



Folsom River District Visioning Community Outreach Report

Report to the City of Folsom



AUGUST 2018

Prepared for:

The River District Organizing Committee

Prepared by:





ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

River District Organizing Committee Members

Claudia Cummings, Chair	John Messner
Rob Aragon	Megan Murphy
Rob Cline	Candy Miller
Joe Gagliardi	Don Reid
Bob Holderness	Rob Ross
Jim Karnis	Lynn Solberg
Will Kempton	

California Department of Parks and Recreation – Gold Fields District

Rich Preston, State Park Superintendent, Folsom Sector

Jim Micheaels, Senior Parks and Recreation Specialist

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

Johnathan Friedman, Recreation Division Chief

Master Planning Consultant

Ascent Environmental

Allen Folks, Project Director	Heidi Gen Kuong, Community Planner
Anh Thai, Senior Planner	Elizabeth Boyd, Community & Outreach Planner
Sangwoo Lee, Senior Urban Designer	Curtis Alling, Project Advisor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction.....	1
2	Executive Summary.....	2
3	Organization and Purpose	5
3.1	Purpose of the Workshops.....	5
3.2	Boundaries of the River District.....	5
4	Community Workshops.....	10
4.1	Visioning Process.....	10
4.2	Workshop Summaries and Results.....	12
5	Conclusion.....	38

FIGURES

Figure 2-1:	Top 3 Use /Amenity Locations in Each Subarea.....	4
Figure 3-1:	River District Boundaries	6
Figure 3-2:	Major Property Owners in the River District	8
Figure 3-3:	River District Subareas.....	9
Figure 4-1:	Community Kick-Off Annotated Map.....	15
Figure 4-2:	Table Visioning Summary	17
Figure 4-3:	Top 3 Use Locations in Each Subarea.....	34

TABLES

Table 4-1:	Uses / Amenities Explored by the Community	11
Table 4-2:	Visual Preference Survey Results	24
Table 4-3:	Top 3 Uses / Amenities by Subarea.....	33
Table 4-4:	Summary of Desired Uses / Amenities, Location Preferences, and Requirements	36

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: List of Participants
- Appendix B: Written Comments Received
- Appendix C: Powerpoint Presentations



Folsom River District Visioning Community Outreach Report

1 INTRODUCTION

RIVER DISTRICT

The riverfront areas of Folsom are great assets that are currently underutilized. While they offer recreational opportunities for Folsom residents, access to the river is limited. Folsom has the opportunity to make the river a more integral part of the community fabric by turning its attention to the river and increasing access.

(The City should) enhance the role of Lake Natoma as a place to recreate and an amenity for Folsom residents and elevate Lake Natoma's role in supporting local and regional business and commerce, including tourism, recreation and leisure, while maintaining compatibility with the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area General Plan.

(The City should) invest in strategically-located sites along the length of Lake Natoma for a diverse mix of passive and active recreation and tourism activities that are compatible with nearby land uses, historically and culturally important sites, significant habitat areas, restoration sites, and native fish and wildlife usage.

- Folsom General Plan 2035

Folsom's new General Plan 2035, just approved by the City Council, calls for consideration of a River District Master Plan for Folsom's riverfront area, one that is based on widespread community engagement, as well as coordination with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Bureau of Reclamation), the California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks), and the Sacramento County Regional Parks Department.

Development of a Master Plan would be a City responsibility if a future City Council decides to pursue this objective. The Folsom River District Organizing Committee, a private sector group, was created to spur this process along, which is the reason for convening a series of community workshops over the past six months to raise the issue of a potential River District Master Plan, to spark community interest in the process and to provide the City with a starting point in terms of public input if and when officials choose to take up the development of such a plan.

This Report includes a summary of the data and input gathered during three community workshops, along with other information, that has been provided to the River District Organizing Committee between our kick-off event in mid-March and completion of the process at the end of August. After a series of presentations to City Commissions, the Organizing Committee anticipates presenting the report to the City of Folsom for consideration in the preparation of a potential River District Master Plan, as laid out in the City's General Plan 2035.



2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Folsom River District visioning process took place between March 20 and August 6, 2018 as a volunteer led effort of the Folsom River District Organizing Committee. The Organizing Committee was sponsored by the Greater Folsom Partnership, a collaboration of the Folsom Chamber of Commerce, Visit Folsom, and Choose Folsom. In the approximately five-month time span, more than 250 people were engaged in the process that began with a community kick-off event in March and was followed by three public workshops. The Greater Folsom Partnership contracted with the planning and design firm, Ascent Environmental, Inc., to provide visioning and facilitation services for the public workshops on the River District. The focus of the workshops was to share the concept of a Folsom River District with the community and gather community input on possible ways to enhance and improve Folsom's waterfront on Lake Natoma and the American River.

This River District Community Workshop Report summarizes the data and input received during the outreach events to the community, and identifies the recurring themes, concerns, and ideas heard during the visioning process for the Folsom River District. While there were many diverse opinions expressed about uses and amenities desired in the River District, the constant was the strong value the Folsom community holds for Lake Natoma as a unique and precious resource and the key importance of having an inclusive public dialogue on the future of the River District.

There were those engaged in this process who felt Lake Natoma should continue to operate the way it has through the efforts of State Parks and the Bureau of Reclamation who own and manage the public lands adjacent to the lake. There was also a mutual respect for other opinions. These opinions include an interest and need to more cohesively plan for the public and private land opportunities that interface with and are adjacent to the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area (FLSRA) as Folsom serves its existing population and plans for its future growth. These adjacent areas provide opportunities to better coordinate with the programs and amenities offered in the Lake Natoma Unit of the FLSRA.

In the community kick-off event for the Folsom River District, there were several inspirational messages shared by members of the community about the opportunity of such a process to reimagine and reposition the American River / Lake Natoma as more of a front door to the city, rather than, as a backyard resource, similar to other waterfronts in cities of the 19th century. Lake Natoma is also uniquely a manmade reservoir for the Sacramento region, making the preservation of this resource a key priority.

It was recognized throughout the process that any proposals in the River District within the jurisdiction of State Parks and the Bureau of Reclamation, will need to be consistent with the policies of the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area General Plan / Resource Management Plan, unless otherwise amended. In that sense, the process for development that occurs in the Folsom River District, will, rightfully, be unlike any other development process in the city. Even though the visioning process was intended to stimulate ideas appropriate for the River District, it was also important to provide information to the community on the vision and plans contained in the FLSRA General Plan.


There was excellent community response for this type of exercise over the last five months, but the input received from this visioning process is just the beginning of the dialogue with the community on the River District. While every effort was made to capture and understand the general preferences of the participants, there should also be no speculation that the amenities suggested in this report represent a finite list, nor the issues discussed, a complete menu for consideration. Those that participated in this visioning effort should recognize that if and when the City chooses to pursue development of a River District Master Plan, that process may take an entirely different course. With that in mind, based on input received through the community kick-off meeting and three public workshops, the following next steps rose to the surface as steps that could be undertaken as part of future planning efforts.

1. Review and confirmation of the area to be included within the River District boundary.
2. Need for additional mapping of existing conditions and resources in the River District, to guide future decision-making, regarding uses and amenities and their appropriate locations.
3. Opportunities to partner with State Parks and the Bureau of Reclamation on projects of mutual interest, such as promoting the use of public transit to Lake Natoma, as a destination, with “last mile” improvements that enhance public access and safety from the light rail stations to the FLSRA. Support and implementation for other highly desired amenities expressed during the visioning workshops, consistent with plans and policies of the FLSRA General Plan / Resource Management Plan and for which no current or near-term plans have been developed, including:
 - a. Development of a boat house at Negro Bar, to accommodate private boat storage and build off the strength of Lake Natoma as a unique resource in the state for rowing and rowing championships held there each year.
 - b. Potential for a visitor center and / or museum in the South Shore subarea for interpretation of resources within the FLSRA. Additional interest was expressed for food concessions, possibly a bike concession and picnic areas (as suggested in the FLSRA General Plan), an overlook, and a nature center or interactive learning center for children.
 - c. Expansion of recreational opportunities at Negro Bar and potentially, a cultural center and small amphitheater for interpretation of Gold Rush era mining camps and miners.
 - d. Potential to improve access to the lake from the Historic District with a small dock for launching boats and concessionaire to support visitor use. The concessionaire could be located on State Park managed lands or be accommodated at the City Corporation Yard, though requiring further exploration.
 - e. Expanding interpretation and education and trail connections in Natoma Canyon. Perhaps this use can take on the form of additional trail overlooks.
 - f. Coordination with State Parks on developing a program to interpret a heron / egret rookery (including at Willow Creek), blue oak woodland (predominantly in the North Shore subarea), and grassland habitats (predominantly in the South Shore subarea).
 - g. Some type of museum, nature center, and / or cultural center providing education and learning were also highly desired by the community and proposed in various locations of the River District. Refer to Figure 2-1 for the top amenities proposed in each of the River District subareas.

Additional input on desired amenities in the district are presented in Chapter 4 of this report.

4. Timely conduct of additional workshops with the community and exploration of related issues, such as waterfront access to complement proposed uses or programs in future planning efforts.

Figure 2-1: Top 3 Use /Amenity Locations in Each Subarea



3 ORGANIZATION AND PURPOSE

This Community Outreach Report provides a summary of the process that was taken in the visioning effort to identify the desired elements of a River District for Folsom. This report is being provided as information to the city and the public on this initial visioning process for Folsom's River District. The report is organized into the following parts.

1. Introduction
2. Executive Summary
3. Organization and Purpose
4. Community Workshop Summary and Results
5. Conclusion

Appendix A: Workshop Presentations

Appendix B: Written Comments Received

Appendix C: Workshop Presentations

3.1 PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOPS


The City's Draft General Plan Update calls for consideration of the preparation of a River District Master Plan, to set a vision and implementation plan for enhancing and improving access to Folsom's riverfront. Organized by the Greater Folsom Partnership, the workshops for the Folsom River District, were intended to begin the discourse on a potential River District in the city. The purpose of the workshops was to introduce the concept of such a district, gather input from the Folsom community on what a River District could entail, and share input received from the community with the City of Folsom, as information in the preparation of a River District Master Plan should the city pursue that effort. The visioning process involved discussions with key staff from State Parks and the Bureau of Reclamation in order to understand the requirements, opportunities, and work in progress on the Lake Natoma unit of the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area (FLSRA), as guided by the FLSRA General Plan / Resource Management Plan. These discussions resulted in providing the community additional information regarding the existing plans for each of the identified subareas of the Folsom River District, as identified by the State Parks General Plan. An important goal of the process has been to seek a balance of ideas for a River District that contains both natural and urban elements on public and private lands, where there are opportunities to enhance Lake Natoma as a "front door" and amenity for the City of Folsom while complementing the environmental, historic, cultural, educational, and other requirements of State Parks.

3.2 BOUNDARIES OF THE RIVER DISTRICT

The proposed boundaries of the Folsom River District, shown in Figure 3-1, expands upon the Folsom River District Boundary identified in the General Plan 2035, to include Folsom Prison, (should that not be needed by the State in the future) and the area around Folsom Junction, and Kikkoman Foods. The project boundary follows the City of Folsom limits on the west, is bound



Figure 3-1: River District Boundaries



by Folsom-Auburn Road to the north and is generally bound by Folsom Boulevard to the east; but also includes the city-owned Natoma Ground Sluice Diggings (better known as the Chinese Diggings) site, the Kikkoman Foods and Folsom Junction lands north of Willow Creek, the Historic Folsom district, the city-owned Civic Center lands, and the State-owned Folsom Prison, west of Folsom Boulevard.

3.2.1 MAJOR PROPERTY OWNERS WITHIN THE RIVER DISTRICT

The River District includes a mix of public and private lands, as shown in Figure 3-2. State and federal lands within the FLSRA occupy over 77% of the land identified in the Folsom River District. Approximately 7% of the River District is city-owned lands and the remaining 16% of the River District is privately-owned land.

3.2.2 RIVER DISTRICT SUBAREAS

Over the course of three public workshops, the subareas for the Folsom River District have been refined. Figure 3-3 shows the proposed Folsom River District subareas. From north to south, the proposed subareas are:

- Natoma Canyon
- Folsom Prison
- Folsom Civic Center
- Negro Bar
- Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard (note that going forward the River District Committee recommends that the City Corporation Yard be identified as a separate subarea from the Historic Folsom subarea)
- North Shore
- Folsom Junction
- Lake Forest
- Willow Creek
- South Shore
- Alder Creek Pond / Automall



Figure 3-2: Major Property Owners in the River District





Figure 3-3: River District Subareas





4 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS

4.1 VISIONING PROCESS




























The visioning workshops were sequenced to understand in greater detail the community's preferences for uses / amenities desired and key concerns for the River District. In doing so, each workshop built off the information learned from the previous workshop, to work with the community to envision the potential uses / amenities that could improve or enhance the River District, recognizing that a diversity of uses is desired to satisfy the interests of all who participated. The process also focused on identifying the potential subareas within the overall River District, where different use or treatment of the land and resources would logically apply. The visioning process for the Folsom River District consisted of:

- **A Community Kick-off "Ideation" Event** was held to gather initial impressions on the existing resources, concepts, concerns, and interests that should be addressed in the Folsom River District planning process.
- **Visioning Workshop #1** introduced the community to the proposed boundaries of the River District; provided background on the physical and development constraints of the District; and shared the key recommendations of the FLSRA General Plan. Workshop participants were engaged in two visioning exercises: 1) to map and weigh in on the desired uses / amenities they'd like to see in identified subareas of the River District; and 2) to vote on the character and scale of images they preferred to see in the area, organized along a spectrum of low to higher intensity uses.
- **Visioning Workshop #2** provided a recap and the result of the visioning exercise in Workshop #1 and provided additional information on uses / amenities in the subareas of the River District allowed under the FLSRA General Plan; and, to inform and confirm the community's preference for several types of uses / amenities that could be provided on public or private lands in the River District. Voting clicker technology was used to collect and document the community's preference for a range of uses / amenities and a visual preference survey of the character and scale the community preferred for each amenity was conducted.
- **Visioning Workshop #3** reported back the results and community preferences in the second visioning workshop and provided the community with information on the next steps the Folsom River District Committee will follow going forward. The initial step is that this Community Outreach Report will be shared with the City of Folsom and various City Commissions with encouragement for the City to move forward with development of a Folsom River District Master Plan.

4.1.1 INPUT ON USES / AMENITIES DESIRED OR UNDESIRED

Through the community kick-off event and two visioning workshops (Workshops 1 and 2), 30 representative uses / amenities were explored to determine the community’s preference for each general category of use within the River District and where that use should occur. In no particular order, these uses are illustrated by the icons in the table below, organized by general themes. It should be noted that in addition to the uses below, more uses and specific location for uses were identified by the community over the course of the visioning process. This input is included in the workshop summaries and results in Section 4.2.

Table 4-1: Uses / Amenities Explored by the Community

Natural Uses / Preservation			History, Culture, Education		
 Wildlife Viewing	 Nature Preserve	 Heron Rookery / Bird Nesting	 Interpretive Signage	 Native Plant Demonstration	 Public Art
History, Culture, Education (continued)					
 Historic Interest	 Museum	 Visitor Center	 Cultural Center	 Nature Center / Learning Center	 Small Amphitheater
Recreational Pursuits					
 Boating	 Swimming	 Bicycling	 Fishing	 Horseback Riding	 Camping / Glamping
Recreational Pursuits (continued)			Low Intensity Development		
 Picnicking	 Play Area	 Beaches	 Boathouse	 Boat Concession	 Food Concession
Low Intensity Development (continued)			Medium Intensity Development		
 Overlook	 Boat Tours	 Water Taxi	 Community Amphitheater	 Dining / Drinks	 Hotel



4.2 WORKSHOP SUMMARIES AND RESULTS

A synopsis of the community kick-off event and each of the community workshops for the Folsom River District follows. Refer to Appendix C for the presentations of each community workshop.

4.2.1 COMMUNITY KICK-OFF EVENT

A community kick-off or “ideation” event was conducted at Lake Natoma Inn on March 20, to formally invite community participation in the Folsom River District visioning process. During this event, community members that attended were given an opportunity to annotate on maps and on a large wall paper their comments for a River District in Folsom. This kick-off event generated the following key themes, described in more detail in the results summary that follow.

1. Preserving the Natural Landscape / Ecology
2. Honoring and Celebrating the Area’s History
3. Expanding Recreational Pursuits
4. Providing Limited Development Opportunities in Appropriate Locations
5. Providing Low-Power River Transportation Modes
6. Increasing and Improving Access to the River and Riverfront Bike Trails

A. WALL PAPER INPUT / IDEAS

As part of the community ideation event, the public was asked to provide input on ideas for the River District. Land use concepts and programs identified during the ideation meeting included:

River / Riverfront Recreational Activities

- Fishing, paddling, and other opportunities on the water
- Community boathouse for local high school and college athletes, for Upper Natoma Rowing Club, who have been practicing at Lake Natoma for the last 8 years, and for private boat storage
 - ▮ The boathouse should be able to store at least 40’ rowing shells
 - ▮ Continue promoting and enhancing rowing events, including more spectator viewing opportunities along the lake
 - ▮ Preference for the boathouse at Negro Bar, with access to both sides along the width of Lake Natoma



Community ideas for the Folsom River District were gathered and displayed on large wall paper

• Docking access within the Historic District, so people can walk into Historic Folsom and come back and paddle across the lake

- Passive recreational uses near homes
- A floating home / art community with visitor opportunities for viewing brightly, painted homes and food kiosks
- Zipline from upper Folsom to Negro Bar
- Waterfall (man-made)
- Water taxi; gondola transport from Historic Folsom to Negro Bar
- Pontoon boat tours, brew boat
- Camping
- Sand volleyball

Increase and Improved Trail and River Access

- Access to the river from the Historic District
- More pedestrian bridges across Folsom Boulevard
- More trail access to the river and trail connections with the Willow Creek Trail and other city trails

Preservation of Natural Resources

- Preserve open space and shoreline on the lake that is used as a wildlife corridor
- Opportunities for seeing and experiencing nature

Celebration of the History Along the River

- With historic markers, honoring Gold Rush and mining history of the area; interpretation of significant Native American sites.
- The prehistory and native American history of the area
- An interpretive park at the corporation yard site

Development Concepts / Opportunities

- Building off Folsom's motto: "Distinctive by Nature," perhaps something like the Effie Yeaw Nature Center at the corporation yard site for educating children and families on the sensitivity of this natural setting
- Dining options, a wine bar
- A resort hotel with paddle up options and boat parking or boat house
- Open air amphitheater for concerts and movie nights
- Multi-use central core
- More parking in the Historic District



B. MAP INPUT

The community input that was provided on maps are associated with the numbered comments below. These are keyed into Figure 4-1, organized by local area place names (for the purposes of the meeting summary).

CSUS Aquatic Center / Nimbus Dam

1. Aquatic center boat launch and safe boating activity center
2. Potential for water taxi from the Aquatic Center or Willow Creek to Historic Folsom

Lake Natoma South Shore

3. Deer grazing on the north end
4. Wildlife corridor along the shoreline
5. Potential community amphitheater; some noted they would not recommend here
6. Pedestrian bridge over Folsom Boulevard suggested from light rail station over Iron Point Road (similar to what was done at Blue Ravine and East Bidwell)
7. Potential for shared parking opportunities at Folsom Premium Outlet parking lots

Willow Creek Recreation Area

8. Existing boat/kayak launch; the inlet area also attracts fish
9. Enhance the activity hub already at Willow Creek
10. Potential community amphitheater; some noted they would not recommend here

Lake Forest and Lake Natoma North Shore

4. Wildlife corridor along the shoreline

Lake Natoma Shores

11. On the corporation yard site, an interpretive park or nature center; perhaps, a small hotel

Negro Bar

12. Existing campsite location
13. Potential for boat house, maybe south of the camp sites on County land

Historic District and Folsom Powerhouse

14. Access opportunities to the river from Historic Folsom, including more parking associated with proposed riverfront activities

Mississippi Bar and Other Areas South

15. What are the future plans for this area? Existing, observed use are boat access to pond and lagoons on the south end and eagle nesting area on the north end.
16. Uses and connections to future Glenborough development.

Figure 4-1: Community Kick-Off Annotated Map



- LEGEND**
- Proposed River District Boundary
 - Current Folsom Prison Property
 - Riverfront Subareas / Zones
 - Creek Trail
 - Water Taxi Path to/from Historic Folsom?
 - Existing Boat Launch
 - Additional Trail Access; Crossing Improvements

- Activity Centers or Hubs
- CSUS Aquatic Center
- Willow Creek Recreation Area
- City Corporation Yard
- Historic Folsom

- Annotated Comments
- Water taxi
- Deer grazing area
- Wildlife corridor along shoreline
- Amphitheater not recommended at this site
- Pedestrian bridge crossing
- Parking structure opportunities

- Willow Creek boat, kayak launch
- More trail connections to the east
- Existing camp site location
- Future boat house location?
- Planned uses at Mississippi Bar?
- Connections to/from Glenborough





4.2.2 VISIONING WORKSHOP #1

Visioning Workshop #1 took place on April 11, 2018, from 5 pm to 7 pm, at the Folsom Community Center. Approximately 120 people attended this first visioning workshop, which shared with the community the proposal within the Draft Folsom 2035 General Plan Update to include a River District overlay zone, including the development of a River District Master Plan. Visioning Workshop #1 introduced the community to the proposed River District boundary as proposed by this process; existing land ownership and environmental constraints such as steep slopes, flood zone areas, and wildlife habitat areas; and, the land use designations and key concepts and policies of the FLSRA General Plan / Resource Management Plan governing the public lands of the Lake Natoma Unit of the FLSRA. Key themes heard from the community kick-off event were shared as a starting point of discussion, as well as benchmark examples of other river cities that had similar characteristics to Folsom and have unique features or assets along their riverfronts. These cities included Durango, Colorado; Missoula, Montana; Hood River, Oregon; Ladybird Lake in Austin, Texas; and Richmond, Virginia.

Two table visioning exercises were conducted to understand the desired uses or amenities within the Folsom River District. The first exercise asked public workshop participants at each of the tables to place icon stickers on maps identifying various uses / amenities based on where they thought those uses should occur within the subareas of the district. Facilitators at each table recorded the input from the community at each table on their proposed uses and priorities for the River District. The second visioning exercise had workshop participants comment on their preferences for character images of various uses arranged on a board, by placing a green dot on images that were desired somewhere within the River District and an orange dot on the images that were not desired in the River District.

A. TABLE VISIONING EXERCISE

The community participated in a table visioning exercise, where they were asked to place use icon stickers on a map where they preferred those uses to occur in the River District. The results of this exercise are graphically shown in Figure 4-2. Comments collected around the table on key themes / use input from this visioning exercise are also summarized below.


Natural Resources / Preservation

- Protect bald eagle habitat and foraging nesting area
- A nature center or learning center at the corporation yard (e.g., Effie Yeaw)
- Wildlife viewing in places where animals are today
- Need for habitat connectivity
- More park rangers
- A nature preserve near the shores of the City Corporation Yard (north of North Shore)



Community ideas for the Folsom River District were gathered and displayed on large wall paper sheets.

Figure 4-2: Table Visioning Summary





History, Culture, Education

- More historical signage monuments
- Redo/upgrade interpretive signs
 - Provide interpretation in a variety of forms – maps, signs, mobile app
- Provide signage, interpretation to tell people and visitors why this place is so valuable, such as with a heron rookery, a botanical garden, or native plant demonstration area
- Education about boating safety
- Wayfinding signs are also needed
- Preserve, study the archaeological site next to the Corporation Yard
- A museum at Negro Bar
- A community center (for holistic education, organic cooking classes) near the Powerhouse, Negro Bar, or anywhere else
- Amphitheater or theater in the park
- Save the Chinese Diggings

Recreational Use / Activities

- Water access from the City corporation yard
- Natural park at the corporation yard
- Make the Class I bike trail the best it can be
- Need for boat storage and a boathouse separate from the CSUS Aquatic Center for unaffiliated teams and high school and college crew
- If there is a boat house, keep it at Negro Bar (small scale and non-intrusive)
- A cycling hub
- Trail system. Addressing different recreation type interactions (bicycling, walking, equestrians); split bike and walking trails; a walking promenade; signage for walking
- Waterfront wildlife viewing (from kayak)
- Public art (similar to Natoma Station) rock piles
- Family activities at Sutter Street
- Play areas
- Picnic areas

Development Uses

- Develop inspiring public spaces
- Farm to fork food and concessions
- Wine bar within walking distance of the Historic District
- A vibrant historic area
- Water taxi
- Acquire Cliff High School for combination of music / restaurant and event center
- Hotels / commercial uses near Nimbus Flat / Automall site

Public Access

- Trail connection at Glenn Drive
- More parking to provide access for small craft
- More information on public access
- Water fountains along the bike trail

Issues / Concerns / Comments

- Potential loss of natural resources
 - ✓ Don't touch state and federal lands; no hotel on those lands
 - ✓ No intensive development in habitat areas
 - ✓ Will lose eagles, etc. with more development
 - ✓ A unique area unlike any other in the state; keep it natural; don't ruin it with development
- Respect the existing State Park General Plan and its plan for uses. Help implement the General Plan. Consider what can and cannot be done, recognizing public lands and sensitive resources.
 - ✓ Recreation that respects the environment
- Noise and pollution from development and recreational activities
 - ✓ No motorized boats on the water
 - ✓ Be sensitive to noise issues of adjacent neighbors and on the water
 - ✓ Reduce light pollution from Folsom and don't add to it (a particular concern for residents across the river from Folsom)
 - ✓ No intensive development, such as hotel, dining, water taxis, food concessions, or an amphitheater that generates large amounts of trash
 - ✓ No amphitheater or tourist attractions by the river
 - ✓ Dog waste facilities along trails
 - ✓ Fishing is not recommended - high mercury levels in the water
- Do not commercialize; preserve the nature and serenity of the lake
- Workshop Process / Set-Up:
 - ✓ River District boundary should include the other side of the River (City of Orangevale)
 - ✓ Hard to measure impacts of proposed uses
 - ✓ Plans should make a distinction between what is desired on public land vs. private land

The responses from the community in this mapping exercise and through their table input suggest prioritizing:






























- Enhancements to existing uses already occurring within the subareas;
- Reinforcing the priorities for resource protection in the management zones studied in the FLSRA General Plan;
- Expanding recreational opportunities along the river, while being sensitive to natural resources and resource protection;
- Potential support for compatible uses and amenities, consistent with the land use character or opportunities of each subarea, such as, the more park-like setting of Negro Bar; the more entertainment-focused setting of Historic Folsom; more family-oriented setting of the Civic Center area; and the more resource intensive areas of other subareas in the District; and
- Overall development restraint, a light footprint in the River District, especially within the resource areas of Federal and State Park lands and in general, lands and opportunity sites west of Folsom Boulevard.

B. CHARACTER BOARD EXERCISE AND RESULTS

Visioning Workshop #1 gauged the community's interest in use and character through the placement of dots on a character board, illustrating a variety of uses of different intensities.

What Uses and Character is Desired in the Riverfront District?
Place a green dot next to character images desired and an orange dot next to character images undesired.

← Low Intensity Preservation → Higher Intensity Activation

Natural Landscape / Ecological Values	  	 	
Historic and Cultural Values	 	  	 
Recreational Value	 	  	 
Economic and Tourism Draws	 	 	 
Alternative Transportation / Circulation		 	

The results of this exercise showed a preference for natural uses / preservation as a key priority, as well as, the interpretation and education of the historic, cultural, and natural resources in the district. In particular, there was write-in interest for a nature center or children’s learning center and strong interest for museums and creative interpretation of history and culture. Enhancements to existing boating and biking, hiking activities along the river, including a boat house for private boat storage and more trail markers and bike and pedestrian amenities were also favored.

Generally, a variety of lower-intensity uses that can be designed to fit in with the more natural character and setting of Lake Natoma seemed to be preferred, though this did not necessarily preclude more park-like or manicured settings in certain locations, as illustrated in the preferred images (by number of votes in green bubbles), to the right.



28



25



21



25



28



21



34




24





29




27



Less desirable uses for the community consisted of higher intensity urban development, such as large footprint hotels, large amphitheaters, and development on the river's edge. Urban edge conditions, such as the linear concrete walkways and canals, present in some cities, was also not desired. Boat tours were also seen by many participants as not an appropriate amenity for the River District.



The community's preferences seem to indicate less of a desire for more urban development along the river's edge.



4.2.3 VISIONING WORKSHOP #2

Visioning Workshop #2 took place on June 4, 2018, from 6 pm to 8 pm, at the Folsom Community Center. Approximately 140 people attended this second visioning workshop for the Folsom River District, focused on confirming the community's land use and activity preferences as these relate to each of the subareas of the River District. Workshop #2 summarized back the key character and land use themes of interest and the results from the visioning exercises in Workshop #1. Additional input was shared with the community on each of the FLSRA General Plan Management Zones for Lake Natoma; their proposed land use designations, intent, key guidelines, and projects completed, planned, or proposed by State Parks over the next 5-10 years as these relate to plans in progress within each of the subareas of the River District. Many of the amenities desired by the community were indeed consistent with the FLSRA General Plan. However, several amenities proposed were not consistent with services State Parks provides but might be considered on city or private lands. Section 4.2.4 includes a summary overview of each use and their consistency with the State Park General Plan.

Based on this background information, workshop participants were asked to engage in a visual preference survey, using electronic clickers to vote on their preference among four different image options for various uses that could occur in the River District. The community was also asked whether they supported each use, with a vote of yes, maybe, or no. 17 uses / amenities requiring further clarification of the community's preferences on use and/or character, based on input from the first visioning workshop, were chosen for the survey. These uses included:

- type and character of museum or visitor facility, such as a history museum, nature center, cultural center, a visitor center;
- small amphitheater;
- public art;
- native plant demonstration;
- overlook;
- food concession;
- water taxi;
- boat tour;
- camping/glamping;
- play area;
- boat house / storage;
- community amphitheater;
- restaurant; and
- hotel

The visual preference survey and the input received by the community from this survey are presented in Table 3-2 in the next section. Following this exercise, workshop participants were given the same use icons they voted upon and asked to stop by 5 stations, organized by key use themes, to place these use icons on their preferred subarea location for that use.

A. VISUAL PREFERENCE SURVEY EXERCISE RESULTS

Workshop attendees participated in a visual preference survey through electronic voting that asked them to vote on their top preferences among four image options for various uses that could occur in the River District. Workshop participants were then asked whether or not they supported the particular use or amenity somewhere within the River District.

Icons for these same uses were made available and workshop participants were asked to place these icons at their most preferred location for that use. The character image preferences, votes in support of each use, and the preferred location for that use are summarized in Table 4-2.

Table 4-2: Visual Preference Survey Results





History Museum (88 votes):		
1	2	Support for History Museum? (103 votes) Yes – 58% (60 votes) Maybe – 26% (27 votes) No – 16% (16 votes)
 18% (16 votes)	 52% (46 votes)	
3	4	Preferred Location of Use: 1. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard 2. South Shore 3. Civic Center 4. Folsom Junction 5. Negro Bar, South Shore
 15% (13 votes)	 15% (13 votes)	

Table 4-2: Visual Preference Survey Results (cont'd)













Nature Center (101 votes):		
<p>1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">35% (35 votes)</p>	<p>2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">7% (7 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Nature Center? (101 votes)</p> <p>Yes – 68% (69 votes)</p> <p>Maybe – 21% (21 votes)</p> <p>No – 11% (11 votes)</p>
<p>3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">51% (52 votes)</p>	<p>4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">7% (7 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard 2. Negro Bar 3. South Shore, Willow Creek 4. North Shore 5. Folsom Junction, Civic Center, Natoma Canyon
Cultural Center (88 votes):		
<p>1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">32% (32 votes)</p>	<p>2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">22% (22 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Cultural Center? (103 votes)</p> <p>Yes – 53% (55 votes)</p> <p>Maybe – 22% (23 votes)</p> <p>No – 25% (26 votes)</p>
<p>3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">41% (41 votes)</p>	<p>4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">5% (5 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. South Shore, Willow Creek 2. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard 3. Negro Bar 4. North Shore, Alder Creek Pond 5. Folsom Junction, Civic Center

Table 4-2: Visual Preference Survey Results (cont'd)

Visitor Center (96 votes):

<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">29% (28 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">25% (24 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Visitor Center? (103 votes) Yes – 60% (58 votes) Maybe – 22% (21 votes) No – 18% (17 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">31% (30 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">15% (14 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. South Shore 2. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard 3. Nimbus Flat, Willow Creek, Negro Bar 4. Folsom Junction

Small Amphitheater (102 votes):









<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">5% (5 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">35% (36 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Small Amphitheater? (105 votes) Yes – 56% (59 votes) Maybe – 15% (16 votes) No – 29% (30 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">11% (11 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">49% (50 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Civic Center 2. Negro Bar 3. North Shore 4. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard, Folsom Junction, Alder Creek Pond 5. South Shore, Folsom Prison

Table 4-2: Visual Preference Survey Results (cont'd)

Public Art (91 votes):

<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">58% (53 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">19% (17 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Public Art? (105 votes) Yes – 65% (68 votes) Maybe – 20% (21 votes) No – 15% (16 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">5% (5 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">18% (16 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard 2. Civic Center 3. Lake Forest, Natoma Canyon 4. South Shore, North Shore, Folsom Junction, Negro Bar

Native Plant Demonstration (98 votes):









<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">59% (58 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">30% (29 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Native Plant Demonstration? (102 votes) Yes – 67% (68 votes) Maybe – 20% (20 votes) No – 14% (14 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">5% (5 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">6% (6 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. North Shore 2. South Shore 3. Civic Center, Natoma Canyon, Willow Creek 4. Negro Bar

Table 4-2: Visual Preference Survey Results (cont'd)

Overlook (96 votes):

<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">27% (26 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">22% (21 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Overlook? (103 votes) Yes – 70% (72 votes) Maybe – 15% (15 votes) No – 16% (16 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">4% (4 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">47% (45 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use: 1. Natoma Canyon 2. South Shore 3. Lake Forest, Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard</p>

Food Concession Format (82 votes):









<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">26% (21 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">50% (41 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Food Concession? (105 votes) Yes – 47% (49 votes) Maybe – 12% (13 votes) No – 41% (43 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">4% (3 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">21% (17 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use: 1. Negro Bar 2. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard 3. Willow Creek 4. South Shore, Lake Forest</p>

Table 4-2: Visual Preference Survey Results (cont'd)

Water Taxi (80 votes):

<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">18% (14 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">21% (17 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Water Taxis? (107 votes) Yes – 45% (48 votes) Maybe – 9% (10 votes) No – 46% (49 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">0% (0 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">61% (49 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard 2. Negro Bar 3. Nimbus Flat 4. Lake Forest, South Shore

Boat Tour (82 votes):









<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">50% (41 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">21% (17 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Boat Tour? (105 votes) Yes – 37% (39 votes) Maybe – 14% (15 votes) No – 49% (51 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">16% (13 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">13% (11 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Negro Bar 2. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard 3. Nimbus Flat 4. Lake Forest, Willow Creek

Table 4-2: Visual Preference Survey Results (cont'd)

Camping / Glamping (98 votes):

<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">40% (39 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">7% (7 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Camping / Glamping? (106 votes) Yes – 56% (59 votes) Maybe – 10% (11 votes) No – 34% (36 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">40% (39 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">13% (13 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Negro Bar 2. North Shore 3. Natoma Canyon 4. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard, South Shore 5. Folsom Prison

Play Area (83 votes):









<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">20% (17 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">71% (59 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Play Area? (104 votes) Yes – 66% (69 votes) Maybe – 12% (12 votes) No – 22% (23 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">6% (5 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">2% (2 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Negro Bar 2. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard 3. North Shore 4. Civic Center 5. South Shore

Table 4-2: Visual Preference Survey Results (cont'd)

Boat House / Storage (86 votes):

<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">28% (24 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">4% (4 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Boat House / Storage? (100 votes) Yes – 52% (52 votes) Maybe – 13% (13 votes) No – 35% (35 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">26% (22 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">42% (36 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Negro Bar 2. Lake Forest 3. Willow Creek 4. South Shore

Community Amphitheater (88 votes):













<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">48% (39 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">10% (8 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Community Amphitheater? (106 votes) Yes – 44% (47 votes) Maybe – 13% (14 votes) No – 42% (45 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">26% (21 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">16% (13 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Negro Bar 2. Civic Center 3. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard, North Shore, Folsom Junction, Willow Creek

Table 4-2: Visual Preference Survey Results (cont'd)

Restaurant (86 votes):

<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">14% (12 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">21% (18 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Restaurant? (102 votes) Yes – 49% (50 votes) Maybe – 9% (9 votes) No – 42% (43 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">1% (1 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">64% (55 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard 2. Willow Creek 3. North Shore 4. Natoma Canyon, Negro Bar, Lake Forest, South Shore

Hotel (73 votes):

<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">47% (34 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">32% (23 votes)</p>	<p>Support for Hotel? (107 votes) Yes – 35% (37 votes) Maybe – 18% (19 votes) No – 48% (51 votes)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">14% (10 votes)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">8% (6 votes)</p>	<p>Preferred Location of Use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historic Folsom / City Corporation Yard 2. North Shore 3. Folsom Junction, Willow Creek


B. USE / AMENITY LOCATION PREFERENCE EXERCISE

To provide an understanding of the plans for public lands within the Folsom River District, Visioning Workshop #2 included an overview of the State Park Management Zones within the Lake Natoma unit of the FLSRA General Plan, including land use information, management zone intent, key General Plan Guidelines, and projects and plans in progress by State Parks within each of the proposed subareas of the River District. This guidance is summarized in the PowerPoint presentation for Visioning Workshop #2, provided in Appendix B. Based on the 17 uses or amenities included in the Visual Preference exercise, workshop participants were asked to place icon stickers of these same 17 uses onto District Subarea maps at stations around the room, indicating their most preferred location for that use. Based on this input, Figure 4-3 and Table 4-3 indicates the top 3 uses preferred within each of the subareas of the River District.

Table 4-3: Top 3 Uses / Amenities by Subarea

River District Subarea	Top 3 Desired Uses in Subareas		
Natoma Canyon	1. Overlook	2. Native Plant Demonstration	3. Camping / Glamping
Folsom Prison	1. Cultural Center; Small Amphitheater; Camping / Glamping		
Folsom Civic Center	1. Small Amphitheater	2. Community Amphitheater	3. Play Area; Native Plant Demonstration
Negro Bar	1. Boathouse	2. Camping / Glamping; Community Amphitheater	3. Food Concession
Historic Folsom	1. Public Art	2. Museum; Restaurant	3. Nature Center; Food Concession
Folsom Junction	1. Nature Center; Small Amphitheater; Museum		
North Shore	1. Native Plant Demonstration	2. Camping / Glamping	3. Play Area
Lake Forest	1. Native Plant Demonstration	2. Boathouse	3. Public Art; Food Concession
Willow Creek	1. Nature Center; Restaurant	2. Cultural Center	3. Food Concession; Visitor Center
South Shore	1. Overlook	2. Visitor Center; Nature Center; Museum	3. Cultural Center; Native Plant Demonstration
Alder Creek Pond / Auto Mall	1. Visitor Center	2. Cultural Center; Small Amphitheater	

Figure 4-3: Top 3 Use Locations in Each Subarea



The following additional comments were offered up by workshop participants at each of the use stations to clarify some of the map responses.

History, Culture, Education – Museums and Center

- One center providing multiples uses, such as at Point Reyes or the Effie Yeaw Nature Center (four others concurred)
- Museum at the Diggings site and another Native American museum at Negro Bar
- A nature / education center for kids to learn about nature and Folsom’s heritage / history (two others concurred)
- A Chinese Cultural Center (two others concurred)

History, Culture, Education – Interpretive Signage and Public Art

- History-led tours
- Native plants all along the district
- Interpretive signage all along the district – not just one place
- Native plant demonstration / signage along trails
- Native American history has been largely ignored. It needs to be added to these discussions.

Recreational Amenities

- There are already hundreds of kayakers / canoers and rowers; capacity needs to be addressed (one other concurred)
- Redesignate existing trails to multi-use, where appropriate (northside of Lake Natoma) (Three others concurred)

Low Intensity Visitor Amenities

- Food concessions are not appropriate on the riverfront; high waste, little or no plastics in the area

High Intensity Visitor Amenities

- Don’t support high-intensity uses in the River District (three others concurred)
- Hotel at the corporation yard; amphitheater at the rodeo (least impact, already developed sites)
- Emphasis on low intensity (two others concurred)
- Community amphitheater will be an issue because of its adjacency to the water
- Willow Creek is not appropriate for hotel or food. It is a kayak launch site and native bird / animal habitat
- Use rodeo arena as amphitheater when not in use, multi-use, repurpose.

4.2.4 VISIONING WORKSHOP #3

Visioning Workshop #3 took place on August 6, 2018, from 6 pm to 7:30 pm, at the Folsom Community Center. Approximately 105 people participated in this workshop, which included a presentation of the findings of the second visioning workshop. The summary included a review of each of the uses / amenities that were voted upon in Workshop #2, support or lack of support for the amenities within the River District, and their suggested locations in the River District, as summarized in Section 4.2.3. The consistency of the use with the State Park General Plan was



also identified. Table 4-4 summarizes the suggested uses / amenities in Visioning Workshop #2, their preferred locations, and the consistency of the use with plans for the FLSRA General Plan / Resource Management Plan. Uses not permitted or provided by State Parks may be provided on public or private lands outside the FLSRA. Coordination with State Parks and the Bureau of Reclamation is required or highly encouraged for uses and development within the River District.

Table 4-4: Summary of Suggested Uses / Amenities, Location Preferences, and Requirements

Top 3 Desired Uses / Amenities	Location Preference in River District Subarea (Preference Ranking)	Permitted within, Consistency with Plans for the FLSRA General Plan / Resource Management Plan (Yes, No, Why?) or Permitted within Other Locations within the River District
Overlook	Natoma Canyon (1) South Shore (1)	Yes. Use and desired location of use is consistent with the FLSRA General Plan.
Native Plant Demonstration	North Shore (1) Lake Forest (1) Natoma Canyon (2) Folsom Civic Center (3) South Shore (3)	No. Use is not currently a service State Park provides, though it could be supported on city-owned or private lands outside the FLSRA. Use would require an amendment to the FLSRA General Plan if desired with the FLSRA.
Camping / Glamping	Folsom Prison (1) Negro Bar (2) North Shore (2) Natoma Canyon (3)	Yes. Use is generally supported in the FLSRA, with projects/plan in progress at Negro Bar. Use may be permitted in other locations.
Cultural Center	Folsom Prison (1) Willow Creek (2) South Shore (2) Alder Creek Pond / Auto Mall (2)	Yes. Use is supported in the FLSRA General Plan, particularly at Negro Bar or as a component of a multi-use visitor center in the South Shore subarea. The use could be supported on city-owned or private lands outside the FLSRA, such as within the Alder Creek Pond / Auto Mall subarea.
Small Amphitheater	Folsom Prison (1) Folsom Civic Center (1) Folsom Junction (1) Alder Creek Pond / Auto Mall (2)	Yes, use is supported by the FLSRA General Plan at Negro Bar. Use can also be supported on city-owned or private lands outside the FLSRA, as suggested by the preferred use locations.
Community Amphitheater	Folsom Civic Center (2) Negro Bar (2)	No. Use is not supported in the FLSRA General Plan and would require an amendment to the FLSRA General Plan if desired with the FLSRA. Use can be supported on city-owned or private land outside the FLSRA.
Boathouse	Negro Bar (1) Lake Forest (2)	Yes, use is supported by the FLSRA General Plan, particularly at Negro Bar, but may also be supported on the public, private lands in the Lake Forest subarea as suggested.

Table 4-4: Summary of Suggested Uses / Amenities, Location Preferences, and Requirements

Food Concession	Negro Bar (3) Historic Folsom (3) Lake Forest (3) Willow Creek (3)	Yes, use is supported by the FLSRA General Plan. Use can also be supported on city-owned or private land outside the FLSRA.
Public Art	Historic Folsom (1) Lake Forest (3)	No. Use is not currently a service State Park provides, though it could be supported on city-owned or private lands outside the FLSRA.
Museum	Folsom Junction (1) South Shore (2) Historic Folsom (2)	Yes. Use is supported in the FLSRA General Plan if it provides interpretation of resources within the FLSRA and/or functions as a multi-use visitor center in the South Shore subarea. Use can also be supported on city-owned or private land outside the FLSRA, including at the other preferred locations.
Restaurant	Willow Creek (1) Historic Folsom (2)	No. Use is not supported in the FLSRA General Plan and would require an amendment to the FLSRA General Plan if desired there. Use can be supported on city-owned or private land outside the FLSRA.
Nature Center	Willow Creek (1) South Shore (2) Historic Folsom (3)	Yes. Use is supported in the FLSRA General Plan, but location would require coordination with State Parks and the Bureau of Reclamation. Use may also be supported on city-owned or private land outside the FLSRA.
Play Area	Folsom Civic Center (3) North Shore (3)	No. Use is not currently a service State Park provides, though it could be supported on city-owned or private lands outside the FLSRA. Use would require an amendment to the FLSRA General Plan if desired in the FLSRA.
Visitor Center	Alder Creek Pond / Auto Mall (1) South Shore (2)	Yes. Use is supported in the FLSRA General Plan and proposed as a multi-use center within the South Shore Subarea. Use can also be supported on city-owned or private land outside the FLSRA in coordination with State Parks.

The visioning process and Workshop #3 was closed with a summary of next steps. Workshop participants will be invited to view this Community Outreach Report and notified of presentations that will be given to the various City Commissions regarding this visioning process, following adoption of the City's 2035 General Plan Update.



5 CONCLUSION

The River District Organizing Committee estimates that more than 250 people were engaged in this five-month community outreach effort. While this is an excellent public response for this type of exercise, it is important to note that the information in the report represents “a snapshot in time” from a small but engaged slice of the City’s population. As previously stated, there should be no speculation that the amenities suggested in this report represent a finite list, nor the issues discussed, a complete menu for consideration. Participants and readers alike should recognize that if and when the City chooses to pursue development of a River District Master Plan, that process may take an entirely different course and the results will certainly not be limited or restricted to the number, type, location and scope of amenities identified in this report. Finally, as made clear in the City’s General Plan Update and referenced several times in this report, development of a Folsom River District Master Plan will require close coordination and collaboration with the State Department of Parks and Recreation and the Federal Bureau of Reclamation.

With publication of this document, the Organizing Committee intends to present this information to several City Commissions and the City Council prior to formal transmittal to the City of Folsom. We may look to combine some commission presentations, but assuming these meeting dates remain firm, the following is the current schedule:

Publication of Final Report	August 31, 2018
Parks and Recreation Commission Presentation	September 4
Planning Commission Presentation	September 5
Arts and Culture Commission Presentation	September 13
Historic District Commission Presentation	September 19
Possible City Council Presentation	October 9
Formal Transfer of Completed Report to the City of Folsom	Mid-October

After transmittal of the report to the City of Folsom, the River District Organizing Committee intends to continue to advocate for early implementation of a Folsom River District Master Plan effort. In addition, the Committee will actively support the timely development and funding of related State Parks and Recreation proposals that are contained in the 2010 Folsom Lake State Recreation Area General Plan/Resource Management Plan and which would be located in a Folsom River District. Indeed, focusing on priorities that are consistent with the State’s plans could result in earlier implementation of some of the amenities identified in this report.

The City's new General Plan lays out a goal (LU 5.1) to "Support the appropriate enhancement of Folsom's riverfront areas for current and future residents in order to increase public access, recreational opportunities, and economic development in consultation with federal, state, and regional land management agencies." The Organizing Committee supports this goal and looks forward to continuing the dialogue and working with the broader community, stakeholders and the appropriate governmental agencies in establishing a vision for Folsom's River District. The public's continued involvement in these ongoing efforts is encouraged and any support of these activities is appreciated.



This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX A: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

More than 250 individuals participated in the Community Workshops conducted as part of the effort to gather input for presentation to the City of Folsom for use in the potential development of a River District Master Plan (as set forth in the City's General Plan 2035). Listed below are nearly 240 names of those who registered at the Workshop events or who provided separate comments on the subject of a potential Folsom River District. Three-quarters or more of the individuals live or work in Folsom. **This list of names does not imply any endorsement of the content of this report but is intended to display the level of interest and involvement in the Workshops.** The Organizing Committee wishes to thank all of those who took part in this exercise and appreciates the input received from those who participated.

Sharon Adkins	Marc Chan	Allen Folks	Joshua Hoover
Kaylee Agamar	Connie Chan	Jonathan Friedman	Brad Hubbard
Vicky Allen	Nick Chiappe	Miki Fujitsubo	Diane Hunt
Shelly Alves-Churito	Robert Cline	Maureen Gagliardi	Ann Hutto
Donna Ammerman	Rick Cogil	Joe Gagliardi	Dawn Johnson
Ruth Anderson	Judy Collinsworth	Judith Gagnon	Bill Hutto
Steve Anderson	Ian Cornell	Jonathan Ganz	Ross Jackson
Sarah Aquino	Katie Cronsford	Jesus Garcia	Susan Johnson
Rob Aragon	Claudia Cummings	Rebecca Garrison	Peter Juhos
Alison Atkins	Chris Cunningham	Paul Gerhart	Jim Karnis
Dianne Babcock	Mike Curtin	Loreli Gilmore	Warren Kasper
Linda Bailey	Samantha Davidson	Claudia Goss	Jim Kauffman
Scott Bailey	Robin DeCristofaro	Deborah Grassl	Kathy Kayner
Cindy Baker	Catherine Dee	David Graves	Gary Keill
Enid Baldock	Bob Delp	Beth Graybill	Matt Keister
Ken Benedict	Sarah Denzler	Sean Greeley	Janice Kelley
David Benevento	Ryan DeVore	Cathleen Grooman	Beth Kelly
Jerry Bernau	Amy Diedrich	Taryn Grows	Bev Kempton
Pat Binley	Shaina DiMariano	Mary Beth Hacker	Fred Kindel
Dede Birch	Jeff DiMariano	Mary Hansen	Sharon Kindel
Brian Birch	Eve Dorf	Kent Hansen	Pat King
Jim Bloodworth	Kevin Duewel	Barbara Hayes	Claudia Kirkpatrick
Nan Bloodworth	Brian Dulgar	Steve Heard	Joseph Klun
Jim Bolden	Cindi Dulgar	Stephanie Henry	Joseph Klun
Phyllis Bolden	Clayton Eckstein	Loretta Hettinger	Joyce Kramer
Daron Braccht	Lynn Evans-Bonzell	Carol Hobbs	Gary Krause
Christine Bremner	Jeff Ferreira Pro	Brett Hoffman	Gary Krause
Mike Brenkwitz	Joe Fichera	Jason Holderness	Sharon Krause
Janice Brial	Jim Field	Robert Holderness	Pat Kunz
Kelley Butcher	Laura Fisher	Karen Holmes	James Landon
Dave Carlsen	Robert Flautt	Scott Holmquist	Carrie Lane
Jim Cassio	Jerry Flynn	Ernie Hook	John Lane
Ken Cemo	Sabrina Flynn	Josh Hook	Haley Limpach



Jennifer Lane	Cindy Pharis	Crystal Tobias
Jeanne Lawson	Bert Pittari	Warren Truitt
Barbara Leary	Tina Polley	Chad Vanderveen
Sangwoo Lee	Tony Powers	Pearl VanInwagen
Lynn LePage	Rich Preston	Carol Veder
Martha Lofgren	Blaine Quillin	Karen West
Dave Long	Justin Raithel	Steve Wetzel
Roberta Long	Aaron Ralls	Tracy Wetzel
Jamie Lopez	Mechelle Reasoner	Tad Widby
Martha Lysle	Lori Rediger	MaryAnn Williams
Jean Magarian	Dave Reid	Sharon Williams
Joleen Maiden	Don Reid	Dan Winkelman
Joleen Maiden	Eileen Reynolds	Denise Witthaus
Kevin Mallory	Gary Richard	Whitney Yamamura
Brian Martell	Joyce Roderick	Dick Zeiner
Mary Ann McAlea	Rosario Rodriguez	Rachel Zirin
Linda McDonald	Tracy Rodriguez	Pat Zuccaro
Valerie McMillen	Paul Romero	
Leslie Mendoth	Christie Ross	
John Messner	Rob Ross	
Jim Micheaels	Rob Roth	
Kyle Middleton	Phil Rotheram	
Candy Miller	Dan Ryan	
Alan Milner	Preston Sandbakken	
Marge Milner	Larry Shannon	
Bertha Mitchel	Ernie Sheldon	
Jorjorian Mitchell	Stacie Sherman	
Scott Moore	Jan Shipstad	
John Moore	Kathy Shurtleff	
Tanya Morales	Michael Smith	
Vida Morhain	Jim Snook	
Megan Murphy	Lynn Solberg	
Mary Nesel	Jennifer Sorensen	
Debbie Newell-Juhos	Terry Sorensen	
Blaine Nickens	Pamela Sowers	
James O'Connell	Dakota Spillers	
Monica Pactol	David Storer	
Karen Pardieck	Lesley Storz	
Tom Parker	Marjorie Stotenburg	
Garry Parliel	Curt Taras	
Rene Parliel	Alison Taylor	
Kenneth Payne	Anh Thai	
Karen Peterson	Janet Thew	
Kevin Peterson	Betsy Weiland	

APPENDIX B: WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED

B.1 VISIONING WORKSHOP #1 COMMENT CARDS

The comment cards for the first visioning workshop asked the public: “**What types of uses or activities would you like to see within the Folsom River District?** (with references to the following functional areas, shown in the Workshop #1 subarea map: A. Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center; B. South Shore; C. Willow Creek; D. North Shore; E. Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom; F. Negro Bar; G. Other Parts of the District.” The following were the responses received.

Table B.1: Visioning Workshop #1 Comments

Comment 1:

B. South Shore. Don't overdevelop.

C. Willow Creek. Don't overdevelop.

D. North Shore. Don't overdevelop.

F. Negro Bar. Fix boat ramp.

F. Other Parts of the Plan Area. Maintain large areas of natural undeveloped habitat. This is so unique to the Folsom Area.

Comment 2:

A. Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center. Continue kayaking, etc; no motorized boats.

B. South Shore. Maintain/protect existing natural habitat area (surrounding bike trail).

C. Willow Creek. Continue kayaking. No motorized boats. No boathouse; already full of kayaks, boats.

E. Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom. Greenbelt on the corporation yard

F. Negro Bar. Limit boating; no motorized boats.

F. Other Parts of the Plan Area. Maintain/preserve natural habitat; protect habitat. Manage homeless persons. No after dark / past sunset activities.

Comment 3:

A. Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center. Love this area has more than adequate picnic areas and boats to rent. Don't need this kind of area in other locations within Folsom city limits.

B. South Shore. Keep as is. Open space, trees, bike trail, and some picnic tables where people can overlook the cliffs.

C. Willow Creek. Another great area already built for Folsom residents to enjoy picnicking, boating, and hiking. No need for any of this elsewhere in the city limits.

D. North Shore. Don't want any development or trails west of Folsom Boulevard, but development east of Folsom Boulevard appears appropriate.

E. Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom. Keep as is, a mix of natural area and some Downtown development.

F. Negro Bar. State Park area that the city of Folsom could partner with the State to improve facilities where the state has not made improvements for some years.

G. Other Parts of the Plan Area. Overall thoughts are to keep the usage of these areas to day time only. Do not add any lighting or roads. People should not be out in this area at night to keep it a natural environment with wildlife that continues to live out there. Don't be like other areas that exterminate the wildlife.



Comment 4:

- A. **Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center.** Update facilities.
 - B. **South Shore.** Link bike trail through the Historic District in a way that does not disturb natural areas.
 - C. **Willow Creek.** Another shade structure with picnic table.
 - D. **North Shore.** No development. Bald eagle and egret nesting.
 - E. **Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom.** No development-keep natural. Much wildlife in the area that would be disturbed.
 - F. **Negro Bar.** Currently being enhanced.
 - G. **Other Parts of the Plan Area.** Do not put anything near the water that would bring in hoards of rude, obnoxious tourists / visitation that would trash the area. The city is notorious for not maintaining their trails and other areas.
-

Comment 5:

- A. **Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center.** Only appropriate additions to recreation.
 - B. **South Shore.** Leave as is. Only minimal interpretive signs re: Chinese Diggings.
 - C. **Willow Creek.** Fine as is.
 - D. **North Shore.** Only additions to facilitate nature enjoyment or viewing.
 - E. **Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom.** Nothing within State Park lands.
 - F. **Negro Bar.** Improve beach area.
 - G. **Other Parts of the Plan Area.** No hotels, boat houses, amphitheaters, or restaurants anywhere. No public art within State and Federal lands.
-

Comment 6:

- A. **Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center.** No additional development.
 - B. **South Shore.** Nothing - no development / changes.
 - D. **North Shore.** Nothing - no changes.
 - E. **Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom.** No waterfront development.
 - F. **Negro Bar.** Nothing - no changes.
 - G. **Other Parts of the Plan Area.** Indian museum near Highway 50. Learning Center.
-

Comment 7:

- A. **Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center.** Restaurant. Private/commercial water sports operations.
 - B. **South Shore.** Natural.
 - C. **Willow Creek.** Water fountain! Restaurant. Integrate commercial office park and lake. Boat ramp.
 - E. **Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom.** Connection from Sutter Street to lake. Restaurants, wine bars, amphitheater.
 - F. **Negro Bar.** Amphitheater.
-

Comment 8:

- A. **Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center.** See G.
 - B. **South Shore.** See G.
 - C. **Willow Creek.** There is already a kayak concession, boat ramp, and picnic area here.
 - D. **North Shore.** See G.
 - F. **Negro Bar.** There is already a boat ramp, picnic tables, and beach area here. A snack area or small boat storage area could be improved.
 - G. **Other Parts of the Plan Area.** People enjoy the natural space that is available and do not come here to enjoy a "built environment." They come to escape that.
-

Comment 9:

- A. **Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center.** Build a ropes course. Build a kayak course through or around the fish hatchery using diverted waters from Nimbus Dam.
- B. **South Shore.** Add yurts for kid's overnight camp, connected to the CSUS Aquatic Center.
- C. **Willow Creek.** Plant more trees in parking lot. Add flush toilet and water fountain. This was possible when Willow Creek boat ramp was improved.
- D. **North Shore.** Restore tailing rock piles to riparian forest. Add topsoil to rock areas.
- E. **Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom.** Add kayak ramp / paddle board landing with driveway access on Folsom Downtown side from Corporation Yard.
- F. **Negro Bar.** Boathouse needed. Add flush toilet and bathhouse / changing rooms. Ban glass bottle at Negro Bar Rocks. Add more recycle cans.
- G. **Other Parts of the Plan Area.** Improve amphitheater at Rodeo Park.

Comment 10:

- A. **Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center.** Would like to see a visitor center at the beginning of the area (move it from the outlets).
- B. **South Shore.** Museum for History of Folsom. Chinese Diggings close by.
- C. **Willow Creek.** Boathouse and amenities for more water access in this area, at the end of Parkshore.
- D. **North Shore.** Restaurants / bars midway between Old Town and CSUS Aquatic Center.
- E. **Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom.** Waterfront promenade for families. Increase access to the river.
- F. **Negro Bar.** Amphitheater for outdoor theater events. Water taxi for access to Old Town.
- G. **Other Parts of the Plan Area.** If Folsom Prison leaves, resort area (think Incline Village). Art trail from Rainbow / walking Bridge to Prison property. Art or historical markers alongside dirt trail.

Comment 11:

- A. **Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center.** Kayaking. Non-motorized boating. Swimming.
- B. **South Shore.** Bike trail / walking trail. Keep it natural. No amphitheater; disturbs animals, birds, existing residents.
- C. **Willow Creek.** Boating. Non-motorized boats. Keep it natural.
- D. **North Shore.** Concerned about blight and noise pollution. No development. Leave natural. Protect for wildlife, including birds. Keep it natural.
- E. **Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom.** Have more parking for anything built.
- F. **Negro Bar.** Swimming. Keep as is – natural.
- G. **Other Parts of the Plan Area.** Protect bald eagles, deer, animals. Purchase Cliff House for museum and restaurant. Everywhere concerned about noise and light pollution on water. No hotels on State Park areas. Follow the State Parks General Plan in all areas.

Comment 12:

- A. **Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center.** No changes. No motorized vehicles.
 - B. **South Shore.** Natural and cultural history preservation. Interpretive signage. No amphitheater.
 - C. **Willow Creek.** Wildlife viewing.
 - D. **North Shore.** Concerned about light and noise pollution. Walking, biking, nature preserve. Restrooms.
 - E. **Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom.** Better wayfinding signage. Connecting trails that are maintained upstream of Rainbow Bridge. Restrooms.
 - F. **Negro Bar.** A great place for a natural history museum. Acquire the Cliff House for a combination museum and event center.
 - G. **Other Parts of the Plan Area.** Corp yard – art walk, connecting trails, playground.
-



Comment 13:

- A. **Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center.** Leave alone.
 - B. **South Shore.** Leave alone. Too visible. Preserve its history. Tell us / everyone about its significance.
 - C. **Willow Creek.** Boathouse facility for all boaters.
 - E. **Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom.** This area is heavily impacted already.
 - F. **Negro Bar.** Boathouse, history center.
-

Comment 14:

- A. **Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center.** Install fish ladder for salmon and steelhead to spawn in Folsom over streams – Willow-Humbug-Alder-Hinkle-Gold Creeks and in Lake Natoma, a wide spot in the American River. Fishing – mercury concern. Endangered species and amphibians of concern. Amphitheater doesn't belong on the river.
 - E. **Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom.** Rodeo should be refurbished and used more often.
 - F. **Negro Bar.** Public art.
- Other Parts of the Plan Area.** This natural preserve is imperative for future and longer generations to come, not just in the next 20 years.
-

Comment 15:

- C. **Willow Creek.** Boathouse.
 - F. **Negro Bar.** Wildlife viewing and preservation.
 - G. **Other Parts of the Plan Area.** Use Rodeo Park for amphitheater type events that draw larger audience than the Historic Folsom amphitheater.
-

Comment 16:

The annual visitation of the American River Parkway is 5 million. We do not need more access. Preserve the wildlife experience. The Folsom Lake SRA General Plan represents the people of Folsom and surrounding area. This workshop with small participation does not represent us. The city should support the work of State Parks. The plan represents the word of the residents of Folsom. The City has no jurisdiction and should focus on River Park.

Comment 17:

- A. **Nimbus Flat / CSUS Aquatic Center.** Fish swimming.
 - B. **South Shore.** Grass and flowers growing.
 - C. **Willow Creek.** Walking, jogging. Bird watching.
 - D. **North Shore.** Protect bluffs – visual.
 - E. **Rainbow Bridge / Historic Folsom.** No new hotels or restaurants anywhere. No water taxi.
 - F. **Negro Bar.** Parking? / safe access. No water taxi. Beach improvement. State already planned boathouse; junior lifeguard federally funded.
 - G. **Other Parts of the Plan Area.** Corp yard – Preserved / clean up toxic waste. Interactive study. Historical preserve.
-

B.2 VISIONING WORKSHOP #3 COMMENT CARDS

Visioning Workshop #3 concluded with asking the public for input on what they thought of the visioning process and to provide any additional comments they had. The comment cards were structured as follows:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Over 40 written comment cards were received at the workshop, as drafted below.

Table B.2: Visioning Workshop #3 Comments

Comment 1:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

I believe it would be helpful to explain more about how the results of this planning effort will be used in future years. It's for 2035 and should be considered for this.

Comment 2:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Questions in meeting 2 were skewed towards development. I want to keep, possibly expand State Park property. I want day use; not overnight use, no evening / night noise or lights. I am against restaurants, hotels, amphitheaters, all night use, camping, glamping. I am pro animals, birds, and fish. I am against commercial use. The parks are widely used now by boater, walkers, hikers, bike riding - all fit State Park use.

Comment 3:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

More beach volleyball, more wine bars, more zipline.

Comment 4:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

I live in Orangevale on the bluff. I was completely unaware that this process was going. Residents of Orangevale need to be part of the process. As the process proceeds, impact on existing businesses / residences should be addressed and mitigated.



Comment 5:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

The nature center was accepted as the top voter.

Comment 6:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Appeared to be but missed the first 2 meetings. We reside on the bluffs across the river (Orangevale) and already feel we are affected by noise that comes across the river (concert / music, for example). We have grave concerns that an amphitheater (particularly, the community amphitheater) would add to the noise problem. (We are close to an eagle nesting area and have concerns about impact there, as well. We own property in Folsom as well.) We are also seeing increased activity in the State Park area after dark, when the park is "closed." With all the discussion of activities / development at Negro Bar, we have concerns that this could increase (trails from greenbelt, lead down to American River Parkway and Negro Bar).

Comment 7:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Data derived from putting stickers on maps should not be relied on heavily. A lot of people can't read maps and I couldn't help more than a few figure it out. Gratiified by the support for historic and natural uses.

Comment 8:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Never heard anything that had to do with environmental studies, issues, etc.

Comment 9:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Lake Natoma is an important wildlife area. We need to make sure the Folsom shore does not impact the wildlife.

Comment 10:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

I would like to see an overlay of existing resources.

Comment 11:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

I was notified of all River District meetings via the Folsom Chamber emailed letters. Interesting process. Thank you.

Comment 12:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Concerned about how this project will affect wildlife and environment. Haven't we infringed enough?

Comment 13:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Visioning process offered skewed choices. Not enough publicity to get more people at the meeting. If 44 people want something and 42 don't that is NOT "moderate support." If something is not consistent with State regulations, don't do it.

Comment 14:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

The City has no jurisdiction over Lake Natoma. A River District is not the City's job or "again" jurisdiction.

Comment 15:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

I'd like to leave any and create more green space to build up the natural habitat.

Comment 16:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

All input was gathered but only the ideas to develop the State / Federal land were pursued and expanded. The concerns to keep the State and Federal parks natural and historic in their own right were not expanded. Only development was pursued.



Comment 17:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Basically, I am suspicious of the whole process. Who is sponsoring this and for what purpose?

Comment 18:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Folsom Historic District residents would like to see the Historic District left alone. There is poor parking in the Historic District and more parking lots are needed. Please consider noise for residential neighborhoods.

Comment 19:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

I find it both refreshing and positive that the Folsom Partnership has got out in front of this whole process to see public input and general comment. I can't wait for the next steps and seeing how we as a community can use this great space.

Comment 20:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

I feel the request for public input has been extensive and sufficient. The progress has been easily followed and non-biased. I look forward to continued progress. The staff is incredible.

Comment 21:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Will an EIR be done for this project?

Comment 22:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Boat house, camp sites.

Comment 23:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

None.

Comment 24:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

No "duck boats" on Lake Natoma / American River.

Comment 25:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO Sometimes

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

No chance to air out my thoughts. The whole idea of opening the Lake Natoma shore to tourism, too many more feet on the trails is repugnant. Lake Natoma Trails are soothing in the nature that remains. No development.

Comment 26:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Just learned of this process. Appreciated the presentation showing the "snapshot" of what participants prefer and what is consistent with State Parks Plan. I would strongly urge the City to take environmental / species need into account when considering where to locate potential amenities. Also, consistency with American River Parkway Plan and Folsom Lake Plan.

Comment 27:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Opposed to any of this commercial development of our open areas.

Comment 28:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Sort of – voting is an awkward way to come up with complex plans. The public hearings at the City meetings need to be advertised more widely – online, in paper, in mailed city newsletter, and on various Folsom Facebook pages.

Comment 29:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Please make a dock where kayakers can safely dock and run to Historic Folsom for lunch. Have local groups watch boats.



Comment 30:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Preserve our beautiful river - waterways are for nature – birds, fish, and other wildlife. No to water taxis, restaurants, etc. No to areas that will invite more homeless and crime, such as amphitheaters, boathouses, unlocked restrooms.

Comment 31:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Just found out via Folsom Telegraph front page – thanks for article! The public needs to know more about this.

Comment 32:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

None.

Comment 33:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Many people here seem not to realize facilities and programs already in place. Instead of additional camp grounds, clean up camp grounds. I felt a lot of input came from ignorant sources.

Comment 34:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

The nature center is voted as #1!

Comment 35:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Very limited. Seemed that development of these areas was assumed to be desirable and a foregone conclusion. Therefore, people were steered into voting on a menu of amenities as the only allowable input. Also, the types of properties are very different and can't be lumped together in this "visioning" process.

Comment 36:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

I think it is very bold to out of nowhere decide to suggest amenities on lands not under the jurisdiction of the City of Folsom. When the various amenities were voted upon (session #2) the vote should have included an option, such as "none of the above" vs. a separate yea or nay!

Comment 37:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO (to an extent)

Additional Comments?

It still seems like there is a huge push to get State Parks to "amend" their General Plan if people want things outside of the plan. That plan was the product of years of research and stakeholder meetings and it should not be taken lightly. Once something has concrete plastered on it, it can never be removed (or at least not without major effort.

Comment 38:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO (hope so)

Additional Comments?

I would like to offer the following comments by priority: 1) Historic / Corp Area: Cartop boat access and beach, restaurants and boutique hotels historic theme. No sports fields, no residential. Possible boat house concession; 2) Junction: Put visitor/arts cultural/nature demo/nature/centers, museums, and amphitheater; 3) North Shore: Yes to boat/bike/walk-in camping; possibly interpretive center; 4) Civic: Amphitheater; 5) South Shore: Overlook, visitor center.

Comment 39:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

Thank you for your work and effort to bring this forward.

Comment 40:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

I am very excited about seeing some of these developments on Lake Natoma. I hope some of them materialize in my time as a resident of Folsom. Thank you to all who put these workshops together!!

Comment 41:

Did you find the visioning process valuable? YES NO

Did you find the visioning process open and inclusive to your input? YES NO

Additional Comments?

I strongly recommend adding an additional boathouse to Lake Natoma. It is one of the top rowing venues in the country and adding another boathouse will only increase the public access to our amazing resource.



B.3 EMAILED COMMENTS

In addition to comments received at Workshops #1 and #3, several email comments were received regarding the River District planning process from stakeholders in Fair Oaks, Orangevale, Sacramento, and Loomis. In summary, the individuals sending the comments opposed the development of Lake Natoma and supported preservation of the waterfront's natural state.

APPENDIX C: POWERPOINT PRESENTATIONS

Provided under separate cover are the PowerPoint presentations for Visioning Workshops #1, 2, and 3, and the visual preference exercise conducted at Workshop #2.



This page intentionally left blank.