Staff
Youth, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Policies			
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	ES-YPRO-1 (Improve Park Access)	ES-YPRO-1 (Improve Park Access) revised to say: "The City shall explore opportunities to improve park access for the disadvantaged College/Glen neighborhood, such as identifying a new park site or a strategy to improve open space access, such as through redevelopment of vacant lots, joint-use agreements, with pocket parks or better connectivity to existing parks."	Staff
Fruitridge/Broadway			
In FB-ERC-1, the City needs to invest in Fruitridge and Broadway because they are historically underserved neighborhoods and lack a substantial tree canopy. More trees need to be planted in this area immediately, and the City needs to plant trees near walking spaces using creative means, such as cutting into the street near the walking area for placement. This would have an added benefit of slowing traffic and improving pedestrian safety. This is preferable to trees planted in street medians, as these trees provide little sidewalk shade.	FB-ERC-1 (Tree Planting and Maintenance)	See policy M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Policy M-3.1 (Local Streets) also provides for a slow speed network of local-serving neighborhood streets.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
We at ECOS support the City in exploring an annexation of County land in the Fruitridge Florin Study Area. We believe the City will be able to provide better services to the environmentally impacted, and historically disadvantaged communities therein.		Thank you for your comment.	ECOS [42]
Youth, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Policies			
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	FB-YPRO-1 (Granite Regional Park Expansion)	<p>FB-YPRO-1 (Granite Regional Park Expansion) revised to say: "The City shall evaluate the expansion of Granite Regional Park, including the possible acquisition of the east basin or the dedication of land in the west basin to parkland.</p> <p>The City shall expand Granite Regional Park by either acquiring the east basin and planning for a nature preserve with open space and trails or working with a nonprofit to develop it as an open space or botanical garden."</p>	Staff
Greater Land Park			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
I live in Upper Land Park for nearly 10 years and have watched businesses flee since I purchased and renovated my home. The City's assumptions about a walkable/bikeable community cannot be accomplished without addressing the high and rising crime rates, growing homeless population nearby, and the general lack of safety associated with not using a car. I took public transit twice and never felt safe doing so. I also tried biking to work for almost 11 months and was nearly hit by cars several times and, increasingly before I abandoned biking, was approached by mentally unstable homeless people while stopped at intersections. My house has been broken into and a car was stolen from my driveway (yes, police reports were filed) yet there has been a declining police presence. I support efforts to address traffic along Broadway, a reasonable infill that maintains the neighborhood charm, increased police presence, and a focus on returning businesses to Broadway with enhanced pedestrian safety features. Which means doing more to address homelessness too.		Thank you for your comment.	Tanya DeRivi [K-CPA-Greater Land Park-5]
Youth, Parks, Open Space held an Open House on July 19th, 2023. Drawings were presented and voting took place on locating an off-leash dog park in either Land Park, the Sierra 2 Green, or Curtis Park. An off-leash dog park would require an investment of funds for signage, fencing, and double-gates. What is the City's vision for off-leash dog parks in the Greater Land Park area?		Thank you for your comment.	Susan Hida [K-CPA-Greater Land Park-14]
Should the Ray Eames Park in Crocker Village be shown?	Map CP-LP-7 (Park Access)	Map CP-LP-7 revised to include Ray Eames Park.	Susan Hida [K-CPA-Greater Land Park-15]
North Natomas			
Community Location			
It would be nice if this also mentioned natural landmarks such as the canals, farmlands, and the Natomas Basin Conservancy areas that run along side of it. This description does not accurately reflect the area.		Thank you for your comment.	Roslyn Bell [K-CPA-North Natomas-1]
This thought process is a bit backwards. These relatively empty or rotating empty retail locations aren't landmarks. The North Natomas Regional Park is a landmark. The newly built Aquatic Center is becoming a landmark. Landmarks seem defined as areas with historic or community value or irreplaceable. The parks and the Aquatic Center, maybe the libraries fill those but not rotating empty retail or land that still sits empty years after an arena was abandoned.		Page 11-NN-1, "Community Location", second paragraph revised to say: "Important landmarks in North Natomas include Natomas Marketplace, the Town Center and adjacent the North Natomas Community Center and Aquatic Center, Benvenuti Performing Arts Center, North Natomas Regional Park, the Promenade Mall, and the former Sleep Train Arena site, now planned to be redeveloped as a teaching hospital and medical school for California Northstate University."	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-1]
-Part- of which is planned as a hospital. 35 acres to the hospital, 12 to a new school. The remaining of 136 acres will just be more housing and retail (which we have lots of sitting empty). It won't all be the hospital so this statement is inaccurate and misleading.		The Innovation Park project proposes to transform the location of the former Sleep Train Arena into a vibrant mix of residential, commercial, health, and educational uses. As of October 2023, however, the City has not received development proposals for the remainder of the site.	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-1]
Please do not identify shopping centers as landmarks. We have the fabulous Aquatic Center, the North Natomas Regional Park, the education complex with Inderkum High School, American River College and the North Natomas Public library all located adjacent to one another. Aspirationally, we hope for public gathering spaces, entertainment and a permanent mercado space for entrepreneurs to be located in the former Arena site,		Page 11-NN-1, "Community Location", second paragraph revised to say: "Important landmarks in North Natomas include Natomas Marketplace, the Town Center and adjacent the North Natomas Community Center and Aquatic Center, Benvenuti Performing Arts Center, North Natomas Regional Park, the Promenade Mall, and the former Sleep Train Arena site, now planned to be redeveloped as a teaching hospital and medical school for California Northstate University."	Lisa Pray [K-CPA-North Natomas-1]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>Community Vision – We need to stop commenting on The Town Center Shopping Center. Town Center is a name of a shopping center; it is not our town center. There is nothing in that shopping center that makes it more important than any others in Natomas. On pages 11-NN-5 and 11-NN-7, please delete Town Center reference to a Phase II. There is no Town Center Phase II.</p>		<p>Page 11-NN-4, "Community Vision", paragraph 3 revised to say: "The Town Center shopping center and North Natomas Regional Park..."</p> <p>Page 11-NN-5, "Community Gathering Spaces", second sentence revised to say: "New public plazas, community gardens, and arts and cultural spaces, particularly built into existing and new facilities at the Town Center and such as the North Natomas Regional Park, could help give residents a place to gather or come together."</p> <p>Page 11-NN-7, "Land Use and Placemaking", paragraph 2 revised to say: "...surrounded by unique businesses. The Town Center shopping center, with a planned second phase extending into the vacant parcel at the east of the existing development, ties into future light rail stations and with more intensive uses of the North Natomas Regional Park brings many amenities to the community, such as a farmer's markets, dog parks, bikeways, walkways, the North Natomas Aquatic Center, and Stage at Lawn Amphitheaters. Adjacencies to the future development of the Sleep Train Arena and to the American River College Natomas Center and Inderkum High School help to support frequent transit and vibrant commercial areas."</p>	Kaplan (CC)
<p>Could consider expanding the location somewhat to include the new eastern area in City Council District 1, although this is not included in the North Natomas Financing Plan.</p>		<p>These areas are within the the boundaries of the North Sacramento Community Plan.</p>	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
<p>11NN1 - The City planning staff previously used the name Steelhead Creek on planning documents and maps. Please amend maps and text to retile East Main Drain Canal to Steelhead Creek. The creek designation provides many protections and enhances grant options for parks and trails along it, including the Ueda Parkway.</p>		<p>References to the "Natomas East Main Drainage Canal" have been changed to "Steelhead Creek" on pages 11-N-1, 11-NN-20 (NN-YPRO-2 (Ninos Parkway)), 11-NS-1, and 11-NS-5.</p>	Barbara Graichen [80]
<p>We request the text and maps in the draft General Plan be revised to remove the unincorporated parcels adjacent to Westlake from the North Natomas Community Plan. The draft General Plan now shows unincorporated parcels adjacent to Westlake as part of the North Natomas Community Plan. (p.11-NN-1 and 2). This is not accurate since the City boundary does not include these parcels and a community plan is a part of an incorporated city.</p>		<p>These maps are correct. These boundaries were established and adopted in the 2035 General Plan. The 2040 General Plan maintains these boundaries.</p>	ECOS (Friends of Swainson's Hawk) [42]
<p>Map CP-NN-1 North Natomas Community Plan Area Boundary incorrectly includes an area west of the Westlake neighborhood.</p>		<p>This map is correct. These boundaries were established and adopted in the 2035 General Plan. The 2040 General Plan maintains these boundaries.</p>	Chris Holm [44]
<i>Conservation</i>			
<p>Please maintain the existing city limits and support the county Urban Services Boundary Line in South and North Natomas. Please consider all the points made by ECOS.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	Kevin McRae [17]
<p>Protect Natomas Basin Conservation Plan conservation strategy and Natomas Basin Conservancy</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	Kevin McRae [17]
<p>Support County Urban Services Boundary and County farmland protection policies</p>		<p>The City does not have jurisdiction over County-established boundaries or policies.</p>	Kevin McRae [17]
<p>Remove Natomas Basin as a Study Area. 2002 MOU is dead and further study of Natomas for urbanization contradicts the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (NBHCP) and the City and County General Plans' policies emphasizing compact growth, infill. Reject expansion of the Sphere of Influence in North Natomas and rigorously oppose development in Natomas outside the City.</p>		<p>Special Study Areas reflect areas in which careful coordination between the City and County is required to protect natural resources and efficiently deliver services. The City is obligated to have an interest in transregional planning issues adjacent to City limits such as housing supply, environmental conservation, transportation networks, and economic development. Furthermore, the City has a responsibility to carry out the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan. Therefore, the City has a vested interest in the future of the Natomas basin as a whole and designates it as a Special Study Area.</p>	Kevin McRae [17]
<p>Correct the error in North Natomas Community Plan that designates two unincorporated parcels adjacent to Westlake as part of the Community Plan. Affects maps LUP-1, LUP-2, LUP-3, LUP-4.</p>		<p>These maps are correct. These boundaries were established and adopted in the 2035 General Plan. The 2040 General Plan maintains these boundaries.</p>	Kevin McRae [17]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The Biological Resources (ERC2) section of the Plan deletes policies contained in the 2035 draft, and should be reincorporated into the plan.		Various policies from the Environmental Resources Element of the 2035 General Plan are being carried over to the 2040 General Plan.	Kevin McRae [17]
ECOS objects to the City's inclusion of the Natomas Basin as a special study area, as discussed further in the next section.		Special Study Areas reflect areas in which careful coordination between the City and County is required to protect natural resources and efficiently deliver services. The City is obligated to have an interest in transregional planning issues adjacent to City limits such as housing supply, environmental conservation, transportation networks, and economic development. Furthermore, the City has a responsibility to carry out the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan. Therefore, the City has a vested interest in the future of Natomas basin as a whole and designates it as a Special Study Area.	ECOS [42]
We request the City maintain its commitment to the: - Existing City boundary; - Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan and the Natomas Basin Conservancy; - Sacramento County Urban Services Boundary and farmland protection policies		The City is committed to following planning efforts outlined in the General Plan regarding growth and change. The City strategically plans for potential new growth or changes to the City's boundary to foster a proactive response to economic and social needs (see policies and goals LUP-1.1 through LUP-1.7 of the Draft General Plan). The City continues to be committed to the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan, as outlined in the Draft General Plan (see Page 11-SSA-6). Regarding the Sacramento County USB and farmland policies, the City does not have jurisdiction over County-established boundaries or policies.	ECOS (Friends of Swainson's Hawk) [42]
We request the special study area in Natomas Basin be removed from the General Plan. This study area has been included in the General Plan because of a City/County MOU in 2002 which we urge the Council to terminate. By accepting applications for urban development, the County has violated the terms of the agreement and it is void.		The Natomas Basin has not been included as a Study Area exclusively due to the City/County MOU. Special Study Areas reflect areas in which careful coordination between the City and County is required to protect natural resources and efficiently deliver services. The City is obligated to have an interest in transregional planning issues adjacent to City limits such as housing supply, environmental conservation, transportation networks, and economic development. Furthermore, the City has a responsibility to carry out the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan. Therefore, the City has a vested interest in the future of the Natomas basin as a whole and designates it as a Special Study Area.	ECOS (Friends of Swainson's Hawk) [42]
We request the Council explicitly reject the notion that Natomas Basin can accommodate future new growth.		The City Council does not have jurisdiction over the Natomas Basin. Potential future development projects in the Natomas Basin that involve a City approval process will go to the City Council for consideration and will be handled on a case-by-case basis. The Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan establishes a conservation program to mitigate the expected loss of habitat in the Natomas Basin. The City is a party to the HCP and is committed to the success of the HCP.	ECOS (Friends of Swainson's Hawk) [42]
We request the maps of the Natomas Basin in the draft General Plan be revised to accurately show the permanently protected mitigation lands in the Basin.		Thank you for your comment.	ECOS (Friends of Swainson's Hawk) [42]
Figure NN-1 Fisherman's Lake protections and buffers should be maintained and enlarged or enhanced as feasible.		Thank you for your comment.	Barbara Graichen [80]
Development and Planning History			
This would be an ideal educational attraction to show the agricultural history of Sacramento.		Thank you for your comment.	Lisa Pray [K-CPA-North Natomas-1]
The route across 16th St bridge to Del Paso Boulevard is the northern route of the Lincoln Highway. From a historical backdrop to today's planning, the Lincoln Highway is an important driver to North Sacramento and northern California development. There is good website on Lincoln Highway. It would be good to add reference in this history.		Thank you for your comment.	Dave Candey [K-CPA-North Sacramento-1]
There is also a strong need and desire to preserve biodiversity. This is very narrowly focused as written. "including" would be better. I would like it to note biodiversity.		Thank you for your comment.	Roslyn Bell [K-CPA-North Natomas-2]
The mention of the Witter Ranch Historic Farm evokes a site that is preserved and possibly could be a demonstration or living history site.		Please see policy HCR-1.5 (Historic Surveys and Context Statements).	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>There is a large error in the population of the North Natomas Community Plan Area, which includes most of City Council District 1 and part of City Council District 3. According to the Independent Redistricting Commission, the population of District 1 in 2020 was 63,532 and District 3's population was 62,168. If one quarter of District 3's population lives in North Natomas, that would make the total population of the plan area just under 80,000, and according to Map CP-NN-1 North Natomas Community Plan Area Boundary, there are no residences in the areas outside the city limits.</p>		<p>The reference to the number of residents in unincorporated areas of NNCP will be removed. "The North Natomas Community Plan Area is home to approximately 60,000 people, of whom about 48,800 are residents of the city of Sacramento and the remaining are residents of the unincorporated county"</p>	<p>North Natomas Community Coalition [53]</p>
<p>The text indicates there are 11,200 residents in unincorporated areas of the NNCP area. Where are they located?</p>		<p>The reference to the number of residents in unincorporated areas of NNCP will be removed. "The North Natomas Community Plan Area is home to approximately 60,000 people, of whom about 48,800 are residents of the city of Sacramento and the remaining are residents of the unincorporated county"</p>	<p>Chris Holm [44]</p>
<p>11NN1 et al - The historic significance and story of this area are neglected in the NNCP and the General Plan. Dry Creek and Robla Creek previously passed through Valley View Acres which was part of the original Del Paso Land Grant. Native Americans lived along the creeks enjoying the high ground above the basin flood waters. An east west levee once existed from the confluence of Steelhead Creek and Dry Creek to Sorento Road on my property.</p> <p>The Panhandle is currently being excavated. When the portion along Sorento Road is being developed, it should be thoroughly checked for artifacts where Dry Creek crossed the road. This disadvantaged community continues to be neglected. None of the studies to date have thoroughly examined this history or spot checked including SAFCA's study.</p> <p>The land now called Valley View Acres developed as small farms and later rural lots. It is the only City neighborhood where livestock are legally permitted. The neighborhood eagerly promoted and won a downzone from low density residential to rural residential one acre minimum parcel size to achieve consistency with the 1994 Community Plan. The proposal was supported by City staff and unanimously approved by City Council as it was consistent with the age and character of the neighborhood.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>	<p>Barbara Graichen [80]</p>
<p>Valley View Acres is situated in an old historic area. There was Native American habitation along Dry Creek in its pre levee natural waterway which passed through my property. It was first settled in the 1860s. It possesses characteristics and much other history linked to Gardenland, North Sacramento South of Main Avenue and Rio Linda. It was the most attractive area in what is now the Natomas basin because the elevation was higher. Yet, it is lumped in with the new neighborhoods north of Main and Del Paso on all the proposed maps addressing disadvantaged neighborhood, income, environmental justice etc. As a result, the plan provides no protection or remediation that similar neighborhoods receive. You will immediately see that the portion of Valley View Acres north of Del Paso is not similar to the new neighborhoods growing to the immediate east and west of it. Please correct this glaring error seen on multiple maps such as EJ 1 and 5, and many others identifying disadvantaged areas. A quick look at a census tract is not enough.</p>		<p>Map EJ-1 was created using data developed by the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). Map EJ-5 was developed using 68 indicators, ranging from socioeconomic to health outcome factors, and provides a more nuanced view of where disadvantaged communities within Sacramento might be. These maps will be updated with each General Plan update, reflecting any changes to indicators including income and environmental hazards exposure.</p>	<p>Barbara Graichen [78]</p>
<p>11NN1-Valley View Acres was the only North Natomas residential area included in the 1964 annexation which included north Sacramento and Gardenland. The annexation resulted in the total neglect of these older areas; the effects of which are easily seen in haphazard development and blight. Valley View Acres and these other areas need to be protected from incompatible development and treated as disadvantaged areas consistent with disadvantaged and environmental justice policies. Our organizations support Council Member Kaplan's comments that disadvantaged areas need greater attention.¹</p> <p>¹This comment is subject to the qualification that new neighbors have many problems which need to be addressed and should not be neglected.</p> <p>So far, Valley View Acres' open space buffer has been almost completely removed and its previously implemented traffic calming program is about to be undermined by opening traffic into the neighborhood's dangerous shoulderless roads and levee because the City failed to recognize its special characteristics. It and similar neighborhoods should be favored on calming projects implementation lists.</p>		<p>On page 11-NN-3, "Development and Planning History", second paragraph, after fourth sentence, add: "Much of North Natomas's...housing construction. Unlike the rest of North Natomas, Valley View Acres, a community located north of Del Paso Road and west of Steelhead Creek, is the only neighborhood in the city with a Rural Residential land use designation, which is intended to support low-intensity residential neighborhoods adjacent to rural and undeveloped land."</p>	<p>Barbara Graichen [80]</p>

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The park access shown for Valley View Acres would be nice. A field check would show that the park/open space is only accessibly by a steep climb on a levee side. The GP would need to identify the access as part of its discussion and implementation plan.		Thank you for your comment.	Barbara Graichen [86]
Major Transportation Routes			
This service is not currently running since the pandemic. This needs to be updated.		References to Jibe have been updated.	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-3]
These areas, though better than nothing, force bikes and pedestrians to stop frequently to allow for the car traffic that has priority. The paths weren't built to go over, under, or consistently around car centric roads so they're mostly good for slowing moving pedestrians and not commuters with any distance to cover.		Thank you for your comment.	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-3]
There is a desire for more paths, particularly as the area is developed and the population increase. I would like you to delete the word "rich." We want more paths. This makes it sound like there is plenty of paths.		"Major Transprotation Routes", second paragraph, revised to say: "The area also has many is rich in shared-use paths such as..."	Roslyn Bell [K-CPA-North Natomas-3]
Community Vision Box			
I would like to see pictures of open space and not just the Natomas Park photos. There is a strong desire for open space and it should be reflected in the photos. It would also be good to include a picture of the schools.	On photo of clock tower and arches.	Thank you for your comment.	Roslyn Bell [K-CPA-North Natomas-4]
Another thought is to include pictures of the iconic wildlife such as Great Blue Herons, Egrets, and Swanson Hawks & the biodiversity that we want to protect.- It should look like our area. It is very focused on just Natomas Park.	On photo of clock tower and arches.	Thank you for your comment.	Roslyn Bell [K-CPA-North Natomas-4]
This isn't fully accurate. Bike lanes drop in and out all over North Natomas. Car traffic speeds are way to fast for sharable roads with bikes for them to be considered 'safe' for bikes. That's a good goal, but I wouldn't say it currently exists.		Comment author asked to disregard comment.	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-4]
Please disregard, I see now this is the vision section. Scrolled back to the wrong area.		Comment author asked to disregard comment.	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-4]
This implies it has already occurred. That's not the case. Redevelopment of the former arena is still mostly in discussion and approval processes but they haven't broken ground on the hospital or the school and this area is still empty years Natomas residents have begged for family entertainment and opportunities to return to the area.		Comment author asked to disregard comment.	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-4]
Please disregard. I see now this is the vision section and I scrolled back to the wrong section.		Comment author asked to disregard comment.	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-4]
This is a key part of the Vision to many of us who use the parks. Thank you for seeing the value in the parks, environmental areas and the need for them to be a key part of this community moving forward.		Thank you for your comment.	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-4]
With small homes and high density housing, where is there room for move-up housing or housing for the high-paid workers at the anticipated teaching hospital?		Thank you for your comment.	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Town Center shopping center is not a gathering or focal point for North Natomas. The Regional Park, Community Center and Aquatic Center have the potential for this, but the park is not fully developed, and the Community Center is not readily available nor has affordable meeting spaces for community groups.		Page 11-NN-1, "Community Location", second paragraph revised to say: "Important landmarks in North Natomas include Natomas Marketplace, the Town Center and adjacent the North Natomas Community Center and Aquatic Center, Benvenuti Performing Arts Center, North Natomas Regional Park, the Promenade Mall, and the former Sleep Train Arena site, now planned to be redeveloped as a teaching hospital and medical school for California Northstate University."	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
Landmarks should not include typical commercial shopping centers but focus on North Natomas Regional Park and Aquatic Center. The original plan for a Town Center has evolved into a generic shopping center. Another landmark is the Benvenuti Performing Arts Center associated with the Natomas Charter School.		Page 11-NN-1, "Community Location", second paragraph revised to say: "Important landmarks in North Natomas include Natomas Marketplace, the Town Center and adjacent the North Natomas Community Center and Aquatic Center, Benvenuti Performing Arts Center, North Natomas Regional Park, the Promenade Mall, and the former Sleep Train Arena site, now planned to be redeveloped as a teaching hospital and medical school for California Northstate University."	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
The focus of this vision is entirely on the east side of I-5 and does not include those in on the west side. There is a major division between the two sides of the freeway, which this vision should address, as the residents of both sides want to be unified.		Please follow and participate in the Streets for People project, the City's Active Transportation Plan. See website here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Streets-For-People	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
Entertainment venues for older adolescents, adults and seniors need to be described. Currently, as the Plan correctly describes, there are a great number of parks, but those parks typically ignore adult activities or activities for families, in favor of (justifiably so) youth. Some commercial entertainment venues should be pursued.		Please see policies LUP-9.1 (Cultural and Entertainment Centers), LUP-9.2 (Destination City), LUP-9.3 (Assembly Facilities and Event Centers).	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
A potentially more focal point for North Natomas might be developed in the former arena site, as this site will be developed over the time frame of the 2040 Plan. Alternatively, vacant, undeveloped land along the eastern edge of I-5, north of Del Paso Road could be developed into this multi-use focal point, including entertainment, commercial venues and live-work housing.		Please see policies LUP-9.1 (Cultural and Entertainment Centers), LUP-9.2 (Destination City), LUP-9.3 (Assembly Facilities and Event Centers).	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
11NN6- North Natomas residents have also requested more off street east-west bike trail connectors from 1983-present. The unhooded often are found on the Ueda Parkway (top of East Levee) and along levee sides and west through Hansen Ranch. Residents support more trees and a higher percentage of tree canopy. However, it should be clearly stated that the canopy will not be allowed to be irreparably harmed by water restrictions during dry years. We lost hundreds of trees along roads and commercial zones and many were harmed and became diseased from lack of water. Residents are still removing trees that are dying from that treatment. If the City desires us to plant, we must be enabled to maintain.		Thank you for your comment. Please see policies ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance), ERC-3.8 (Public Education), ERC-3.9 (Watering and Irrigation).	Barbara Graichen [80]
Community Issues and Opportunities			
I understand that these projects are located outside of the Sacramento County Urban Services Boundary. These do not appear to be sustainable projects. This does not capture the concerns over these projects. I don't think it informs the public of the facts surrounding these proposed developments.		Thank you for your comment. Note: narrative under the "Community Issues and Opportunities" represent synthesized community input; these do not act as policies or implementing actions.	Roslyn Bell [K-CPA-North Natomas-5]
Please don't build these facilities 'into' the North Natomas Regional Park and remove the 'park' part of the North Natomas Regional Park. The Aquatic Center is great but I don't want to lose more of our park in exchange for these public needs. As mentioned, we have plenty of space for infil. Please use those areas for new facilities and don't remove something earlier mentioned as key in the 2040 vision.		Thank you for your comment. Note: narrative under the "Community Issues and Opportunities" represent synthesized community input; these do not act as policies or implementing actions.	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-5]
Having all transit going through downtown is limiting. How much has this changed since the shift to hybrid work and since downtown commercial leases have shifted? How many state offices moved out of downtown (there are several that moved to West Sacramento) and have no direct public transit without long (and frankly impractical) routes through downtown?		Thank you for your comment. Note: narrative under the "Community Issues and Opportunities" represent synthesized community input; these do not act as policies or implementing actions.	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-6]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Jibe hasn't run since COVID.		References to Jibe have been updated.	Anonymous [K-CPA-North Natomas-6]
This was a priority for every single group at the North Natomas Community Plan update workshop. However, it feels buried and minimized here. There is no map showing the planned/future overcrossings of I-5 to try to achieve this. There is no discussion of the dangerous pedestrian environment at the current Del Paso and Arena freeway on/off ramps. Please add more. We want to be a connected community!		Thank you for your comment. Note: narrative under the "Community Issues and Opportunities" represent synthesized community input; these do not act as policies or implementing actions.	Anonymous [K-CPA-North Natomas-6]
Please delete "all-weather" from sports field. This is not supported by all residents.		Thank you for your comment. Note: narrative under the "Community Issues and Opportunities" represent synthesized community input; these do not act as policies or implementing actions.	Roslyn Bell [K-CPA-North Natomas-6]
This bicycle network should be separated from the roadway, or if that cannot be done must be protected by some barrier to instill a sense of safety from users. Drivers typically go over posted limits in this area, so most heavily utilized roads have cycling facilities that are unsuitable for the existing conditions.		Thank you for your comment. Note: narrative under the "Community Issues and Opportunities" represent synthesized community input; these do not act as policies or implementing actions.	Brian [K-CPA-North Natomas-6]
More area-based entertainment amenities need to be attracted, given the increased number of residents and out of town visitors drawn to the hospital and other sports-leisure sites, such as the Aquatic Center.		Please see policies LUP-9.1 (Cultural and Entertainment Centers), LUP-9.2 (Destination City), LUP-9.3 (Assembly Facilities and Event Centers).	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
While North Natomas has many parks scattered throughout the area, the Regional Park needs to be completed, with paved roads through it demarcating areas for diverse activities. Trees need to be planted to improve the usefulness of open areas. Additional sports complexes could be located in the Regional Park to attract out-of-town visitors to Sacramento. The North Natomas Regional Park is ideally located near the airport for this type of attraction.		Thank you for your comment.	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
In addition to the youth-oriented sports and play parks in the area, attention needs to be focused on young adults and families who would like to participate in activities as a unit. This could include miniature golf, restaurants with gaming elements, or other gathering spots for groups. An entertainment center with multi-use purposes for small-scale concerts, performances and lectures should be attracted to North Natomas, as has been done in other areas of the City of Sacramento and Sacramento County.		Please see policies LUP-9.1 (Cultural and Entertainment Centers), LUP-9.2 (Destination City), LUP-9.3 (Assembly Facilities and Event Centers).	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
A permanent Farmers Market has been built in the Regional Park and is popular during the warmer months. Creating a permanent indoor mercado, with rental stalls for small businesses, could extend the Farmers Market concept and create a venue for craftspeople and makers to sell their goods year-round.		Thank you for your comment.	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
The community center needs to be re-worked to provide local community organizations with a low-cost or free reservable meeting space.		Thank you for your comment.	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
Housing – A balance of the spectrum of housing types in North Natomas is necessary.		Please see policy LUP-6.2 (Range of Residential Development Intensities).	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
Park Amenities – we support the description in this section with the additional comments regarding the North Natomas Regional Park. Simply getting the proposed roads installed, providing shade trees throughout the park and cleaning up the detritus would be the best first start. Additional walking trails in the park would provide a low-cost recreation source, adding trees along the trails would provide some shade from the heat of summer. Adding benches, art installations and even pollinator gardens would also make the park more welcoming.		Thank you for your comment.	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Park Access: There are lots of parks in North Natomas, but the big one – North Natomas Regional Park – is not completed, almost a quarter century after construction began. The Master Plan for this park is very outdated, with existing facilities mislocated and prospective facilities probably not feasible.		Thank you for your comment.	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
The Regional Park needs trees, but also many of the planned buffer spaces between high traffic roads and developed property need trees and water efficient landscaping. North Natomas has many large undeveloped places which could provide needed shade and heat reduction.		Please see policies NN-LUP-4 (Landscape Freeway Buffers) and ERC-3.9 (Watering and Irrigation).	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
Map -NN-6 - If the Ueda Parkway is to be identified as park access as shown on the map, should it not also be maintained as such? Currently, there is no sign of maintenance and the unhoused live in there so residents can't safely use the area.		Thank you for your comment.	Barbara Graichen [80]
Mobility			
Plans for improved mobility and active transportation need to include improving connectivity between shared use paths. There are several instances in north natomas where these paths abruptly end and force a pedestrian or cyclist to reroute to the closest intersection in order to safely cross. This discontinuity discourages people from commuting as it greatly increases total commute time and stress to an already dangerous method of transportation for this region. The plan should identify locations where these conflicts occur and prioritize continuity and safe crossings.		Thank you for your comment.	Brian Junio [K-CPA-North Natomas-12]
And to West Sacramento without having to go through downtown. West Sacramento is growing similar to Natomas and these two cities need to work on interconnectivity between them.		Thank you for your comment.	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-12]
The shuttle shut down during covid.		References to Jibe have been updated.	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-12]
Shifting North Natomas to a destination region highlights the need for more frequent and accessible public transportation. Although the City has approved a contract with an engineering firm to create initial plans and a draft environmental impact report for a bridge over the American River, the proposed Green Line to the airport will not be completed during the timespan of this General Plan Update. An alternative to the Green Line must be developed that can be placed in service within the next 7 years. This indicated improved bus service, which is more flexible for accommodating new projects as they come online.		Thank you for your comment.	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
Finally, there needs to be a way for residents to safely move east and west throughout North Natomas. I-5 creates an obstacle in moving without a motorized vehicle. There isn't a good pedestrian crossing over the freeway, nor are bicycles provided with safe means of transiting over the freeway. Numerous accidents have occurred on Del Paso Road and Arena Boulevard as there isn't a protected route for pedestrians and bicyclists at the intersections with the freeway on and off ramps.		Please follow and participate in the Streets for People project, the City's Active Transportation Plan. See website here: https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Transportation/Planning-Projects/Streets-For-People	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
I-5 and 99 split south of the Sacramento City limits, not north.		Page 11-NN-3, "Major Transportation Routes", first paragraph, second sentence revised to say, "I-5 splits from Highway 99 just south north of the Sacramento..."	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
The bus routes described do not serve North Natomas well. Also, since the bus stop locations are limited, there needs to be a transit center where cars can be parked. Expecting residents to walk in inclement weather several miles to get to a bus stop is not a good business model.		Please see policy NN-M-4 (Transit Center).	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Due to the downturn in ridership in the post-pandemic era, Jibe has curtailed the commuter bus shuttle service.		<p>Page 11-NN-3, "Major Transportation Routes", second paragraph, second sentence revised to say: "North Natomas Jibe, a local transportation management association provides a commuter bus shuttle service."</p> <p>Page 11-NN-6, left column, second paragraph, added sentence to the end: "*The Jibe Express suspended service after this community input was collected."</p> <p>Page 11-NN-12, "Mobility", second paragraph, last two sentences revised to say: "The Jibe Express Shuttle Service is operated by the North Additionally, Natomas Jibe, is a Natomas-based nonprofit organization that works with local residents, businesses, and schools with the mission to foster transportation behaviors that enhances our community through advocacy, programs, placemaking, education, and services. Jibe Express also provides emergency ride home service for walkers, bikers, and transit riders."</p>	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
All plans for North Natomas are based on the existence of Light Rail through the community to the airport. The likelihood of the Green Line being implemented during the Plan's timeframe is very small.		Thank you for your comment.	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
Work to complete fully the identified trails, including means of crossing I-5 and Highway 99, and connecting to other regional trails.		Thank you for your comment.	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
Residential Growth in Adjacent Unincorporated Areas: Another big concern is the impact on traffic, which already has bottlenecks on I-5 and Highway 99, some of which occur outside normal commute hours.		<p>The City has interest in, but no jurisdiction over development in adjacent unincorporated areas.</p> <p>Note: narrative under the "Community Issues and Opportunities" represent synthesized community input; these do not act as policies or implementing actions.</p>	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
Improving Alternatives to Driving: Transit Connections to the Rest of Sacramento – in addition to the options described in the document, locating a transit center in North Natomas, including a parking lot, would assist in the usage of public transportation. Since Centene/HealthNet is not going to meet their planned increases in employment, perhaps their enormous but unused parking lot could serve as a point for both the existing bus lines and a new express line along the path considered for the Green Line. This would give at least a glimmer of the promise of transportation to be provided by the Green Line.		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>Note: narrative under the "Community Issues and Opportunities" represent synthesized community input; these do not act as policies or implementing actions.</p>	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
Improving Alternatives to Driving: Active Transportation – one of the issues with active transportation now is the lack of connectivity. Work to complete fully the identified trails, including means of crossing I-5 and Highway 99, and connecting to other regional trails.		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>Note: narrative under the "Community Issues and Opportunities" represent synthesized community input; these do not act as policies or implementing actions.</p>	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]
Mobility: This section also relies on the Green Line. It is better to advocate for a committed bus service that covers the Green Line route and has a transit hub in the center of North Natomas. The primary factor affecting safety along Del Paso Road is a lack of separation of vehicular traffic from pedestrian and bicycle traffic, especially at the I-5 overcrossing. This street needs a separated bicycle lane and complete sidewalks near the overcrossing. High accident rates along major streets persist, and traffic-calming measures should be taken on Del Paso Road, Natomas Boulevard, Truxel Road and East Commerce Way. El Centro Road is also in need of traffic-calming measures.		<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>Note: narrative under the "Community Issues and Opportunities" represent synthesized community input; these do not act as policies or implementing actions.</p>	North Natomas Community Coalition [53]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
<p>This organization supports Council Member Kaplan's suggestion that additional traffic calming policies be included in the North Natomas and North Sacramento Community Plans.</p> <p>Whenever traffic increases will affect a residential area, as an example the apartments around the arena development project, calming measures should be proposed before the impacts occur and if possible, paid for by the contributing project. Speed humps and similar measures should be constructed as developments are built in order to reduce their costs.</p> <p>This philosophy should be implemented City wide. Action should be taken to lower speed limits temporarily or long term, especially in dangerous areas, as immediate short term priority traffic calming measures.</p>		Please see citywide policies M-1.5 (Street Design Standards), M-3.1 (Local Streets), M-3.2 (Street Design), M-4.2 (Safer Driving Speeds).	Barbara Graichen [80]
Park Access			
This is only true if communities keep current trees. HOAs have been removing trees put in by developers despite complaints from residents and site lack of appropriate trees for the locations they were planted. The city should encourage planting of native trees that will thrive in neighborhoods and discourage tree removal without replacement. This will help lower temperatures in neighborhoods as Sacramento continues to see rising temperatures into the future.		ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Please also see policy ERC-3.3 (Tree Protection) and City Code Chapter 12.56, which regulates tree planting, maintenance, and conservation. City code chapter can be found here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_12-chapter_12_56-12_56_050	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-13]
Map CP-NN-6 North Natomas Park Access incorrectly identifies Jackrabbit Trail as East Drainage Canal Trail, and the East Drain Connector Trail is not identified. If trails are to be shown on the map, line weights should be increased to make the trail locations visible and trails should be identified in the map key.		Map CP-NN-6 updated to remove "East Drainage Canal Trail" label at the intersection of Del Paso Rd. and Natomas Blvd.	Chris Holm [44]
Community Policies			
<p>Why were these policies removed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PUD Designation requirement (NN.LU 1.1) - Housing Type Diversity (NN.LU 1.9) - Upscale Housing (NN.LU 1.13): Community members frequently express desire for move-up housing - Maximum Apartment Complex (NN.LU 1.14): Can the existing policy be modified to encourage architectural diversity if projects exceeds 200 units. Other specifics in the policy (e.g., thoroughfare) should not be included. - Market Study Requirement (NN.LU 1.27): Consider keeping this requirement when we rezone EC properties for commercial. We currently request them when we rezone EC land to develop a hotel. - Industrial Development (NN.LU 1.39) 		<p>NN-LU-1.1: This policy was not recommended for carryover to the 2040 plan because most of the area is already in a PUD.</p> <p>NN-LU-1.9: This policy intent is covered by other citywide land use policies.</p> <p>NN-LU-1.13: This policy intent is covered by other citywide land use policies that aim to increase a greater array of housing types.</p> <p>NN-LU-1.14: This policy intent is covered by citywide development standards.</p> <p>NN-LU-1.27: This policy was outdated and not recommended for carryover to the 2040 plan</p> <p>NN-LU-1.39: This policy intent is covered by citywide policies and development standards.</p>	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Natomas-15]
Land Use Policies			
NN-LUP-1 (increase mix use nodes and high intensity within ½ mile of future rail stops)	NN-LUP-1 (Mixed Use Nodes)	Policy NN-LUP-1 (Mixed Use Nodes) revised to say: " The City shall continue to promote increase mixed-use, high-intensity activity centers near..."	Kaplan (CC)
Remove references to Town Center. Broadly apply Placemaking to all shopping centers.	NN-LUP-2 (Town Center Placemaking)	Policy NN-LUP-2 (Town Center Placemaking) revised to say: " Commercial Town Center Placemaking...the sense of place within commerical commerical centers of North Natomas, at the Natomas Town Center and to ensure that they are it is connected..."	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Natomas-15]
Large retail businesses don't strengthen sense of place. Remove sense of place in connection with Natomas Town Center.	NN-LUP-2 (Town Center Placemaking)	Policy NN-LUP-2 (Town Center Placemaking) revised to say: " Commercial Town Center Placemaking...the sense of place within commerical commerical centers of North Natomas at the Natomas Town Center and to ensure that they are it is connected..."	Christina Parker [K-CPA-North Natomas-15]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Current NNCP includes 250-foot-wide buffers along Elkhorn and 200-foot-wide buffers along the west side. What is causing the change?	NN-LUP-5 (Open Space Buffers)	Thank you for your comment.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Natomas-15]
Policy NN.LU 1.14 Maximum Apartment Size in the 2035 General Plan has been eliminated. This is an important policy for avoiding large barriers to walking and biking. It should either be retained in the North Natomas Community Plan or included within policy M-1.16 Barrier Removal.		Thank you for your comment.	Chris Holm [44]
11 NN7 -Add buffering along existing rural agricultural residential areas.		Please see policies NN-LUP-5 (Open Space Buffers) and NN-ERC-1 (Fisherman's Lake Buffer).	Barbara Graichen [80]
11NN11 -The 0.25 acre minimum parcel size that was applied to Valley View Acres a few years ago is inconsistent with previous council actions, lotting patterns, permitted animal husbandry and agriculture uses, zoning, and infrastructure in Valley View Acres. It should be one acre minimum with recognition that a few parcels were split in half previous to the 1994-95 zoning approval. The existing designation was added without the knowledge of Valley View residents, another case of a disadvantaged community lost in a shuffle.	Map CP-NN-5 (North Natomas Minimum Residential Density)	Please refer to the Zoning Code for minimum lot size requirements. All parcels with a Rural Estates zoning designation in the Valley View Acres have a minimum lot size of 1 acre. A link to the Zoning Code section is available here: https://library.qcode.us/lib/sacramento_ca/pub/city_code/item/title_17-division_ii-chapter_17_204-article_i?view=all	Barbara Graichen [80]
The Opportunity Zone shouldn't extend across Sorento Road into Valley View. The residential area on the north end was previously worked into the General Plan without the knowledge of the residents. Residents were really surprised. There should have been a mailing to the residents or discussion with a community wide meeting in the already disadvantaged and older neighborhood before such radical change was made. This is one of the reasons there is a need for disadvantaged area recognition. That is past now. Opportunity zones, as we understand them, will generally intensify uses. Intensification is incompatible with rural residential uses. Be sure to check the permitted uses in the zoning code.	Map LUP-3 (Opportunity Areas)	Thank you for your comment.	Barbara Graichen [86]
Economic Development Policies			
Missed opportunity to incorporate policy. The community is interested in maintaining a balanced job-housing ratio; and luring businesses which provide amusement opportunities in addition to small businesses and eating establishments.		Please see citywide policies LUP-1.8 (Jobs-Housing Balance) and goal sections E-1 and E-3.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Natomas-16]
Environmental Resources and Constraints Policies			
Staff initiated revision for clarity.		Policy NN-ERC-1 (Buffer Uses), second bullet, revised to say: "The buffer shall include two areas: the nesting tree buffer area around the Swainson's hawk nesting trees; and the rest of the buffer area. Uses allowed in the buffer will be guided by Table 13-1, entitled 350-foot-wide buffer option. "	Staff
Environmental Justice Policies			
Is this true? We know a lot about the school population, so this is hard to believe.		Please see the Environmental Justice Element for citywide policies on environmental justice.	Roslyn Bell [K-CPA-North Natomas-18]
Mobility Policies			
Is this accurate? 800-foot-wide seems unrealistic.	NN-M-1 (Light Rail Corridor)	Thank you for your comment.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Natomas-18]
Staff has been working with RT to acquire 40-foot-wide IODs to accommodate tracks, TPSS, and stations. Not sure where 400 and 800-foot-wide requirements are coming from. This can be simplified to include language to collaborate with RT on acquiring new and additional IOD dedications along the corridor.	NN-M-1 (Light Rail Corridor)	Thank you for your comment.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Natomas-18]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Can we get an updated map to reflect what has changed since this map was first drawn up? Should show Greenbriar and any changes that have transpired since.	Figure NN-2 (Conceptual Transit Corridors Map)	Thank you for your comment. The proposed DNA transit lines are still accurate.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Natomas-18]
Figure NN-2: Conceptual Transit Corridors Map, carried over from the 2035 General Plan, appears to be from the Conceptual Transit Corridors Map in the 1996 NNCP rather than the RT preferred alignment.	Figure NN-2 (Conceptual Transit Corridors Map)	Thank you for your comment. The proposed DNA transit lines are still accurate.	Chris Holm [44]
Add in Section NS-M-5 Transit Connections (Add also to North Natomas Plan): The City shall coordinate with the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT) for planning and provision of high frequency, connected and convenient transit in Robla, North Natomas, and the wider city.		Policy NN-M-3 (High Frequency Transit) revised to say: "The City should encourage and collaborate with the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT) to plan and implement high frequency, connected and convenient transit in North Natomas, as well as to the North Sacramento Community Plan Area and the wider city. " Added new policy in North Sacramento Community Plan, Mobility policy section: "High Frequency Transit. The City should encourage and collaborate with the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT) to plan and implement high frequency, connected and convenient transit to the North Natomas Community Plan Area and the wider city."	Kaplan (CC)
Can we remove the specific locations and keep this open ended and provide them in an area where RT deems appropriate.	NN-M-4 (Transit Center)	Policy NN-M-4 (Transit Center) revised to say: "The City shall encourage the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT) to locate bus transit centers in North Natomas. of at least two acres each, with between 50 and 100 joint use parking spaces, near the corner of Truxel Road and Terracina Drive and at the corner of Del Paso and El Centro Roads in North Natomas. "	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Natomas-19]
- Remove acreage language (not in table anymore) - Del Paso Boulevard should be Del Paso Road. - Remove the themes; North Natomas has changed since this theme table was developed. Land uses have changed. Should broadly encourage TOD surrounding each station.	NN-M-5 (Light Rail Stations)	Policy NN-M-5 (Light Rail Stations) revised for clarity to say: " The City shall encourage transit-oriented development around existing and planned light rail stations. The City shall plan for six light rail stations. The area around each station will include a variety of land uses at sufficient intensity to provide a ridership base adequate to make the transit system function. Also, as reflected in Table CP-NN-1, each station will have a theme to reflect the specific uses that distinguish it from other stations. The number of acres shown with each station includes the number of acres needed for the station, bus staging area, and exclusive park-n-ride lots. " Table CP-NN-1 (North Natomas Light Rail Station Themes) deleted.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Natomas-19]
Table CP-NN-1: North Natomas Light Rail Station Themes, carried over from the 2035 General Plan, seems to be derived from the 1996 NNCP but with the East Town Center station moved from Natomas Boulevard to East Commerce.	Table CP-NN-1 (North Natomas Light Rail Station Themes)	Policy NN-M-5 (Light Rail Stations) revised for clarity to say: " The City shall encourage transit-oriented development around existing and planned light rail stations. The City shall plan for six light rail stations. The area around each station will include a variety of land uses at sufficient intensity to provide a ridership base adequate to make the transit system function. Also, as reflected in Table CP-NN-1, each station will have a theme to reflect the specific uses that distinguish it from other stations. The number of acres shown with each station includes the number of acres needed for the station, bus staging area, and exclusive park-n-ride lots. " Table CP-NN-1 (North Natomas Light Rail Station Themes) deleted.	Chris Holm [44]
Youth, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space			
Staff initiated revisions to the YPRO section of the North Natomas Community Area Plan to reduce overlap with Innovation Park PUD efforts.	NN-YPRO-1 (Innovation Park)	NN-YPRO-1 (Innovation Park) has been removed.	Staff
Reword to something like "look for and evaluate connections from the Niños Parkway to adjacent trail systems and recreational opportunities."	NN-YPRO-2 (Ninos Parkway)	Thank you for your comment.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Natomas-20]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	NN-YPRO-2 (Ninos Parkway)	NN-YPRO-2 (Ninos Parkway) revised to say: "The City shall implement the N northern S section above Interstate 80 of the Ninos Parkway as part of the Panhandle PUD Planned Unit Development and connecting the Ninos Parkway to the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal-Steelhead Creek and Hansen Ranch-Walter S. Ueda Parkway. "	Staff
- Remove "collaborate with developers" - Amenities list is a run-on sentence. - Perhaps be less specific with the types of amenities and include a broader statement.	NN-YPRO-3 (Park Placemaking)	Policy NN-YPRO-3 (Park Placemaking) deleted. Please see YPRO Element for citywide policies on parks design, amenities, and programming.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Natomas-20]
Add in section NN-YPRO-5 Organized Sports and Recreational Facilities: The City shall develop and maintain quality facilities (including sports courts and fields) for a variety of organized sports to ensure active recreation opportunities are met for the growing community needs in the Central City.		New policy added to North Natomas Community Plan at the end of the YPRO policy section: " Organized Sports and Recreational Facilities. The City shall develop and maintain quality facilities (including sports courts and fields) for a variety of organized sports to ensure active recreation opportunities are met for the growing community needs in North Natomas."	Kaplan (CC)
Relevant Plans and Studies			
What studies were done with respect to the South Airport, Upper West Side and Grand Park development? The public should have access to these reports. Those reports should be listed here.		Thank you for your comment.	Roslyn Bell [K-CPA-North Natomas-20]
South Natomas			
Development and Planning History			
Gardenland's first homes were built in 1925, and is one of the oldest neighborhoods in Sacramento.		South Natomas Community Plan "Development and Planning History" sub-section, first sentence, revised to say: " Although neighborhoods existed as early as the 1920s, South Natomas was developed predominantly..."	Julie [K-CPA-South Natomas-1]
Land Use Policies			
Content is fine; reads awkwardly.	SN-LUP-1 (Vibrant Northgate)	Thank you for your comment.	North Area Team [K-CPA-South Natomas-16]
Promote TOD design along Truxel. TOD should be inclusive of these development patterns.	SN-LUP-3 (Truxel Road Site Design)	Policy SN-LUP-3 (Truxel Road Site Design) revised to say: "The City shall promote transit-oriented site designs for new development along Truxel Road, particularly near planned light rail stops..."	North Area Team [K-CPA-South Natomas-16]
Link this policy to the existing TOD ordinance, and explicitly prohibit drive-through uses. Does not provide staff and applicants with a yes or no.	SN-LUP-4 (Drive-through Commercial)	Thank you for your comment.	North Area Team [K-CPA-South Natomas-16]
Encourage/require new developments to preserve existing view corridors.	SN-LUP-5 (Riverfront Landscaping)	Thank you for your comment.	North Area Team [K-CPA-South Natomas-16]
Mobility Policies			
The City needs to better link South Natomas to North Natomas over I-80.		New policy added to goal section LUP-6: " Reconnecting Communities. The City shall support efforts and opportunities to reconnect communities that were disconnected by large infrastructure projects and developments, including but not limited to freeways, railways, and buildings."	North Area Team [K-CPA-South Natomas-17]
The City shall coordinate with Sac RT. The City does not acquire or ask for these easements/IODs. RT needs to make formal comments regarding what needs to be acquired, where, and for how much.	SN-M-2 (Transit Right-of-Way)	Policy SN-M-2 (Transit Right-of-Way) revised to say: "The City shall coordinate with the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT) to acquire right-of-way needed..."	North Area Team [K-CPA-South Natomas-17]
Add SN.M 1.1 from the 2035 SNCP to the 2040. This resulted from a council resolution and is included as a requirement on the title for these properties.	SN-M-3 (American River Parkway Connections)	Thank you for your comment.	North Area Team [K-CPA-South Natomas-17]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The ATC Recommends the following modified language to policy SN-M-3 "American River Parkway Connections.": When planning walking and bicycling improvements, the City shall seek-prioritize opportunities to provide active transportation connections, which are not subject to regular flooding, across the American River to better connect South Natomas with Downtown and the regional bicycling network.		Thank you for your comment.	ATC [26]
Youth, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Policies			
Add another policy related to encouraging formal connections to the E Levee Road trails.	SN-YPRO-1 (Gardenland Park Access)	Added new policy to YPRO section of South Natomas policies: " Connections to East Levee Road Trails. The City shall explore options to improve connectivity to the East Levee Road trails. "	North Area Team [K-CPA-South Natomas-17]
North Sacramento			
Environmental Resources and Constraints Policies			
Twin Rivers	NS-LUP-2 (Del Paso Creative Activation)	Comment author asked to disregard comment.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Sacramento-16]
North Sacramento needs specific economic development strategies tailored to this community and the economic hardships it faces.		Added to North Sacramento Community Plan, after NS-LUP-2 (Del Pas Creative Activation): " Engage North of I-80. The City shall engage the neighborhoods north of I-80 in an effort to assess community needs and identify the appropriate level of planning study required for the area. " Added to Environmental Justice Element, after EJ-A.3 (Diverse Representation): " Community-Led Planning. Pilot a community-led planning grant program focused on addressing the needs of people within disadvantaged and/or historically underserved communities. The planning process would include documenting community vision for a specific neighborhood, concerns keeping the people in that neighborhood from thriving, and potential actions to increase community resiliency, equity, and/or inclusive economic development. These actions could include regulatory fixes to City ordinances, education and training on City programs and opportunities, infrastructure improvements, or others. Pending funding and staff availability, the planning effort should be accompanied by funding and staff time to address some near-term implementation as well as include a final document (or action plan) with a list of short and longer-term actions that can be used to support grant applications, advocacy to government officials, and guide ongoing community collaborations. "	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Sacramento-16]
This is codified in Title 17.	NS-ERC-1 (McClellan Heights and Parker Homes Plan Noise Area)	Thank you for your comment.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Sacramento-16]
Figure NN-1 (Fisherman's Lake Study Area)			
Ascot between Dry Creek and Sully: this is not in City Limits.	NS-M-1 (Street Extensions)	Comment author asked to disregard comment.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Sacramento-17]
Most of the land along the northern city limits is either controlled by the City of by SAFCA; how realistic is it that development will lead to the extension of Ascot?	NS-M-1 (Street Extensions)	Thank you for your comment.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Sacramento-17]
Can we get a map?	NS-PFS-2 (Historic Magpie Creek)	Thank you for your comment.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Sacramento-17]
Add NS.U 1.1 from the current NSCP.		This policy will be added into North Sacramento Community Plan, PFS policy section, with minor revisions. Assessment Districts. The City shall encourage property owners to form assessment districts in order to provide needed physical services.	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Sacramento-17]
Youth, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Policies			
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	NS-YPRO-1 (Walter Ueda Parkway Access)	NS-YPRO-1 (Walter S. Ueda Parkway Access) revised to say: "The City shall work with local landowners to create new pedestrian access points and improve access to Walter S. Ueda Parkway from adjacent neighborhoods."	Staff

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	NS-YPRO-2 (Hagginwood Park Access)	NS-YPRO-2 (Hagginwood Park Access) revised to say: "When planning pedestrian improvements or in the event of adjacent new development, the City shall recognize that completing the sidewalk network near within a 10-minute walk of Hagginwood Park to improve pedestrian access from nearby neighborhoods is a community priority."	Staff
Can we broaden this to include all of North Sacramento. The entire community plan area suffers from a lack of ped infrastructure. The area surrounding Hagginwood Park for the most part has sidewalks.	NS-YPRO-2 (Hagginwood Park Access)	Please see citywide YPRO and Mobility policies on bike and ped connectivity and accessibility. 2035 Policy NS-M-1.1 will be added into the 2040 GP North Sacramento Community Plan, Mobility policy section, with minor revisions: " Street Improvements. The City shall continue to seek funding to carry out improvements as prioritized in the Transportation Priorities Plan for streets that lack sidewalks and street lighting, are under heavy use by pedestrians, or will not be improved through new development and assessment districts. "	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Sacramento-18]
NS.M 1.1	NS-YPRO-2 (Hagginwood Park Access)	Please see citywide YPRO and Mobility policies on bike and ped connectivity and accessibility. 2035 Policy NS-M-1.1 will be added into the 2040 GP North Sacramento Community Plan, Mobility policy section, with minor revisions: " Street Improvements. The City shall continue to seek funding to carry out improvements as prioritized in the Transportation Priorities Plan for streets that lack sidewalks and street lighting, are under heavy use by pedestrians, or will not be improved through new development and assessment districts. "	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Sacramento-18]
Look for funding for sidewalk/ada/ped improvements in areas that are already built-out.	NS-YPRO-2 (Hagginwood Park Access)	Please see citywide YPRO and Mobility policies on bike and ped connectivity and accessibility. 2035 Policy NS-M-1.1 will be added into the 2040 GP North Sacramento Community Plan, Mobility policy section, with minor revisions: " Street Improvements. The City shall continue to seek funding to carry out improvements as prioritized in the Transportation Priorities Plan for streets that lack sidewalks and street lighting, are under heavy use by pedestrians, or will not be improved through new development and assessment districts. "	North Area Team [K-CPA-North Sacramento-18]
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	NS-YPRO-5 (Joint Use Agreement)	NS-YPRO-5 (Joint Use Agreement) revised to say: "The City shall pursue a joint-use agreement with the Twin Rivers Unified School District that allows for community use of Castori Elementary School select school fields and playgrounds during non-school hours to improve park access to surrounding neighborhoods."	Staff
Pocket/Greenhaven Community Plan			
Youth, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Policies			
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	PG-YPRO-2 (Parkways/Greenways)	PG-YPRO-2 (Parkways/Greenways) revised to say: "The City shall continue to improve and maintain the parkway/greenbelt network and public open spaces, including removing fencing and gates and adding access points where feasible, and by exploring strategies to improve connections between greenways and to the Sacramento River Parkway."	Staff
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	PG-YPRO-3 (Joint-Use Agreement)	PG-YPRO-3 (Joint-Use Agreement) revised to say: "The City shall pursue a joint-use agreement with Sacramento City Unified School District that allows for community use of select school fields and playgrounds during non-school hours to improve park access in the Pocket/Greenhaven Community Plan Area."	Staff
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	PG-YPRO-4 (Pool and Neighborhood Center Access)	PG-YPRO-4 (Pool and Neighborhood Center Access) revised to say: "The City shall explore ways to facilitate swimming pool and neighborhood center access for Pocket/Greenhaven residents, especially for youth, through joint-use agreements with the school districts or expanded access to Pannell Meadowview Community Center or North Natomas Community Center and Aquatic Center. "	Staff
South Area			
Youth, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Policies			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	SA-YPRO-2 (Franklin Boyce Park Access)	SA-YPRO-2 (Franklin Boyce Park Access) revised to say: " As part of the Parks Plan 2040, t The City shall explore options to expand pedestrian access to Franklin Boyce Park from adjacent neighborhoods such as by creating a pedestrian entrance on the west side over the drainage canal."	Staff
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	SA-YPRO-3 (Joint-Use Agreements)	SA-YPRO-3 (Joint-Use Agreements) revised to say: "The City shall pursue joint-use agreements with the Sacramento City and Elk Grove Unified School Districts (USDs) that allow for community use of the Union House and John D. Sloat select elementary school fields and playgrounds during non-school hours to improve park access in the South Area."	Staff
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	SA-YPRO-5 (Laguna Floodplain Open Space)	SA-YPRO-5 (Laguna Floodplain Open Space) revised to say: "The City shall preserve open space, maintain passive recreational facilities with designated multi-use paths , and enhance the natural features of Laguna Creek, making floodplain improvements within Laguna's floodplain areas that include natural vegetation of the interior, planting of trees along the floodway or just inside or outside the berm, locating a park node adjacent to the floodway , development of the existing park node adjacent to the floodway , maintaining suitable habitat for the giant garter snake-protected wildlife species , and planting an unlined low-flow channel with emergent vegetation. Any vegetation to be planted along and within the floodway will need to be reviewed and accepted by DOU. "	Staff
South Natomas			
Youth, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Policies			
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	SN-YPRO-1 (Gardenland Park Access)	SN-YPRO-1 (Gardenland Park Access) revised to say: "The City shall explore the feasibility of collaborating with Reclamation District 1000 and Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency to create shared multi-use trails paths and a new access point to Gardenland Park from Indiana Avenue to expand park access for nearby residents."	Staff
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	SN-YPRO-2 (Ueda Parkway Access)	Title of SN-YPRO-2 revised to say: " Walter S. Ueda Parkway Access "	Staff
Staff initiated policy revision for clarity.	SN-YPRO-4 (River Access Points)	SN-YPRO-4 (River Access Points) revised to say: "The City shall encourage collaborate with the Sacramento County Department of Parks and Recreation to improve access to the American River Parkway from South Natomas by updating the American River Parkway Plan to by incorporating new river access points and improved bicycle and pedestrian entrances, as feasible where consistent with the American River Parkway Plan, Natural Resources Element. "	Staff
Special Study Area			
We request the City Council ensure that the General Plan does not authorize the expansion of the Sphere of Influence in Natomas. The staff argument for expanding the Sphere (see page 11-SSA-6) is that the County proposed development on the city's edge would be better integrated with City if the Sphere were expanded. We dispute this assertion. The City should resolutely oppose urbanization on the City's border to protect its investment in habitat and the North Natomas Community Plan, not set itself up to negotiate with the County.		Thank you for your comment.	ECOS (Friends of Swainson's Hawk) [42]
Do these plans help to move Sacramento closer to being national model of sustainable, equitable growth and community development?			
No. North Natomas is still building as very suburban.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-CPA-1]
The North Natomas Community Plan section needs to have a map showing planned/future I-5 overcrossings and discuss it more.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-CPA-1]
East/West connectivity was topic that came up for every group at the N. Natomas Community Plan update workshop. Highlight more.		New policy added to goal section LUP-6: " Reconnecting Communities. The City shall support efforts and opportunities to reconnect communities that were disconnected by large infrastructure projects and developments, including but not limited to freeways, railways, and buildings. "	Station Board [K-CPA-1]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Leave unincorporated Arden Arcade alone, please. Local residents uniformly & continually do not want to be part of City of Sac.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-CPA-1]
I'm glad to see 24th street will be getting a road diet!		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-CPA-1]
No.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-CPA-1]
Yes. I strongly support the green line on Truxel to get us to the airport.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-CPA-1]
Build the green line!		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-CPA-1]
Please include light rail to SMF (not a bus that can get stuck in traffic)		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-CPA-1]
I would love to see light rail go to the airport		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-CPA-1]
"Role of the Central City" neglects other areas leaving them without access to businesses and entertainment since travel is hard		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-CPA-1]

ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION CHAPTER

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
General Comments			
Internal Consistency			
Many of the G&P and IA in the Drafts pertaining to the GHG reductions, don't meet CEQA's guidelines for Measures, as they are not real, feasible, enforceable, or supported by evidence. Moreover, planned actions often are insufficient to achieve the stated goals. The Drafts are not internally consistent. Half of the Priority Funding Measures do not meet the criteria as described in the CAAP and goals in the GP are not reflected consistently across the entire document. For example, establishing an urban tree canopy is a stated goal in Chapter 6 of the GP, Environmental Resources and Constraints, but it is not mentioned in Chapter 3, Land Use and Placemaking even though beautification is part of the G&P and IA for the chapter.		Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Language			
The Drafts consistently use vague, non-committal language and/or caveats otherwise powerful statements. Words such as, "encourage," "promote," "should," "explore the feasibility," and "shall foster" must be eliminated from this document and replaced with words that reflect the necessary changes we need in our communities, examples of such language are "will," "implement," and "actively partner with."		Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Quantifiable, time sensitive goals and measures. Recommend concrete, measurable objectives in each IA section that boldly addresses the issues at hand. This must include Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and a specific deadline for each.		Please see sustainability and equity indicators in the Sustainability and Equity Chapter in Part I.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Establish goals and measures commensurate with the severity of our circumstances.		Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
Funding			
Funding priorities. Many of the goals set out in the Drafts are under or completely unfunded. The City must allocate regular General Funds to pay for these necessary aspects of life, such as housing and transportation. Further, if the CAAP is implemented, the City must provide adequate staffing.		Thank you for your comment.	Citizen's Climate Lobby [38]
We note that discussions of funding are almost entirely absent from the General Plan Update. We recommend the General Plan include funding and financing options in the body of its text, and should be upfront about expected funding gaps. As part of this, the General Plan should prioritize goals and actions according to cost-effectiveness. In the likelihood that the City is unable to secure funding for all priorities inside the General Plan, the GPU should clearly delineate which items will assuredly receive funding, in contrast to which ones represent aspirations, to be completed if funding is secured. Without such a means of funding and prioritization explored within the body of the GPU, the General Plan itself stands as an aspirational text.		Thank you for your comment.	ECOS [42]
Mobility			
Sidewalks on 65th Expressway (between Fruitridge and 14th Street) are needed for safety purposes. High school children walk/ride dangerously close to high speed traffic. Sidewalks should be mandatory, especially near schools.	General comment	Thank you for your comment.	Jonathan Phillips [K-A&I-8]
Implementation Actions			

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
The City should seriously consider reallocating a portion of the existing public works roadway funding to the construction of protected bicycle lanes and pedestrian improvements. Relying on grant funding to make these improvements is insufficient to transition the city in a reasonable timeframe to the dynamic, walkable community the General Plan envisions.	M-A.1 (Transportation Investment Priorities)	Thank you for your comment.	Doug Brown [K-A&I-9]
The City should consider reallocating the large portion of the City's roadways dedicated to parking to pedestrian/bicycle use as a way to transition Sacramento into a more walkable, human-scale city that attracts people rather than cars. Although parking revenue would be reduced in the short term, the City's improved walkability would enhance its economic viability by attracting people desperate for a sense of community and place.	M-A.4 (Curb Space Management Plan)	Thank you for your comment.	Doug Brown [K-A&I-14]
Should consider allocating impact fees to the construction of pedestrian paths/protected bike lane improvements to encourage VMT reduction.	M-A.5 (Regional VMT Mitigation)	Thank you for your comment.	Doug Brown [K-A&I-14]
Definitely include a rep from Caltrans and/or from the state government here because otherwise you'd encounter a lot of friction from Union Pacific.	M-A.6 (Sacramento Valley Station Regional Governance Structure)	Thank you for your comment.	Francois Kaepelin [K-A&I-14]
In addition to the identified roadway reallocation segments, the city should consider improving pedestrian/bicycle connections under the freeways that separate existing neighborhoods from the midtown/downtown area.	M-A.7 (Roadway Reallocations)	Thank you for your comment.	Doug Brown [K-A&I-14]
I approve of this page overall; will the city consider imposing a congestion charge? That would be a great idea for raising revenue and improving safety, in my view.	M-A.7 (Roadway Reallocations)	Thank you for your comment.	Jarrod Baniqued [K-A&I-14]
How about a BRT line along Freeport as well, or J Street all the way from Sac Valley to Sac State?	M-A.8 (Bus Rapid Transit)	Thank you for your comment.	Francois Kaepelin [K-A&I-14]
See if maybe you could work with Caltrans to implement some of this. They now have a policy of building fiber-optic cables when they're building new infrastructure because of state law. Or maybe implement a similar policy at the city level.	PFS-A.7 (Telecommunications Infrastructure in New Development)	Thank you for your comment.	Francois Kaepelin [K-A&I-15]
Maybe investigate the broader potential causes of violence, such as land use policies that discourage social interactions and the lack of things to do in a suburb that don't necessitate having a car.	YPRO-A.5 (Violence Prevention and Youth Development)	Thank you for your comment.	Francois Kaepelin [K-A&I-15]
add "and implement"	LUP-A.5 (Sustainability and Carbonization Standards)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-A&I-16]
include incentives, grants and other potential funding sources to increase participation. Use metrics to measure and report progress.	LUP-A.6 (Beyond Climate Resiliency Measures)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-A&I-16]
include identification and promotion of existing examples of NZE implementation	LUP-A.7 (Net-Zero Energy or Net-Positive Design)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-A&I-16]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Objective design standards are a must to keep the increased density from decimating the existing canopy, leave space for new tree plantings, and avoid the creation of new urban heat islands due to clustering of development projects.	LUP-A.8 (Planning and Development Code Update)	Thank you for your comment.	Francesca Reitano [K-A&I-17]
include identification of opportunities for renaming existing holdings (such as Sutter's Landing regional park) and naming and co-management of new holdings.	HCR-A.9 (Native American Cultural Resources)	Please see policy HCR-1.13 (Indigenous Cultures), which includes "naming of parks and places that reflects local Native American heritage and/or restores tribal names."	Dale Steele [K-A&I-19]
include native tree planting requirements to provide shade and cleaner air with any new approved facilities that encourage motor vehicle idling such drive through, pick-up and drop-off activities etc. Create retrofit standards for existing facilities as well.	ERC-A.7 (Cooling Landscape Standards)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-A&I-19]
include the development of anti-idling education and enforcement requirements for parking lots	ERC-A.10 (Parking Lot Shade Ordinance)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-A&I-20]
The city must find a solution wherein it can plant and maintain city street trees where park strips do not exist (the public right of way between the sidewalk and the street), especially in underserved neighborhoods that require shade as a matter of environmental justice.	ERC-A.11 (Street Standards for Tree Canopy)	M-3.2 (Street Design) and ERC-3.6 (Urban Forest Maintenance) provide guidance for policies that would address supporting trees in the right-of-way. ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements) also requires staff to review and amend the planning and development code to require minimum levels of tree planting in new development. Additionally, the Urban Forest Master Plan is underway. Please see project website for updates. https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/About-Urban-Forestry/Urban-Forest-Master-Plan	Francesca Reitano [K-A&I-20]
add new native tree planting requirements to provide shade and cleaner air with any new approved facilities that encourage motor vehicle idling such drive through, pick-up and drop-off activities etc. Create retrofit standards for existing facilities as well.	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements)	Thank you for your comment.	Dale Steele [K-A&I-20]
There must be objective design standards that are part of the ministerial review. Currently, after a project is approved and is a "done deal," the developer applies for tree removal permits. This is how we lose existing tree canopy.	ERC-A.9 (Minimum Tree Requirements)	Thank you for your comment.	Francesca Reitano [K-A&I-20]
good effort, include educational information	EJ-A.6 (Healthy Food Zoning)	Please see policies EJ-2.17 through EJ-2.20 for policies on healthy food awareness.	Dale Steele [K-A&I-21]
Should be "mandate" not "promote" as we need to be aggressive with our GHG reduction goals due to SACOG's 19% GHG reduction targets and because other counties aren't pulling their weight as much as they should.	M-A.7 (TDM Ordinance)	Thank you for your comment.	Francois Kaepelin [K-A&I-22]
include bicycle safety training with schools, parks, community programs etc.	M-A.8 (Street Design Standards Update)	Please see policy M-4.4 (Collaborative Safety Solutions).	Dale Steele [K-A&I-22]
This I like; will it be able to form partnerships with fiber optic providers? I think a case can be made for establishing municipal broadband through this venture.	PFS-A.8 (Municipal Telecommunications Team)	Thank you for your comment.	Jarrold Baniqued [K-A&I-22]
add bicycle safety training	YPRO-A.7 (Performance-Based Prioritization)	Please see policy M-4.4 (Collaborative Safety Solutions).	Dale Steele [K-A&I-23]

Comment	Goal/Policy/Action	Response/Revision	Commenter/Organization
Please consider the impact of programs and policies on Sacramento Age Friendly efforts. Sacramento enrolled in the Age Friendly Network several years ago. There is no mention of that program in the Implementation plan.		Thank you for your comment.	PATTY WAIT [K-A&I-24]
Do these plans help to move Sacramento closer to being national model of sustainable, equitable growth and community development?			
Mostly yes		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
These measures move Sacramento in the right direction. But the IRA makes more feasible. Has the City updated this since the IRA?		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
Overall yes; however, I think the active transport and natural gas replacement goals should be moved to 2042 at the latest		Please see the public review draft of the Existing Building Electrification Strategy.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
Would like to target more waste reduction goals. Ban plastic bags and Styrofoam takeout etc		Please see policy EJ-2.6 (Food Recovery Program) and goal section PFS-5.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
Permeable paving for patios, walkways, and driveways should be required on all new construction including remodeling.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
No.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
These are strong measures, but they do not include food justice.		Please see goal section EJ-2 for a series of policies on equitable access to food.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
The carbon neutral goal needs to be reevaluated; the latest scientific findings is that CO2 contributes only 10% of global warming		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
mmm		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
Lack of adequate electric vehicle charging stations does not promote reduction in climate change and global warming		Please see goal section M-1 for policies on EV-supportive infrastructure.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
Yes, this looks great!		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
Measures and goals should link changes in built environment to reduced VMTs and car pollution, not just heat exposure mitigation		Please see goal sections M-1, M-2, and M-3 for policies on creating a more equitable and sustainable multi-modal system, reducing reliance on single-occupant vehicles, and designing and maintaining streets that contribute to quality of life.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
There is too little focus on the importance of creating greenspaces and improving biodiversity		Please see policies in the Environmental Resources and Constraints Element and Youth, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
Increasing tree canopy alone won't bring us the changes we need.		Please see the Climate Action & Adaptation plan for additional policies, measures, and actions.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
we should be adding NATIVE GREENSPACES throughout the City		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]
Closer yes, not anywhere close or fast enough. Waste of time if these are your goals.		Thank you for your comment.	Station Board [K-A&I-1]