

February 20, 2024

Sacramento City Council Members,



SacMoves supports the General Plan 2040 update. Though it could be strengthened in a number of areas, it is a great improvement over the 2035 plan and sets goals and policies that will bring the city better land use and better mobility.

SacMoves Coalition focuses on transportation in our region, promoting policy and funding that shift the transportation system from car-dominated to active transportation and transit. While the draft General Plan 2024 recognizes this shift, the details on how that will happen are missing. That means that documents which will or may follow adoption of the General Plan are of critical importance, including Street Design Standards, Streets for All (Active Transportation Plan), Parking Management Plan, Work Zone and Event Detour Policy, Zoning Map, and Urban Forest Plan. We are pleased that the Street Design Standards have been accelerated, as they are absolutely key to the walkability and safety of our streets. We believe that the street designs should also include guidance on how to fix poor street designs from the past.

SacMoves recognizes that we cannot achieve an effective transportation system without affordable housing throughout the city, nor can housing be truly affordable if it is not strongly supported by transit, walking, and bicycling. We have worked with housing advocacy organizations to bring this recognition to the fore. The Missing Middle Housing Plan, which will be integrated to the General Plan, is a great step forward in this integration. In particular, the change to floor area ratio (FAR) 2 within a half mile of high frequency transit will promote the density necessary to support effective transit. We believe that development that complies with FAR and health and safety code should be 'by right'. The time for public input on the built environment is during policy development, not on a project-by-project public review. It is time to end the practice of people opposed to affordable housing and new neighbors stopping and slowing provision of housing in our city.

Land Use and Placemaking (LUP) and Mobility (M) are so closely related that it is critical to have cross-references to Goals and Policies, and Implementing Actions, which are identical, similar, or related in both elements.

Though we realize that the plan has been finalized and should be adopted, we are providing specific input, on the following pages, that can improve the plans which will follow.

Dan Allison & David Moore
SacMoves Coalition
sacmoves.coalition@gmail.com

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dan Allison".

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David Moore".

SacMoves Coalition includes:

Civic Thread, SABA (Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates), STAR (Sacramento Transit Advocates and Riders), Sierra Club, Mother Lode Chapter, ECOS (Environmental Council of Sacramento), Breathe California Sacramento Region, SacTRU (Sacramento Transit Riders Union), RFTM (Ridership for the Masses), SMART (Sacramento Metro Advocates for Rail and Transit), Valley Vision, Sacramento Climate Coalition,

Sacramento Housing Alliance, Sierra Club Sacramento Group, SARA (Save the American River Association), Sacramento ACT (Area Congregations Together), AARP Sacramento (American Association of Retired Persons), 350 Sacramento, 50 Corridor & Sac TMA, North Natomas Jibe, Midtown Neighborhood Association, Sacramento Splash, Central Valley Regional Rail Working Group, SKK Developments, Organize Sacramento, and many supportive individuals.

Land Use and Placemaking Element (LUP) Chapter 3

Land Use Designations (and Map LUP-5 General Plan Land Use General Plan Land Use Diagram): The subdivision of mixed use areas is not useful and too restrictive. There should be two designations, industrial, and everything else. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) will suffice to designate areas with different development types. References to residential density, including Map LUP-8 Minimum Residential Density, should be removed in favor of FAR

- LUP-4.1 Transit-Supportive Development. Change to one-half mile, consistent with Missing Middle Housing Plan.
- LUP 4.5 Efficient Parcel Utilization. The city should NOT encourage aggregation, but consider it on a case by case basis. The fine grained parcel ownership in midtown is in significant part responsible for its economic vibrancy. Fine grained ownership usually results in higher sales tax and property tax income per acre.
- LUP-4.12 Drive-Through Restaurants. Change to one-half mile, consistent with Missing Middle Housing Plan. The city should study the prohibition of drive-through restaurants in some additional areas, or citywide.
- LUP 6.8 Gated Communities. The city should consider prohibiting gated communities.

Mobility Element (M) Chapter 8

A Goals and Policies section should be added that develops a plan for public restrooms and water fountains in high pedestrian use areas. Restrooms are critical for walkers and bicyclists traveling distances, and water fountains are critical for walkers during the summer, and the provision of facilities encourages these modes of travel.

- Map M-3 Candidate High-Frequency Transit. Light Rail Blue and Gold to Sunrise, and Route 51 Stockton, are already high frequency, not candidates, so they are mislabeled.
- Map M-4 Regional Connectivity. Light rail to the airport (shown in green) cannot be implemented in the 2040 time frame, and should not be shown beyond San Juan Rd.

Curb Management and Parking Management are the weakest and vaguest section of the Mobility element. Ineffective curb management and illegal stopping/standing/parking are serious safety hazards and result in lost economic productivity. Ineffective parking management, such as under-priced and over-supplied parking, induces vehicle ownership and vehicle miles traveled. Parking is often used as an excuse for why streets cannot be reallocated, nor housing increased.

The Parking Management Plan must be completed as soon as possible. It must include:

- Removal of parking mandates city-wide
- Establish parking fees or permits for all on-street parking throughout the city, including residential areas. Both must fully recover the cost of installing, maintaining and managing the parking areas, as well as other uses. Many streets could be designed with less parking, perhaps only one side, if free parking were eliminated.
- Criteria for establishing parking maximums.
- Provision for re-investing a portion of parking fee and permit income in the neighborhood from which it is collected.

- A program for identifying curb space necessary for passenger pick-up/drop-off, loading and delivery, and short term parking, and then implement this within 5 years. A commitment to enforcing illegal stopping/standing/parking in travel lanes or bicycle facilities should be made.
- The plan makes reference to using technology to better manage parking, but doesn't commit to any methodology. A commitment to installing occupancy sensors on any street which is repaved and which has or recently had metered parking is the specific needed.
- Bundled parking: New bundled parking should be prohibited citywide, and existing bundled parking phased out over 10 years. Bundled parking increases rental prices significantly, and induces motor vehicle use.
- Surface parking lots should have property tax rates set at the level of the building that was there before it was razed for parking. Surface parking should require a special use permit that includes a plan for transforming the parking to productive use. Surface parking lots are the lowest form of land use, and should be strongly discouraged.

- M-1.1 Street Classification System (and Maps 2a & 2b): The functional classification system (FCS) established by the federal government and approved by the state is based on motor vehicle throughput, is not understood by the public, and should not be used in the General Plan. Instead, a classification that recognizes placemaking and access should be used. The text distinguishes local residential and local commercial, which should not be separated, as mixed use is the intended outcome nearly everywhere.
- M-1.5 Street Design Standards: Add: Streets should be designed for slow speeds in order to ensure safety for all users.
- M-1.13 Walkability. Add: No development will be approved which does not have a street grid system of no more than 1/8 mile. Streets within this grid may curve or wander, but the grid must be enforced.
- M-1.14 Walking Facilities (Active Transportation). The city should undertake a study of responsibility for sidewalk maintenance. The current reliance on property owners maintaining sidewalks has led to a system of cracked, heaved, and impassible sidewalks at many locations in the city.
- M-1.19 Walking Safety: Consideration should be given to prohibiting right turns on red, in specific situations or citywide.
- M-1.23 Transit Priority. The term 'priority corridors' must be defined. Is it the same as high frequency service, or different?
- M-1.33 Electric Vehicle (EV) Car Share and Electric Bike Share. Bike share should be in a separate Goal and Policy, not subsumed under EV efforts. The city should directly support bike share rather than depending on private providers, which has failed.
- M 4.3 Vision Zero. A map of all Vision Zero High Injury Corridors and intersections, and the current top 5 corridors, should be included in the General Plan.