



**CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT MASTER PLAN
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA**

**October 21, 2024
3:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.**

**Folsom Community Center
52 Natoma Street Folsom, CA 95630**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Edward Igoe
Julie Lofgren
Anthony Powers
Brian Wallace
Kris Steward
Liz Ekenstedt

Tom Econome
Jen Lee
Margie Donovan
Joe Gagliardi (Shannon Robb alt)
Monica Flores Pactol
Gary Eckhardt

Dan Dreher (Jeremy Dreher alt)
Mark Johnson
Tim Kuntz (Dean Williams alt)
Ardie Zahedani
Elija Tiglao

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

3:00

MEETING PURPOSE AND PLAN

- Meeting to discuss the Advisory Committee’s review and recommendation of the Draft Master Plan and determine whether the document should be called a Master Plan or Vision Plan.

TOPICS

I. Overview of the Master Plan

3:10

- Review of Format
 - Existing Conditions
 - Transformative Ideas
 - Implementation Strategies

II. Committee Discussion and Feedback

3:30

- Does the Master Plan adequately characterize the Committee’s feedback?
- Discuss substantive recommendations provided in advance of meeting by individual Committee members (minor edits/corrections will be incorporated)
- Additional substantive recommendations for consideration?

III. Master Plan versus Vision Plan Discussion

5:00

- Discuss whether the name should be changed to a Vision Plan

IV. Recap Advisory Committee’s Recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council on the document

5:15

NEXT STEPS/TENTATIVE PROJECT REVIEW SCHEDULE

5:45

- **October 23** – Modified Draft Plan incorporating Committee recommendations
- **October 30-** Planning Commission Hearing/Recommendation 6:30 p.m. Council Chambers City Hall 50 Natoma Street
- **November 5-** Parks and Recreation Commission Hearing/Recommendation 6:30 Council Chambers City Hall 50 Natoma Street
- **November 12-** City Council Hearing and Adoption 6:30 p.m. Council Chambers 50 Natoma Street

ATTACHMENTS

1. Final Staff Recommended Changes to the Draft Central Business District Master Plan
2. Individual Committee Member Recommended Changes to the Draft Central Business District Master Plan

PUBLIC ATTENDEES COMMENT PERIOD

5:50

NOTICE: Members of the public are entitled to directly address the Committee concerning any item that is described in the notice of this meeting. If you wish to address the Committee on an issue which is on this agenda, please complete a blue/green speaker request card, and deliver it to a staff member prior to discussion of the item. When your name is called, stand to be recognized by the Facilitator. Please limit your comments to three minutes or less.

ADJOURNMENT

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you are a person with a disability and you need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Manager's Office at (916) 461-6010, or mkasama@folsom.ca.us. Requests must be made as early as possible and at least two full business days before the start of the meeting.


Any documents produced by the City and distributed to the Committee regarding any item on this agenda will be made available at the City Clerk's Counter at City Hall located at 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, California during normal business hours.

Central Business District STAFF DEPARTMENT Inputs on Draft Master Plan/Vision Plan

Staff Department	Additional Comments
Public Works	<p>Amend Figure 39 to show both Roundabout Feasibility Study intersections under current study (5 total) and the other logical CBD intersection locations that should be considered moving forward.</p> <p>Add the 5 additional “dots” for the intersections of Wales/East Bidwell, Wales/Riley, Orchard/East Bidwell, Orchard/Riley, and East Bidwell/Blue Ravine in a different color and add a legend that the existing green dots show “Roundabout Feasibility Study Intersection” and the other color dot represents “Other Potential Roundabout Intersection”</p> <p>Revised the bottom paragraph on page 65 to read “The above-noted (Figure 39) intersections within the District are logical areas for considering roundabout applications. Five of these locations are overlap intersections with the Feasibility Study, and the other five locations are logical to accomplish corridor-wide treatments and a more even distribution of this traffic control strategy throughout the District.”</p>
	<p>Figures 40-43 should be moved up to be right after Page 65. Change the last sentence on Page 65 to read “Figures 40-43 on the following pages feature graphics showing preliminary feasibility analysis findings at the Riley Street intersection with Glenn Drive.” I’m not sure that we need all four graphics that comprise Figure 5.2.1 (Riley/Glenn). Consider eliminating Figures 41 and 42 as unnecessary for the purposes of this document. If eliminated, change references and renumber remaining figures throughout.</p>
	<p>The East Bidwell cross section on Page 58 is missing lane dimensions; so is the Glenn and Wales cross section on Page 59. The other two cross sections show dimensions so we need to get some consistency there.</p>
	<p>On page 66 regarding opportunities within existing rights-of-way, modify the language about decision making authority to modify road segments and through route designation to read, “if supported by detailed traffic analysis, and supported by the desires of the adjacent uses and owners’ desires, and the majority of affected property owners and/or City Council policy, consider....”</p>

Central Business District STAFF DEPARTMENT Inputs on Draft Master Plan/Vision Plan

Staff Department	Additional Comments
	<p>Page 77 New/Replacement Action 5.4.12 (current action is repetitive of 5.4.8). Improve access to Lembi Park/connectivity to the District. The City should consider additional opportunities to improve access and connectivity between Lembi Park and the rest of the District. As part of District traffic analysis, capital improvement projects qualification, or grant opportunities, consider new safe crossings of Riley Street at Orchard, the Raleys Driveway/Lembi entrance, Hazelmere, and/or Arbuckle/Timson. Also consider a new safe crossing of Glenn at Oxborough/Vierra Circle and either the fire department driveway or alternative mid-block location.</p>
Community Development (including Kathy Pease)	<p>Page 5 Key recommendations from the CAC – need minor clarifications and wordsmithing for consistency and capture of majority comments.</p>
	<p>Page 12 Vision Box revise text to read: A unique and vibrant destination District that is economically sustainable with events, entertainment, art, and mix of uses including mobility enhancements to support traffic flow, safety, and all modes of travel.</p>
	<p>For actions throughout, add action headers similar to the mobility chapter to help focus/simplify the actions.</p>
	<p>Revise Action 4.4.2 to focus on zoning related changes for outdoor dining and land uses. Remove parking area references as covered elsewhere.</p>
	<p>Revise Action 4.4.6 to focus on the landscape plan/guide and create a new separate item 4.4.9 regarding relocation of the Post Office.</p>

Other Miscellaneous Changes/Non-Substantive – Not Necessary to Flag	
Matt Weir	Changing his title from Principal to Vice President
Kathy Pease	City Logo on Front Cover?
	Page 92 Figure 60, delete left graphic of tree canopy. It is not applicable- shows rural landscape corridor.
	
	Appendix Section 9.1 Amend Header as follows: List of Documents in the Appendix A <u>Potential Grant Opportunities</u>
	Under Funding Table in Appendix Highway Safety Improvement Program (SHIP) delete the word "off", last column before Federal Aid

Central Business District CAC Inputs on Draft Master Plan/Vision Plan		
Committee Member	Vision Plan?	Specific Recommendations for CAC Consideration
Tom Econome	Yes	None – all incorporated
Ed Igoe	Yes	Concerned that little consideration has been addressed about the need to preserve our small town/suburban character, as well as the traditional business convenience which exists in the Central Business District. Frankly, the CAC Master Plan work seems to focus largely on incorporating more vertical rental housing units into the district.
Tony Powers	Yes	Page 24 Clear up confusion about goals vs transformative ideas and refer to the fact that the related actions are also found in the land use and placemaking chapters.
		Section 4.2.2 makes a good case for the transformative idea of better connections to Lembi Park along Glenn, Wales an Orchard, but this is not reflected in the recommended actions in Section 5.
		Action 5.4.4 Clarify that sidewalk gaps can be filled by City as part of capital project or grant funding, not just waiting for adjacent private development.
		Remove Action 5.4.12 as repetitive.
		Similarly, while there are actions related to mid-block crossings, they are presented along with language suggesting all the reasons they cannot be done (the city doesn't install uncontrolled mid-block crossings on roads with more than two lanes), rather than how they can be implemented safely (maybe they need to be signalized); and, there is no discussion of the distances between existing safe crossings of Riley, E. Bidwell and Glenn, and what considerations should be used to determine how many, and where, additional crossings should be added.
		There is a sentence that suggests that the property/business owners should essentially have a veto over safety improvement for cyclists and pedestrians along E. Bidwell. That is just wrong. Those at or hired by the city with expertise in traffic safety and charged with implementation of the General Plan goal of

Central Business District CAC Inputs on Draft Master Plan/Vision Plan

Committee Member	Vision Plan?	Specific Recommendations for CAC Consideration
		<p>Complete Streets should, with consideration for all of the general public and particularly those whose safety is involved, determine how to safely accommodate all travelers within the city. The perception of economic impacts on property values/profits based on old rules of thumb (which have not been backed up with data and are very likely wrong) should not hold sway over the City's responsibility to public safety. All residents, whether they choose or can afford to travel by car or not, have the right to safely use our streets. That should not be left to public opinion or personal whim; we are 25 years behind in traffic safety because a couple influential people had an irrational dislike of roundabouts, even though the data were readily available indicating that they are safer, more efficient and, in the long run (or if planned into new development, from the start) cheaper than traffic signals. Let's not let that happen again.</p>
Gary Eckhardt	Yes	<p>Missed the mark on safety improvements- should be number one priority- should have addressed Middle School crossings, Lembi connections (walk bridges (could be costly to hire someone to do branding, but \$\$ should go toward safety), prioritize safety before branding</p>
Dan Dreher	Yes	<p>With the stated Vision Plan being to promote economic viability we are very concerned with even a vision plan being submitted to the city for consideration that does not include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -1. A clarification of what size roundabouts that are being proposed for all areas. Considering the Riley roundabout that is depicted as a single lane round about, what are the pros/cons to a single lane vs. a two-lane roundabout? -2. A question that must be answered is what is the minimum setback distance before entering or after exiting a roundabout to allow for a left turn lane into a business and or parking lot?

Central Business District CAC Inputs on Draft Master Plan/Vision Plan

Committee Member	Vision Plan?	Specific Recommendations for CAC Consideration
		<p>-3. A final major concern that needs to be addressed is, change to both East / West Parallel thoroughfares (Riley & Bidwell) occurring simultaneously. With such a monumental change we would propose that instead of fundamentally changing both thoroughfares simultaneously, that the vision be to change Riley street to multiple roundabouts heading East to West first, that way if the public perception and traffic analysis both support this change, the future consideration can then be directed towards E. Bidwell St. The reason we are proposing Riley street as the test street is for two main reasons. First the decades worth of businesses that have invested in E. Bidwell st. as the main central business thoroughfare connected directly to US50, should not be subjected to a experimental change in the flow of traffic. Secondly the ease of access horizontally from business to business parking lots is significantly better on the Riley corridor compared to the E. Bidwell Corridor. Meaning a customer of Walmart could not only access all the businesses in that shopping center but they can also exit to multiple access streets. This is the same for the other businesses in Kohls & O'Reilly/Wendy's shopping centers. Many of the businesses including ours, down E. Bidwell St. only have access to E. Bidwell St. and not any adjacent businesses or exits to multiple access streets, so limiting street access would be negatively magnified to businesses on the E. Bidwell st. corridor vs. the Riley St. Corridor.</p>