Active Transportation Program
Cycle 2
Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program
June 19, 2015

Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail
Gap Closure Project

City of Folsom
Parks & Recreation Department
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630
June 19, 2015

Lacey Symons-Holtzen, Active Transportation Team Manager
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Symons-Holtzen:

The City of Folsom, Parks & Recreation Department per the ATP/BPFP application guidelines is submitting one (1) signed original, five (5) color copies of the complete grant application and one electronic copy of our application on a compact disk for funding under the Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 and Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program. The project name is “Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail Gap Closure Project”.

The contact person for this project is:

Jim Konopka
Senior Planner, Trails
Parks & Recreation Department
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630
(916) 351-3516

If you have any questions please contact Jim Konopka.

Sincerely,

Jim Konopka
Section I

Project Sponsor
I. Project Sponsor Information

(Please read the Caltrans “ATP instructions” and the SACOG “Program and Application Guidelines” documents prior to responding to the questions in this application.)

PROJECT SPONSOR: This agency must enter into a Master Agreement with Caltrans and will be financially and contractually responsible for the delivery of the project within all pertinent Federal and State funding requirements.

PROJECT SPONSOR'S NAME:  
City of Folsom

PROJECT SPONSOR'S ADDRESS:  
50 Natoma Street

PROJECT SPONSOR'S CONTACT PERSON:  
Jim Konopka

CONTACT PERSON'S TITLE:  
Senior Park Planner, Trails

CONTACT PERSON'S PHONE NUMBER:  
916-496-1505

CONTACT PERSON'S EMAIL ADDRESS:  
jkonopka@folsom.ca.us
Section II

Project Information
II. Project Information

1. Project is applying for (check all that apply): ☒ Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Program (4-county)  
   ☒ Regional Active Transportation Program (6-county)

2. Application number: 1 out of 1 applications (ranked by project sponsor priority)

3. Project Name  (To be used in the CTC project list)
   Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail Gap Closure Project

4. Project Location  (Include a map in the Appendix)
   Project is located parallel to the existing JPA rail corridor, and extends approximately 1.3 miles between the existing Humbug-Willow Creek Trail and Scholar Way, and between Broadstone Parkway and Iron Point Road.

   Project Coordinates
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>38.665662</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>-121.138601</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Decimal degrees)</td>
<td>(Decimal degrees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Project Description/Scope:

   a. What is the full project description and scope for the project applying for funds?
      Project includes the construction of approximately 1.3 miles of Class I Bike Path, that is 12-feet wide. The Trail fills a significant gap in the Folsom Placerville Rail Trail and makes the long awaited connection to the 16-mile Humbug-Willow Creek (HBWC) Trail and the Folsom Lake College campus.

   b. Is there a usable partial scope of the project? Describe the scope and cost estimate.
      To make the direct connection between the HBWC Trail and Folsom Lake College, it would be difficult to construct a portion of the project. The portion of trail between the HBWC Trail and Oak Ave Parkway could be constructed, but would not provide access to the college and other destinations along East Bidwell Street. The cost to fund that segment is estimated at $425,000.

6. Project Type:

   % of project that is infrastructure (I): 100 % $1,184,036
   % of project that is Non-Infrastructure (NI): 0 % $0
   (% based on Project Cost. "I" plus "NI" % must equal 100% for all applications. "Plan" applications are 100% NI.)

   Development of a Plan in a Disadvantaged Community: Yes/No: No
   (Check all Plan types that apply):
   ☐ Bicycle Plan
   ☐ Pedestrian Plan
   ☐ Safe Routes to School Plan
   ☐ Active Transportation Plan  (Must meet CTC Guidelines)
Indicate any of the following plans that your agency currently has:

- Bicycle Plan
- Pedestrian Plan
- Safe Routes to School Plan
- Active Transportation Plan

Safe Routes to School Project: (Yes/No) No

Does the project involve more than one school: (Yes/No) No

If the project involves more than one school: 1) Insert "Multiple Schools" in the School Name, School Address, and distance from school; 2) Fill in the student information based on the total project; and 3) Include an attachment to the application which clearly summarizes the following school information and the school official signature and person to contact for each school.

School name:

School address:

Project distance from school

District name:

District address:

Co.-Dist.-School Code:

Total student enrollment:

% of students that currently walk or bike to school%

Approx. # of students living along route proposed for improvement:

A map must be attached to the application which clearly shows the limits of the following elements:

1) the student enrollment area
2) the project improvements.

7. Project Funding Request:

Project funding request: $1,048,036

Project matching funds: $136,000

TOTAL PROJECT COST: $1,184,036

8. Project Programming Request (PPR) and Cost & Schedule Summary:

Please include Excel versions of the completed PPR and the Cost & Schedule Summary with your electronic application submittal. (Project status and expected delivery schedule.)

Enter the expected milestone date or enter "Completed" for all milestones already complete prior to submitting the application for ATP funding. The project sponsor must use standard timeframes for CTC Allocations, FHWA E76 Approvals, and Caltrans processing for all project phases and milestones. The project sponsor is responsible for meeting all CTC delivery requirements or their ATP funding may be forfeited. The project status and expected delivery schedule must assume use of federal funding.

9. Current state of the project area:

For infrastructure projects:
a. Are there existing bike/ped facilities?
There are no pedestrian facilities (sidewalks) available along the north side of East Bidwell Street and no consistent bike lanes within the limits of the project area. With traffic volumes in excess of 35,000 vehicles a day and speeds of 50-55 mph, this is not an environment to encourage non-motorized travel.

b. If the project is adjacent to a roadway, what is the posted speed limit?
The project is adjacent to East Bidwell Street, which has a posted speed limit of 50 mph.

c. If the project is adjacent to a roadway, what are the daily traffic volumes? Peak hour traffic volumes?
The project is adjacent to East Bidwell Street, one of the highest traffic volumes streets in Folsom. The annual peak hour traffic counts average 3,500 and daily traffic volumes average 35,000 a day. These counts were done recently on 3/24/2015, so they reflect current conditions.

d. Are there any projects near the project area anticipated for construction in the immediate future (next four years)?
Folsom Lake College recently completed a 50,000 sq ft expansion of instructional facilities and over the next four years the campus is expected to expand by another 50,000 sq ft, with a projected student enrollment in excess of 15,000. There is also a mixed use residential/retail center planned adjacent to the corridor, between Broadstone Parkway and Iron Point Road.

For non-infrastructure projects:

a. What other plans or programs are currently in place within the project area, or recently concluded?
Click here to enter text:

b. Are there any plans or programs in or near the project area anticipated to begin in the immediate future (next four years)?
Click here to enter text:
Section III

Screening Criteria
III. Screening Criteria

1. Explain how this project is consistent with the EDCTC Regional Transportation Plan, PCTPA Regional Transportation Plan, or the SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). (Please only answer the option most applicable to your project.)

   A. Infrastructure Project is a planned project included in the SACOG Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan, MTP/SCS, and/or the Regional Transportation Plan of EDCTC or PCTPA. Provide the project name and number (if available) and the applicable document title and page number.
   
   Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail ID# 30106
   Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trails Master Plan, Page Number 98 of Appendix B.

   B. If your infrastructure project is not included as described above, please explain any special circumstances that precluded it from being included in the applicable Regional Transportation Plan.  
   Click here to enter text:

   C. Non-Infrastructure Project meets at least one of two eligibility requirements:

      1) Encourage biking and walking through public information, education, training, and awareness,  
      Click here to enter text:

      or

      2) Perform studies and develop plans that support one or more of the project performance outcomes of the program.
      Click here to enter text:

2. Project is identified in the project sponsor’s Statement of Intent to Apply correspondence. Please include a copy of the letter in the application Appendix.
   Yes ☒ No ☐

3. Project is ready for inclusion into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, with project scope and cost.
   Yes ☒ No ☐

   a. Please include an appropriate project description per the below guidelines:
      
      [(Location:) + (Limits) + (;) + (Improvement)]
   
      Example: In Bakersfield: Between 1st Street and Pine Boulevard; fill in sidewalk gaps and add a
      protected bike lane.

      In Folsom: Between existing Humbug-Willow Creek Trail and Scholar Way and from Broadstone
      Parkway to Iron Point Road; fill in trail gap and construct approximately 1.3-miles of Class I Bike
      Trail

4. Project is eligible for appropriate funding sources. (i.e. ATP for ATP-only applications; CMAQ, RSTP, and
   STIP for BPFP-only applications; ATP, CMAQ, RSTP, and STIP for applications to both programs)
   Yes ☒ No ☐
5. Project meets the minimum dollar amount for an infrastructure or non-infrastructure project and includes at least an 11.47% local match; local match requirements apply to all project categories.
   A. Infrastructure project minimum total cost is $282,390 ($250,000 funding request + $32,390 local match).
      Yes ☒ No ☐
   B. Non-Infrastructure project minimum total cost is $56,478 ($50,000 funding request + $6,478 local match).
      Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Project proposal culminated from a community-based public participation process.
   Yes ☒ No ☐
   A. Is the total project cost over $1 Million? Yes ☒ No ☐
      If yes: Is the project prioritized in an adopted city or county bicycle transportation plan, pedestrian plan, safe routes to school plan, active transportation plan, trail plan, circulation element of a general plan, or other publicly approved plan that incorporated elements of an active transportation plan?
      Yes ☒ No ☐

   List the plan and project number or page number to demonstrate project priority:
   City of Folsom Bikeway Master Plan - Page Number 59

7. Project demonstrates coordination with the California Conservation Corps (CCC) or a certified community conservation corps. (Applies to infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects applying to the Regional ATP.)

   The applicant must send the following information to the CCC and CALCC prior to application submittal to SACOG:
   - Project Description
   - Detailed Estimate
   - Project Schedule
   - Project Map
   - Preliminary Plan

   The corps agencies can be contacted at:
   California Conservation Corps representative:
   Name: Wei Hsieh
   Email: atp@ccc.ca.gov
   Phone: (916) 341-3154

   Community Conservation Corps representative:
   Name: Danielle Lynch
   Email: inquiry@atpcommunitycorps.org
   Phone: (916) 426-9170

   A. The applicant has coordinated with the CCC to identify how a state conservation corps can be a partner of the project. Yes ☒ No ☐
      • Please include a copy of the correspondence in the application Appendix.
B. The applicant has coordinated with a representative from the California Association of Local Conservation Corps (CALCC) to identify how a certified community conservation corps can be a partner of the project. Yes ☒ No ☐
   - Please include a copy of the correspondence in the application Appendix.

C. The applicant intends to utilize the CCC or a certified community conservation corps on all items where participation is indicated? Yes ☒ No ☐

   I have coordinated with a representative of the CCC; and the following are project items that they are qualified to partner on:

   CCC was contacted on June 8, 2015 and indicated they are unable to participate in this project.

   I have coordinated with a representative of the CALCC; and the following are project items that they are qualified to partner on:

   Item 2 - Temporary Fence
   Item 6 - Clearing and Grubbing
   Item 13 - Fencing
   Item 16 - Remove Fence
   Item 20 - Retaining Walls
   Item 23 - Trail Signage
   Item 28 - Irrigation System
   Item 32 - Tree Planting

   *If the applicant has indicated intended use of the CCC or CALCC in the approved application, a copy of the agreement between the implementing agency and the CCC or CALCC must be provided by the implementing agency, and will be incorporated as part of the original application, prior to request for authorization of funds for construction.

   Or

D. Did the CCC and a certified community conservation corps indicate they cannot participate in the project? Yes ☒ No ☐

   CCC indicated they cannot participate in this project (see Appendix H).

   Or

E. The project sponsor is electing to provide demonstration of the cost-effectiveness clause 23 CFR 635.204 and provide the relevant documentation. (include in Appendix) Yes ☐ No ☐
8. Project is not part of developer-funded basic good practices in a new development.
   See the Federal Highway Administration's guidance for more background on basic good practices.
   http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design_guidance/design.cfm

   Yes ☐ No ☒

   If applicable, please explain how the project falls outside of developer-funded basic good practices (100 words or less).

   Project is not part of a developer funded project or new or future development
Section IV

Narrative Questions
IV. Narrative Questions (Sections 1-6)
20 pages maximum, 12 point font
(ATP: 0-95 points total; BPFP: 0-83 points total)

1. Increasing Walking & Biking
(ATP: 0-30 points; BPFP: 0-44 points)

   Note: In relation to the State ATP, the Regional ATP places additional emphasis on clearly demonstrating how well the project supports improving access to transit services, increasing access to schools, and eliminating gaps or barriers in the bicycle/pedestrian network. In each of your responses, be sure to describe the current and projected types and numbers/rates of users.

A. Schools/Students
Describe the potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and bicycling routes to and from schools. Please include any relevant walk audit, needs assessment, or other supporting materials.
(ATP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-11 points)

   The proposed trail is fortunate to provide a direct connection to the Folsom Lake College campus, with a current enrollment of 8,000 and growing. Currently, students have no facilities available for them to walk or bike to campus. There are no sidewalks along the north side of East Bidwell Street and no continuous bike lanes or bike paths along this segment of East Bidwell Street.

   Recent surveys done by Folsom Lake College have shown almost 60% of students reside within 3-5 miles of the campus and with the addition of the Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail it is anticipated that many will walk or ride on the new addition. This will have the additional benefit of making the campus more accessible to many, including those unable to drive.

   No current pedestrian or bicycle usage counts are available for the Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail because the facility does not currently exist. However, bicycle and pedestrian counts were conducted over a four year period from 2010 - 2013 at 12 locations throughout the City for both on-street Class II bike lanes and off-street Class I Bike Trails. The counts were done in accordance with the National Bicycle and Pedestrian Documentation Program. The counts were done on September 14, 2010; September 13, 2011; September 11, 2012; and September 10, 2013. The counts were on a Tuesday from 4pm to 7pm. The results of the survey are shown on Figure 1.
Figure 1 – Bicycle and Pedestrian Counts - City of Folsom
Count summary for 2010 thru 2013.
Time period is 4PM to 7PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Bicycles</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tuesday, Sep 14</td>
<td>49 29 53 226 189</td>
<td>23 16 0 37 18</td>
<td>1 0 0 4 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>132 29 40 141 514</td>
<td>19 5 11 72 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>166 54 58 321 521</td>
<td>35 12 24 57 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>196 43 46 275 517</td>
<td>38 15 26 38 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surey not done</td>
<td>2 0 0 1 10</td>
<td>2 0 0 1 10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tuesday, Sep 15</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is a one of the count forms for one of the 4 count stations at the Lake Natoma location.
### STANDARD SCREENLINE CLASS 1 TRAIL COUNT FORM

**Name:** Jay and Jan O'Brien  
**Location:** Bike Trail near the south end of Folsom Blvd at Lake Natoma Crossing  
**Date:** 9/10/13  
**Start Time:** 4 pm  
**End Time:** 7 pm  
**Weather:** 4 pm 97F; 5 pm 93F; 6 pm 90F; 7 pm 80F

For users traveling east (upstream side of the bridge)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Bicyclists*</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 - 4:15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 - 4:30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 - 4:45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 - 5:00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 - 5:15</td>
<td>7 (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 - 5:30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 - 5:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 - 6:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 - 6:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:15 - 6:30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 - 6:45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45 - 7:00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bicyclists using off-street Class 1 bike trail except Class 2 on-street bike trail users shown in parentheses. A total of 3 Class 2 trail users plus 100 Class 1 users.
The total number of cyclists counted within the 3 hour period in 2010 was 876 and that number increased to just over 1,400 in 2013. The number of pedestrians counted was 187 in 2010 and jumped to 288 in 2013. The highest counts were recorded at the intersection of the American River Bike Trail and the Historic Truss Bridge with an average of over 500 cyclists and 70–80 pedestrians within the 3 hour period. The number of pedestrians and cyclists currently utilizing the Folsom/Placerville Rail corridor is low even though the demand is high. The safety concerns and unfriendly atmosphere expressed by cyclists and pedestrians makes it very hard to attract new users to the corridor. As the counts show in Figure 1, the public will walk and bike as long at the facilities are safe and take them were they need to go.

Providing a Class I facility for cyclists and pedestrians that is physically separated from East Bidwell Street, and provides direct front door access to the every expanding Folsom Lake College campus will be a major attraction to students and faculty. Once this project fills the current gap between the Humbug-Willow Creek Trail and Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail, residents living in the 1,000 plus multifamily units adjacent to the HBWC trail will now have direct trail access to the Folsom Lake college campus, less than 2 miles away.

B. Transit Services

Describe the potential for increased walking and bicycling access to and from transit services, including transit stops and transfer centers. If a pedestrian project, is it located within one-half mile radius of transit stops? If a bicycle project, is it located within a 3 mile radius of transit services?

(ATP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-11 points)

The proposed new trail is located just 100-feet from the Folsom Stage line Route 20 transit stop, located adjacent to the Folsom Lake College Campus. Rt 20 provides access to the Iron Point Light Rail Station, which provides service to downtown Sacramento. In addition to the Iron Point light rail station, Rt 20 has stops at a number of destinations throughout Folsom including, Broadstone Market Place, Pallado Mall, Kaiser Medical Center, Folsom High School, and major employers like Intel and CALISO. Connecting the Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail with the well-established 16-mile HBWC Trail now provides direct trail access to over 15,000 residents that are now within 2-3 miles of the Folsom Stage Line RT 20 Transit stop. Pretty amazing.
Project is also adjacent to an inactive rail line that extends 30 miles into the City of Placerville and could potentially be utilized for passenger rail in the future, which would further enhance the importance of the proposed trail by offering additional mode choice options from the bike trail. The trail is being designed to accommodate future rail surface (Rail-with-Trail).

C. Barrier Removal and Gap Closure
Describe how the project removes a barrier, closes a gap, or otherwise completes a facility related to non-motorized mobility. Include a description of the existing barriers and/or gaps, how the barriers and gaps within the existing facility discourage walking or biking, and how non-motorized mobility will be effectively addressed upon project completion.

\[ \text{ATP: } 0-10 \text{ points; BPFP: } 0-22 \text{ points} \]

The most significant advantage this project offers to pedestrians and cyclists is addressing the current barrier East Bidwell Street has created and filling the long awaited gap in the Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail and connecting with the Humbug-Willow Creek Trail (Figure 2). East Bidwell is a major arterial street with an ADT of 35,000 and an average speed of 50-55 mph and lacking the appropriate facilities for cyclists and pedestrians. Under the current condition cyclists and pedestrians are not willing to share the road with the current traffic conditions along East Bidwell Street. The City has heard loud and clear from the public during the update of both the Bikeway and Pedestrian Master Plans that they do not feel comfortable riding or walking next to traffic and would ride and walk more if they could use a facility separated from the roadway. Public input was essential in the planning for this project and it helped confirm what the community feels is most important and what would encourage them to pursue more active transportation alternatives. During the development of the “East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan” (adopted February 15, 2015) two of the primary recommendations by the stakeholders and general public was to provide bike and pedestrian gap closures for improved connectivity and to preserve the Folsom/Placerville Rail corridor for future use and accommodate a Multi-Use Trail. A “Needs Study” conducted in 2006 showed that facilities for walking ranked as the highest priority among the residents polled (out of 47 other choices). The results show the community wants facilities for active transportation and based on previous user counts they will use them. As mentioned the new trail removes the current barrier by providing a Class I Trail, physically separated from East Bidwell Street while still providing direct bicycle and pedestrian access to the many destinations along the corridor.
Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail Gap Closure Project – Destinations and Attractions

- Existing Class I Bike Path
- ATP Grant Project
- Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail

1. Folsom Lake College
2. Folsom Middle School
3. Cummings Family Park
4. John Kemp Community Park
5. Broadstone Plaza
6. Palladio
7. Broadstone Market Place
8. Costco
9. Folsom Gateway Center
10. Kaiser Permanente
11. Mercy Folsom Hospital
12. Lakeside Church
13. 24 Hour Fitness
14. Office
15. Folsom Lake College Campus
16. Major Retail
17. High Density Multi-family Apartments
18. Mercy Low Income Senior Apartments

Figure 2
without having to compete for space on the roadway. Filling this last gap in the Folsom/Placerville Rail trail makes these connections all possible.

2. Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians  
(ATP: 0-25 points; BPFP: 0-19 points)
Note: In relation to the State ATP, the Regional ATP places additional emphasis on providing data that demonstrates the benefits this project will have on reducing walking/bicycling fatalities and injuries. Please describe the potential for reducing the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries, including the identification of safety hazards for pedestrians and bicyclists.

A. History of Collisions
Describe the plan/program influence area or project location's history of collisions (both the number of collisions and the rate of collisions in relation to the population around the area, and/or the number of people biking or walking exposed to the risk of collision) resulting in fatalities and injuries to non-motorized users and the source(s) of data used (e.g. collision reports, community observation, surveys, audits).
(ATP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-4 points)

A Collision Report Summary was prepared by the City of Folsom Public Works Department for the segment of East Bidwell Street from Oak Avenue Parkway to Iron Point Road. This is the segment of East Bidwell Street that cyclists and pedestrians must currently use to travel along this corridor to access the Folsom Lake College campus and numerous other retail destinations along East Bidwell Street. The attractions and destinations have made this is a very popular transportation corridor and unfortunately there are no other options available for cyclists and pedestrians.

Figure 3 shows the Collision Report Summary reported all collision involving motor vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists from 01/01/2010 to 12/31/2015. Out of the 4 documented incidents between vehicles and bicycles, the types of collisions included 4 broadside and 1 other. Of those 4 incidents there was 1 injury. Each of the collisions listed between a motorist and cyclist in the report occurred at intersections along East Bidwell Street. The number of incidents may appear low however, the current conditions along the corridor discourage many cyclists and pedestrians from taking the risk of sharing the road with traffic along East Bidwell Street. As mentioned the demand is there with the current 8,000 students at Folsom Lake College and the proximity of several neighborhoods within 2 miles of the many major destinations along East Bidwell Street (See Figure 2). The goal of this project is to provide the appropriate counter measures to address this problem. In response, this project offers a facility that is physically separated from East Bidwell Street providing cyclists and pedestrians a more user friendly
Proposed Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail Alignment

City of Folsom

E Bidwell Collisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Injury</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3
environment where there not forced to share the roadway with motorists or navigate through intersections along the route.

B. Community Need

Please describe the need for the project and provide an analysis of the project’s benefit to your community and the region. Qualitative benefits can be measured using various factors. Factors to discuss, as applicable, include: accident reduction, existing and projected usage/ridership/productivity, increase or decrease in ADT, life cycle cost reduction, VMT decrease, pavement quality index, congestion relief (idle reduction, stop and go reduction, and travel time decrease), reduced operating or maintenance costs, etc.

(\textit{ATP: 0}-5 \textit{points}; \textit{BPFP: 0}-4 \textit{points})

The need for the project centers on providing the necessary facilities to accommodate active transportation with safe, efficient bicycle and pedestrian travel along the East Bidwell Street Corridor to access the numerous destinations, specifically the Folsom Lake College campus. Not having a facility to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel along this very popular corridor in the City needs to be addressed. East Bidwell Street from Oak Avenue to Iron Point Road operates at a Level of Service (LOS) between D-E and during peak times it reaches LOS F near the intersection with Iron Point Road. As development continues along the corridor, traffic congestion will continue to worsen, resulting in increased delays. The proposed project is desperately needed to provide a realistic transportation alternative and provide a corridor that accommodates all users safely, and is consistent with the recently adopted East Bidwell Complete Streets Corridor Plan. The only option available for cyclists currently is to ride on the shoulder, which varies in width and the only thing separating them from the motorist is a 6” wide white stripe. Also there are no sidewalks on the north side of East Bidwell Street between Oak Avenue and Iron Point Road, making it very uncomfortable to travel along this corridor.

The specific benefits from removing the current barrier and filling the final gap in the Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail include:

\textbf{Reducing Accidents/Conflicts between Motorists and Cyclists:} 

The separated facility has proven to be the most successful way to reduce and even eliminate conflicts/accidents between motorists and cyclists. This is even more important along this corridor with the high traffic volumes and speeds of 50-55 mph.

\textbf{Existing and Projected Uses:} 

As mentioned, bicycle and pedestrian counts were conducted over a four year period from 2010 – 2013 at 12 locations throughout the City and the results verified that if the appropriate facilities are provided the public will use them. The staff at Folsom Lake
College conducted a survey among the 8,000 students and found that 60% of the students live within 3-5 miles of the campus and would use the facility once it’s constructed. An additional benefit for students who ride their bike is not having to pay for a parking pass and front row parking.

Effects on ADT:
This project has a realistic opportunity to reduce overall ADT along the East Bidwell corridor. For example, if just 5% of the students at Folsom Lake College now start riding their bike that would be almost 500 cars off the road every day. Also with the connection this project makes between existing multi-family housing and the major retail shopping centers along the corridor, including Palladio Mall and Broadstone Market Place it could replace a significant amount of car trips to bicycle/pedestrian trips. The highest density of multi-family housing in the City is within 2 miles from the major shopping centers and 1 mile from Folsom Lake College, all accessible from the new trail.

Congestion Relief:
The ability to shift these shorter trips (those 3 mile and under) to non-motorized trips is a goal of this project and will serve to reduce overall ADT and VMT and help toward reducing congestion along this very busy segment of East Bidwell Street. Reducing congestion has several benefits including idle reduction, travel time decrease and helping toward greenhouse gas reduction through improved air quality.

C. Safety Hazards
Describe how the project/program/plan will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards that contribute to pedestrian and/or bicyclist injuries or fatalities (discussed in A and B above); including but not limited to the following possible areas; include a description of the existing facility, how the incomplete facility discourages walking or biking, and how the completed facility will be better utilized upon project completion.

(\textit{ATP}: 0-10 points; \textit{BPFP}: 0-11 points)
- Reduces speed or volume of motor vehicles in the proximity of non-motorized users.
- Improves sight distance and visibility between motorized and non-motorized users.
- Eliminates potential conflict points between motorized and non-motorized users, including creating physical separation between motorized and non-motorized users.
- Improves compliance with local traffic laws for both motorized and non-motorized users.
- Addresses inadequate traffic control devices.
- Eliminates or reduces behaviors that lead to collisions involving non-motorized users.
- Addresses inadequate or unsafe traffic control devices, bicycle facilities, trails, crosswalks and/or sidewalks.

There are two significant safety hazards within the project area that need to be addressed. The first is that there are no sidewalks on the north side of East Bidwell Street, forcing pedestrians to walk on the shoulder of the road adjacent to cars passing them at an average speed of 50-55 mph. The second safety hazard is cyclists having to share the road with the high traffic volumes and speeds along East Bidwell Street. The only thing separating the cyclist from the adjacent passing automobile is a 6" white stripe. Over the last 5 years there have been 4
collisions between cyclists and motorists within the project area. The current condition along the corridor is a major deterrent to attracting cyclists and/or pedestrians to travel through this area.

Safety is a top priority for this project and to help address the specific collision types identified, the project has included safety countermeasures. The source for selecting the appropriate roadway safety countermeasures was from the Caltrans local highway safety improvement program – specifically the Local Roadway Safety Manual.

FHWA has identified three main considerations to assure appropriate selection of CMF’s for a given countermeasure. They include the availability, the applicability and the quality. These three considerations were taken into account in the selection of the appropriate countermeasure.

- **Eliminate potential conflict points between motorized and non-motorized users, including physical separation between motorized and non-motorized users:**
  This measure was determined to be the most appropriate action for the current conditions. All the incidents reported on the Collison Report between a motorist and a bicyclist occurred at an intersection where automobiles were making either a right or left turn collided with a bicyclist proceeding straight. The most appropriate safety countermeasure as listed in the Local Roadway Safety Manual included:

  **R37 – Install sidewalk/pathway (to avoid walking/riding along roadway)**

  This countermeasure offers the protection needed to provide a safer facility and improving the comfort level for all users.

- **Addresses inadequate or unsafe traffic control devices, bicycle facilities, trails, crosswalks and/or sidewalks:**
  This measure was also very appropriate to the current situation. As mentioned, there currently are no sidewalks along the north side of East Bidwell Street and a lack of consistent bike lanes. The only option for pedestrians and cyclists is to use the shoulder of the roadway. This project addresses this problem by constructing a 12-foot wide Class I trail physical separated from East Bidwell Street that pedestrians and cyclists can utilize to safely travel through this area.
o **Reduces speed or volume of motor vehicles in the proximity of non-motorized users:**

Having the bike trail physical separated from the roadway will effectively reduce the volume of motor vehicle traffic in the proximity of the non-motorized user. The bike trail will have a minimum separation of 60 feet from the roadway.

**Improves sight distance and visibility between motorized and non-motorized users:**

The existing speeds along East Bidwell Street impairs site distance in specific areas for motorized travel at speeds approaching 55 mph making it difficult to anticipate cyclists and pedestrians utilizing the shoulder of the road. This creates a hazardous situation that is addressed with the proposed Class I Trail physically separated form the roadway.

o **Improves compliance with local traffic laws for both motorized and non-motorized users:**

The new Class I facility will be separated from the roadway and eliminating any conflicts with motorists. It would improve compliance by reducing the interaction between cyclists and motorists at signalized and unsignalized intersections.

o **Addresses inadequate traffic control devices:**

This segment of East Bidwell Street has numerous traffic signals that create additional conflicts for pedestrians and cyclists to navigate through. Having a separated trail will help reduce these conflicts and allow the existing traffic control devises to effectively move motorists through the corridor with limited interruption from cyclists and pedestrians.

o **Eliminates or reduces behaviors that lead to collisions involving non-motorized users:**

Separating pedestrians and cyclists from the high speed motorists on East Bidwell Street will eliminate the potential for collisions. Also shifts from driving to active modes, like walking and cycling tend to reduce total per capita collision rates (U.S. Census 2000).
3. Supporting greenhouse gas reduction goals & linking to MTP/SCS

(AtP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-21 points)

Describe how the project advances the active transportation efforts of SACOG to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals while improving health and sustainability as established pursuant to SB 375 and SB 391, and supports implementation of the 2012 MTP/SCS. Figure 7.7 of the 2012 MTP/SCS (“Greenhouse Gas Emissions per Capita from On-Road Sources”, page 179) may be used to demonstrate your project’s potential to support greenhouse gas reduction goals; if you already completed a project-specific GHG analysis for this project, please describe the methodology used and the results of the analysis.

A. Supportive Development Efforts

Please describe how the project supports land use and economic development efforts in alignment with MTP/SCS performance goals and the land use vision for the area, as described in the SCS, or the local general and/or specific plan.

(AtP: 0-5 points; BPFP: 0-5 points)

1. Please describe the project’s Community Type (i.e. development context) as described in the MTP/SCS for 2035 (i.e. Centers and Corridors, Established Communities, Developing Communities, Rural Residential Communities, or Lands Not Identified for Development—definitions of the Community Types can be found in Chapter 3 of the MTP/SCS for 2035: http://sacog.org/mtpscs/mtpscs/). Next, please describe the amount of development and type of uses that are expected to be built over the next 20 years for that Community Type in your jurisdiction (reference Appendix E-3 of the 2012 MTP/SCS). If your project is located in the Community Type of “Lands Not Identified for Development” or there is insufficient information in the 2012 MTP/SCS Appendix E-3 for your project plan area, please describe the project’s development context using the applicable local land use plan.

The project community type based on its location along the East Bidwell corridor and as defined in the MTP/SCS is considered a “Established Community” type. Capacity in the city, including the current SOI area, is estimated at 14,139 new housing units and 32,381 new jobs. Established Communities, if built out, would add 15,595 new jobs and 3,155 new housing units. In total, the MTP/SCS forecast for Folsom includes 10,247 new housing units and 13,304 new jobs by 2035. Of this, the majority of the new jobs, 10,264, are in Established Communities. The majority of the new jobs are commercial, office, and light industrial filling in the existing employment centers along Highway 50. Established Communities would also add 2,795 new housing units.

2. Describe how the project, in this Community Type, will support biking and walking in place of vehicle trips. (e.g. the project connects a multifamily housing development to a school or shopping center where no such connection previously existed.)

This project within the “Established Community” type will help support biking and walking trips by providing a Class I trail that connects the largest existing density of multi-family housing to the 8,000 students enrolled at Folsom Lake College and also the several large retail shopping
centers including, Broadstone Market Place, Broadstone Plaza, 24 Hour Family Fitness and the Palladio Mall, all no more than 3 miles from their residence. In addition, the project provides a direct connection to the City of Folsom Bus Route #20, which provides connections to many destinations including the Iron Point Light Rail Station. Currently, there are no facilities on East Bidwell that provide this connection. As mentioned there are no sidewalks on the north side of East Bidwell, and no consistent bike lanes.

B. Placemaking
Describe/explain the project’s role in a placemaking strategy for the future land use and transportation vision for the area it is located, as described in the MTP/SCS and/or the local general/specific plan. Placemaking is defined as a combination of strategies (e.g. zoning, context-sensitive design standards, planned infrastructure, etc.) that lead to a built environment where walking and biking can become a primary mode for shorter distance trips.

The biggest job growth expected in the City per the MTP/SCS is in the Established Community Type and there is also an estimated 2,795 new housing units planned within this same community type. The location of this project within the still rapidly growing retail and commercial core fits well to help accommodate that future growth and provides a much needed active transportation facility to address the every increasing traffic demand. As this new trail becomes established in the community it will become an essential part of the built environment, where walking and biking will be the primary mode for trips between 3-5 miles.

It is anticipated that as traffic delays on East Bidwell Street continue to worsen, residents in this community will realize that they will be able reach their destination in less time on their bike then driving and have the added benefit of being able to park right by the front door every time. Being able to shift these short trips to non-motorized trips will help support the regions greenhouse reduction goals.

C. Reducing or shortening vehicle trips
Building on your responses in sections A and B, describe the project’s potential to reduce the number (i.e. replace) of or shorten vehicle miles traveled (VMT), particularly trips serving utilitarian purposes (e.g. trips to school, work, services, shopping). The resource map “2012 MTP/SCS Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Capita” (available on http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/fundingprograms_bikeped-overview.cfm) illustrates average VMT per capita throughout the region by 2035 and may be used to support a description of your project’s potential to achieve VMT reductions in your community; alternatively, you may use information from approved local plans or other applicable documents to support a description of how your project will support reduced VMT.

(2015 Application for the Active Transportation Program and Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program)
This project has the biggest potential of reducing VMT by providing a more attractive alternative to driving, by providing a facility that will help people shift from vehicle to non-vehicle modes. This area is within an Established Community type and is fortunate to have a good mix of residential, employment, education and service uses to allow people to accomplish their daily activities with less driving and more walking and biking and consequently less VMT. The resources map 2012 MTP/SCS Vehicles Miles Traveled Per Capita in Folsom shows a range of 18-30 VMT in 2035. Based on the location of this project, it will serve to reduce that number by replacing many of the 3-5 mile utilitarian trips in town from car to bike. This project provides a direct link from many neighborhoods to the most popular destinations in Folsom along East Bidwell Street. Within the last five years this segment of East Bidwell has experienced significant growth with new major retail, including the Broadstone Market Place, Palladio Mall, Broadstone Plaza and of course Folsom Lake College which grew from a few modular trailers to a 60,000 sqft facility with a current enrollment of 8,000 students and the opening of the Davis Center (Three Stages) concert venue, which attracts 1,000’s of visitors a month.
4. Cost effectiveness
   (Total ATP: 0-10 points, BPFP: 0-4 points + Other Considerations)
   Note: In relation to the State ATP, the Regional ATP emphasizes cost-effectiveness as a way of determining the appropriate facility improvement or project given the needs of the intended users, how well it is expected to perform, what other financial support (i.e. match) is pledged, and how it minimizes construction or operating costs.

A. Context Sensitive Design
   Describe how the project design is appropriate for the community and surrounding environment.
   (ATP: 0-5 points; BPFP: 0-4 points)

   To be consistent with the principles of Context Sensitive Design the project was designed using this model:
   - Optimize safety of the facility for both the user and the community.
   - Are in harmony with the community, and preserve the environmental, scenic, aesthetic, historic, and natural resource values of the area.
   - Are designed and built with minimal disruption to the community.
   - Involve efficient and effective use of the resources (time, budget, community) of all involved parties.
   - Assure that transportation objectives of projects are clearly described and discussed with local communities in a process that encourages reciprocal communication about local views and needs in the overall project setting.

   Through the Context Sensitive Design process the city made it a high priority to engage the community and soliciting their comments to ensure we were providing a facility that met their needs and still being sensitive to the surrounding environment. This process was conducted through the recent East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Planning Study, which made every effort to include the public in the process (see Appendix I).

B. Describe Alternatives
   Describe the alternatives that were considered and how the ATP-related benefits vs. project-costs varied between them. Explain why the final proposed alternative is considered to have the highest Benefit to Cost Ratio (B/C) with respect to the ATP purpose of “increased use of active modes of transportation”.
   (ATP: 0-3 points; BPFP: Part of Other Considerations)

   The project design alternative analysis was a collaborative effort between the City of Folsom, Folsom Lake College, local business owners, residents and community stakeholders. The alternatives analyzed for this project focused on the safest, and most cost-effective design that would provide a seamless connection between the neighborhoods and the many destinations along the East Bidwell Street Corridor and take advantage of making a connection to the 16-mile Humbug-Willow Creek Trail. The initial design proposed to provide bike lanes on this segment of East Bidwell Street. After further analysis it was determined that with the current and projected traffic volumes and speeds on East Bidwell Street the ability to attract cyclists to use this segment would be limited, and still would not provide a facility for pedestrians to use.
Other options were limited based on the minimal right-of-way available along this corridor. Providing the Class I trail along the existing JPA corridor was found to offer the best Benefit to Cost ratio. The City already owns the right-of-way where the trail is proposed, which reduces the overall project cost, while providing a facility that met the overall goal of providing a safe, efficient and seamless route for both pedestrians and cyclists to access the many destinations along East Bidwell Street.

The communities input was a big factor in choosing the preferred alternative, of providing a facility that was physically separated from the roadway, filled a gap in the trail network and met their preference of avoiding any conflicts between motorists and cyclists/pedestrians. This alternative is consistent with the safety counter measures identified earlier to address the current safety concerns along East Bidwell Street.

The principles of Context Sensitive Street Design (CSSD) as outlined previously also played a role in the selection and analysis of the project alternatives. This project is consistent with the principles of CSSD, which respects traditional street design objectives for safety, efficiency, capacity, and maintenance, while integrating community objectives and values relating to compatibility, livability, sense of place, urban design, cost and environmental impacts. A fundamental concern for CSSD projects is balancing the space requirements among various users that must be accommodated in the urban/suburban, public right-of-way. This project emphasizes this concept by promoting efficient and safe mobility for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles within the existing JPA railroad corridor.
C. Calculation

Use the ATP Benefit/Cost Tool, provided by Caltrans, to calculate the ratio of the benefits of the project relative to both the total project cost and ATP funds requested. After calculating the Benefit/Cost ratios for the project, please provide constructive feedback on the tool.

(\textit{ATP: 0-2 points; BPFP: Part of Other Considerations})

\begin{tabular}{l c}
  Total Benefits: & \$16,010,543.09 \\
  Total Project Cost: & \$1,183,820.00 \\
  Grant Funds Requested & \$1,048,036.00 \\
\end{tabular}

\[
\left( \frac{\text{Benefit}}{\text{Total Project Cost}} \right) \text{ and } \left( \frac{\text{Benefit}}{\text{Funds Requested}} \right)
\]

\[
\left( \frac{\$16,010,543.09}{\$1,183,820.00} \right) \text{ and } \left( \frac{\$16,010,543.09}{\$1,048,036.00} \right)
\]

\[
(13.52 \text{ and } 15.27)
\]

The ATP Benefit/Cost Tool overall was user friendly and provides consistent results for all users. Did have trouble entering the pedestrian trip count numbers into the table. Would recommend looking into that area. Not sure if anyone else had the same problem.

The Tool is available at \url{http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/eab/atp.html}.

*Benefits must directly relate to the goals of the Active Transportation Program.
5. Improved Public Health

(A TP: 0-10 points)

A. Current Health Data

Describe current health-related data available for the targeted users of the project. (ATP: 0-3 points)

The Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail Project provides ample opportunity for the improvement of public health through the creation of public infrastructure that will encourage bicycling and walking in the City of Folsom. Residents and commuters alike will be able to use the new facility on their way to work, for shopping, or for recreational use, all of which contributes to improved public health. In addition to the health benefits created by increased walking and bicycling associated with the new infrastructure, the project will also result in a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions as residents elect to travel by bike or foot instead of in automobiles.

Although there are many ways to be physically active, walking and cycling are among the most practical and effective, particularly for inactive and overweight people. Specific health issues we plan to focus on are obesity, diabetes and asthma. In Sacramento County (the County in which Folsom is located), 14.9% of children and adults have been diagnosed with asthma, a rate 0.8% than the state average (www.californiabreathing.com). The World Health Organization (WHO) claims that obesity is dramatically on the rise, particularly in urban settings. Figures 4 and 5 are taken from the Sacramento County Department of Health and Human Services, show the most current health data provided by the California Health Interview Survey (CHIS). In 2011, it was estimated that 97,000 adults in Sacramento County had been diagnosed with diabetes; compared to the State, the County rate was higher. Among those diagnosed with diabetes, 17. 1% had Type I diabetes where 78.5% had Type II Diabetes. According to the WHO, Type II diabetes is often the result from excess body weight and physical inactivity. Diabetes was the seventh leading cause of death in Sacramento County in 2011. In 2011, an estimated 295,000 (28%) adults aged 18 and older were obese.
Lower than recommended activity levels are directly related to Type II diabetes, vascular disease, and cancers. Low physical activity levels put a person at higher risk for obesity which is a mediating risk factor for the above chronic conditions. The California Health Interview Survey 2011-2012 found 4.8% of Sacramento and Eldorado County children were physically active for at least an hour every day versus the state percentage of 32.6%. Teens in the Sacramento and El Dorado County were roughly the same with only 4.6% putting in at least an hour of activity
every day in a typical week which was still significantly worse than the statewide average of only 16.1%.

One of the biggest factors contributing to inactivity is not having a place close by to walk and bike safely. This new Class I trail offers a facility available to all age groups and skill levels. The trail offers cyclists and pedestrians a stress free environment separated from motorists. Furthermore, because the facility will link residential areas and employment centers in the corridor, the proposed trail will encourage users to bike to work thereby shifting commuter trips away from vehicles. The Figures 6 and 7 show the majority (75.0%) of Sacramento County commuters reported driving alone as their main transportation method. That is a 2.0% higher than the statewide estimate of 73.0%. In addition, transportation accidents were the leading cause of unintentional injury deaths in Sacramento County.
B. Potential for Improvement
Describe how you expect your project to enhance public health. (ATP: 0-7 points)

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) suggests that adults ages 18 and older get at least 2 hours and 30 minutes of moderate intensity aerobic activity, such as walking, every week for good health. The City of Folsom expects the Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail project to provide an excellent opportunity to encourage this type of physical activity due to the fact that once this trail segment is complete users will have unlimited active transportation opportunities with 60 miles of continuous class I trails connecting residents in Placer, El Dorado and Sacramento County to numerous destinations suitable for all skill and fitness levels. The lack of a continuous trail along the East Bidwell Street corridor has been big deterrent to cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed project will help encourage more active transportation along this corridor by providing a new connection to one of the most thriving and activity filled retail/commercial centers in eastern Sacramento County: the East Bidwell Street Corridor. By creating this connection, literally thousands of residents living within a very easy walk or bike ride will have a new incentive to walk or bike to dine, shop, attend class, or just for the sake of exercise.

The City has seen a steady increase in cycling and walking as our trail system has developed to almost 40 miles. The addition of this 1.3 mile segment will help us fully realize the potential we are striving for, to improve the communities overall health by offering a truly barrier free Class I trail network.
6. Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities

(AtP: 0-10 points)

A. Disadvantaged Community Details (AtP screening for DAC points)

Please include a map with your project's location in the Appendix to demonstrate the project is located in or near a Disadvantaged Community.

I. Is the project located in a disadvantaged community? Yes ☐ No ☒

II. Does the project significantly benefit a disadvantaged community? Yes ☐ No ☒

a. Which criteria does the project meet? (Answer all that apply)

- Median household income for the community benefited by the project: $ _______
  - Provide all census tract numbers
  - Provide the median income for each census track listed
  - Provide the population for each census track listed

- California Communities Environmental Health Screen Tool (CalEnviroScreen) score for the community benefited by the project: _________
  - Provide all census tract numbers
  - Provide the CalEnviroScreen 2.0 score for each census track listed
  - Provide the population for each census track listed

- For projects that benefit public school students, percentage of students eligible for the Free or Reduced Price Meals Programs: ________%
  - Provide percentage of students eligible for the Free or Reduced Meals Program for each and all schools included in the proposal

b. Should the community benefitting from the project be considered disadvantaged based on criteria not specified in the program guidelines? If so, provide data for all criteria above and a quantitative assessment of why the community should be considered disadvantaged.

  • Provide median household income (option 1), the CalEnviroScreen 2.0 score (option 2), and if applicable, the percentage of students eligible for Free and Reduced Meal Programs (option 3)
  • Provide ADDITIONAL data that demonstrates that the community benefiting from the project/program/plan is disadvantaged
  • Provide an explanation for why this additional data demonstrates that the community is disadvantaged

The proposed project is fortunate to connect with several other existing trails that provide access throughout the City. One of those trails is the 16-mile Humbug-Willow Creek Trail which extends north-south and is adjacent to two affordable housing apartment complexes. One is called the Vintage Willow Creek Apartments and is ½ mile from the proposed project. This
complex has 55 units for Very Low Median Income residents and 128 units for Low Median Income residents. The second residence is called the Creekside Manor Apartments and this complex is located where the proposed Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail connects with the Humbug-Willow Creek Trail. This complex has 138 units for Very Low Median Income residents.

The connection this new trail provides to the Humbug-Willow Creek Trail will now offer a direct connection for these residents to access to the transit/bus stop located adjacent to the new Trail across from Folsom Lake College and have easy access to the many attractions and destinations along the East Bidwell Street corridor.

The population and income levels served by this project are projected to be very diverse in nature because of the access opportunities this project offers. As mentioned, the linkage to a transit/bus stop located in adjacent to the project provides alternative transportation opportunities for the low-income population, who might not have easy access to an automobile. From the transit/bus stop, trail users can connect with light rail at the Iron Point Station and travel to downtown Sacramento.

B. Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities

I. For proposals located within a disadvantaged community: What percent of the funds requested will be expended in the disadvantaged community? ____ % Explain how this percent was calculated.
   \[\text{ATP: 0-5 points}\]
   \[N/A\]

II. Describe how the project/program(plan provides (for plans: will provide) a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to members of the disadvantaged community. Define what direct, meaningful, and assured benefit means for your proposed project/program/plan, how this benefit will be achieved, and who will receive this benefit.
   \[\text{ATP: 0-5 points}\]

The project does provide a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to the residents in the low income housing communities by providing connectivity to the City's larger Class 1 trail network. Currently, that network is cut off by the gap in the Folsom/Parkway Rail Trail and the current conditions along the East Bidwell Street corridor. East Bidwell Street is a very real barrier for
unaccompanied minors, seniors, members of the disabled community, and alternative modes travelers who are uncomfortable sharing the road with traffic on the high speed arterial streets. The project represents a commitment on the part of the City of Folsom to serve its low income residents.

Because the surrounding area is generally comprised of residential and higher density housing, the project will be a huge benefit to the community as the local residents now have safe and a more direct access route to the retail centers as well as transit adjacent to the Folsom Lake College. The Folsom Stage Line, Route 20 has a bus stop adjacent to the proposed trail with a connection to Regional Transits Light Rail Station at Iron Point Road. Overall, better access through interconnection with other transportation modes and gap closure routes will have a positive economic effect on this area.
Section V

Other Considerations
V. Other Considerations
2 pages maximum, 12 point font
(ATP:0-10 points BPFP: 0-12 points)

A. Applicant’s Performance on Past Grants

1. Describe how your agency intends to deliver this project on time and within budget. If your agency has had difficulty delivering past grant or federal aid projects during the past five years, then also describe what changes your agency will take in order to deliver this project.

Over the last 18 years the City has been awarded grants totaling approximately $14 million that included State and federal funding from various sources administered through the Californian Transportation Commission and Caltrans Local Assistance, including Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation, Bicycle Transportation Account, Federal Lands Access Program and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality and Regional ATP. These projects have been delivered in a timely manner in accordance with federal and State Requirements. The City has the experience and expertise to deliver this project on time and within the proposed budget. The City makes it a priority from the onset, that when applying for grants to spend the extra time creating a realistic schedule, and setting an accurate project budget. This has proven successful for the City of Folsom over the past 18 years. The City also has a full time Trails Coordinator that is committed to implementing trail projects throughout the City.

2. Describe one of your agency’s prior experiences allocating a project through the California Transportation Commission.

Our most recent experience has been on a trail called the Johnny Cash Trail – Phase 1 that was completed in December 2014. The total project budget was $4 million and involved six different state and federal Grants. One of those grants ($790,000) was administered through the California Transportation Commission. The City filed the Project Programming Request and submitted to CTC for board approval to proceed with construction. The project was completed within the required time frame and was closed out and the final invoice for reimbursement was recently submitted.

B. Project Readiness

To demonstrate project readiness and ability to move forward on a timely schedule (i.e. clear schedule, cost, and partnerships to deliver the project), please fill out the Cost and Schedule Summary & the Project Programming Request, both in Excel, available at:

http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/fundingprograms_bikeped-overview.cfm

C. Community and Stakeholder Support

1. Describe the community based public participation process that culminated in the project proposal or plan, such as noticed meetings/public hearings, consultation with stakeholders, etc.

Recognizing the importance of active and meaningful engagement with both those interested and those potentially affected by the project, the project team developed a multi-faceted Community
Engagement Strategy at the onset of the project. This documentation, a copy of which is included in Appendix I, addresses the key elements of community engagement for the project including:

- Focus Group meeting formats and approaches
- Community Meeting formats and approaches
- Online access and engagement
- Environmental Justice, Title VI, and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) considerations
- Notice requirements and advertising for Community Engagement activities

Furthermore, the project community meetings were envisioned to include the following elements to maximize input from participants:

PowerPoint® presentations that, in addition to including material tailored to the specific focus of the workshop, include an introduction to the project and overview of the Corridor. The team has relied heavily on renderings, photos, and other visual techniques to make these presentations understandable to a broad audience.

Multiple opportunities for participants to provide input either verbally, written, or through the use of one of several interactive formats including:

- The use of colored dots that are placed on various options as "votes" from the public
- Large scale aerial maps of the corridor with permanent markers and stickies available for writing
- Strategically stationed maps and other graphics with staff available for discussion
- A coordinated on-line campaign that provides both notifications and opportunities for input prior to and after events

Consistent with the Community Engagement Strategy, the project team has conducted multiple stakeholder and public meetings to discuss the project and to obtain valuable input, feedback, and recommendations. Based on input from the City, four Focus Groups were established, through invitation, to enable the project team to collaborate and interact with representatives from the following four general groups: Active Transportation, Business & Commerce, Municipal, and Service.

To date, the following community engagement activities have been undertaken:

- **February 2013:** Project Kick-Off Meeting
- **June 2013:** Focus Group Meetings
- **July 2013:** Community Meeting #1
- **August 2013:** Online Survey
- **June/July 2014:** City Council Briefings
- **July 2014:** Combined Focus Group Meeting
- **August 2014:** Community Meeting #2
- **November 2014:** Community Meeting #3

Summaries of these meetings are provided in Appendix I.
While all of the feedback received has been valuable and will ultimately influence the direction of the Plan, the following are the primary recommendations as expressed by the stakeholders and the general public:

- Reinvent Central Business District (CBD)
- Maintain Existing Vehicular Capacity in CBD (4 lanes)
- Improve Aesthetics and Corridor Identity
- *Provide Bike and Pedestrian Gap Closures for Improved Connectivity*
- Emphasize all Travel Modes
- Consider Alternate and Parallel Routes (Divert Non-Local Traffic)
- *Preserve the Rail Corridor for Future Use and Accommodate Multi-Use Trail*
- *Integrate Folsom Lake College into the Corridor*

In fact, through the use of an online survey in August 2013, respondents reinforced many of these points by ranking the importance of bicycle facilities and bicycle safety, the significance of traffic congestion, and the attractiveness of the rail corridor for multi-modal use as the most important Corridor considerations. All of these recommendations will guide the development of corridor improvements and enhancements in order to arrive at a Plan that is mutually beneficial and acceptable by all stakeholders and the general public.

2. Describe the local participation process that resulted in the identification and prioritization of the project.

Providing local participation was the highest priority in the preparation of the East Bidwell Street Completes Street Corridor Plan and the process is described above. There were several opportunities for local participation with three community meetings, online surveys, focus group meetings and at City Council.

Through these meetings and surveys the community reinforced the importance of bicycle facilities and bicycle safety, the significance of traffic congestion, and the attractiveness of the rail corridor for multi-modal use as the most important corridor considerations. Was also nice to see the desire to integrate the Folsom Lake College into the JPA corridor. This information was the key in prioritizing the proposed project and addressing the needs of the community.

3. Attach any relevant notices and materials associated with the public outreach identifying support for this project.

See Appendix I – Copies of notices and materials associated with the public outreach from the East Bidwell Street – Complete Streets Corridor Plan. This process confirmed the public support for this project.

D. Cost Effectiveness

Refer to Narrative Question 4 for consideration of Regional BPFP points awarded.
VI. Project Application Checklist

- **Eligibility:** Potential applicants may check with the contacts identified for SACOG, EDCTC (for project sponsors in El Dorado County), or PCTPA (for projects in Placer County) regarding the eligibility of their project or their eligibility as an applicant (project sponsor) for federal transportation funding.

- **Program Schedule:** Review the program schedule (Section 1: Reference Information) in the Guidelines for important dates.

- **Application contents:** Review pages for all needed elements. Review the section of the Guidelines on Project Evaluation (Part G) and check that the application contains all information necessary. Page limits are listed in Part I.
  - Cover letter with a wet signature
  - Completed Application—Part O
    - Project Sponsor Information—Section I
    - Project Information—Section II
    - Screening Criteria—Section III
    - Other Considerations—Section V
    - Narrative Questions—Section IV
  - Complete Appendix—in order
    a. Copy of Statement of Intent to Apply correspondence (due June 5, 2015) —Part K
    b. Cost & Schedule Summary (Excel)— Part L
    c. Project Programming Request (Excel)— Part M
    d. Engineer’s Estimate (Excel)—Part N
    e. Emissions Benefit Calculations for CMAQ (BPFP Applicants)—Part P
    f. Map(s) of project location—or included in Narrative
    g. Photographs of project location—or included in Narrative
    h. Copy of CCC & CALCC Correspondence
    i. Any additional exhibits
    j. Partner Support Letters (if project is co-sponsored)
    k. Miscellaneous — Any other information in support of your project

- **Implementation Requirements:** Review the Implementation section in the Guidelines (Part J) and evaluate your ability to meet all federal and SACOG requirements, including providing local matching funds of at least 11.47 percent of the total project cost and following SACOG’s “Use it or Lose it” policy.

- **Submittal Deadline:** Please submit one (1) signed original, five (5) color copies of the complete grant application no later than 1:00 p.m. on Friday, June 19, 2015, to:
  - Lacey Symons-Holtzen, Active Transportation Team Manager
  - Sacramento Area Council of Governments
  - 1415 L Street, Suite 300
  - Sacramento, CA 95814

E-mailed applications are not acceptable. This deadline will be strictly enforced. Please refer to Part I and Part J for additional information. Failure to submit all required parts of the application may result in the application being screened out of the competition.
Electronic File Submittal: Submit one (1) USB or compact disc with a PDF file of all the application contents no later than 1:00 p.m. on Friday, June 19, 2015.

Include electronic versions of your Engineer's Estimate, Cost & Schedule Summary, and PPR (in Excel) in the electronic submittal. The additional materials may be scanned into a PDF file, such as maps, graphics, etc. If a Project Study Report (PSR) or equivalent is complete, please submit a PDF of the PSR on the USB or compact disc. Please do not include a complete Master Plan or other local planning document.
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Statement of Intent to Apply
Statement of Intent to Apply

(Park K of application)

To: lsymons-holtzen@sacog.org
CC: vcacciatore@sacog.org

Subject: Statement of Intent to Apply

Ms. Symons-Holtzen:

The City of Folsom intends to submit two projects to the Active Transportation Program and/or the Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program. The titles of the project(s) are listed below:

1. Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail
2. Historic Powerhouse Canal Trail

Please contact Jim Konopka at 916-351-3516 with any further questions on these projects identified in our Statement of Intent to Apply. I acknowledge that identifying a project in the Statement of Intent to Apply does not commit my agency to submitting an application for funding for this project.

Sincerely,

Jim Konopka
Senior Park Planner
Appendix B

Cost & Schedule Summary
Advanced Tool: Cost and Schedule Summary

Required for Regional/Local, Optional for Community Design, Regional ATP and Regional BPFP

Fill in **BLUE SECTIONS** where appropriate. Edit the formula cells at your own risk.

**Project Sponsor**

City of Folsom

**Project Title**

Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail Gap Closure Project

**Project Description (scope and limits)**

Project includes the construction of approximately 1-mile of Class I bike trail, connecting the Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail with the 16-mile Humbug-Willow Creek Trail. Also provides for the long awaited trail connection to the Folsom Lake College campus.

### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-capital Activities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Jun-17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$ 974,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$ 1,184,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Federal Aid Delivery Steps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SACOG Board Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTIP Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-CAPITAL ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorization to Proceed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2015 Funding Round

**Federal Aid Delivery Steps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Studies</th>
<th>Non-capital staff activities</th>
<th>Non-capital materials</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date Completed** | **Duration in Months** | **Cost Estimate** | **Requested Funding** | **Applicant Comments**

| N/A   | N/A   | $     | -     |               |

**Comments**

---

**Advanced**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Aid Delivery Steps</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Duration in Months</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Requested Funding</th>
<th>Applicant Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request PE authorization (RFA)</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive PE authorization (E76)</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL Type (NEPA/CEQA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA CEQA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Type (NEPA/CEQA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Decision Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Reports to Caltrans</td>
<td>Jul-16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Circulation/Permits</td>
<td>Nov-16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Adopted</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$53,118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$53,118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESIGN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% Design, Preliminary Plans</td>
<td>Feb-17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% Design, (Cross sections)</td>
<td>Apr-17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% Design, Detailed Plans</td>
<td>May-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (Plans, Specs, &amp; Est)</td>
<td>Jun-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$132,604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Jun-17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$132,604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIGHT-OF-WAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request ROW Authorization (RFA)</td>
<td>Jun-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive ROW Authorization (E76)</td>
<td>Jun-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need ROW Acquisition?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Utilities Relocation?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Certified by Caltrans</td>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Federal Aid Delivery Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Duration in Months</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Requested Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request CON Authorization (RFA)</td>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive CON Authorization (E76)</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise Date</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Award Date</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Completion (open to public)</td>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$ 974,036</td>
<td>$ 862,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Closeout</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**
- **Mar-18**: 8 months
- **Cost Estimate**: $ 974,036
- **Requested Funding**: $ 862,314
Appendix C

Project Programming Request
### Project Information:

**Project Title:** Folsom/Placerville Rail Trial Gap Closure Project  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Information:

**DO NOT FILL IN ANY SHADeD AREAS**

#### Proposed Total Project Cost ($1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>974,036</td>
<td>974,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>1,124,036</td>
<td>1,184,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>1,124,036</td>
<td>1,184,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ATP Funds Infrastructure Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>53,118</td>
<td>53,118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>132,604</td>
<td>132,604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>862,314</td>
<td>862,314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>53,118</td>
<td>994,918</td>
<td>1,048,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ATP Funds Non-infrastructure Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ATP Funds Plan Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ATP Funds Previous Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ATP Funds Future Cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Information:

**Project Title:** Folsom/Placerville Rail Trial Gap Closure Project  
**District:** 03  
**County:**  
**Route:**  
**EA:**  
**Project ID:**  
**PPNO:**

### Funding Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DO NOT FILL IN ANY SHADED AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund No.</th>
<th>Proposed Funding Allocation ($1,000s)</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 14/15</th>
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### Notes:

- **Date:** 10-Jun-15
- **Program Code:**  
- **Funding Agency:**  
- **Notes:**
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Engineers Estimate
### Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail Gap Closure Project

**SPONSOR:** City of Folsom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL PRICE</th>
<th>ATP GRANT COSTS</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Temporary Fence (Type ESA)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prepare Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Construction Area Signs</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Traffic Control Plan</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clearing and Grubbing</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Temporary Storm Drain Inlet Protection</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Temporary Fiber Roll (Type 1)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Temporary Silt Fence</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hydrosed</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Erosion Control Blanket</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$88.00</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Class 2 Aggregate Base</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>$3.70</td>
<td>$303,400</td>
<td>$303,400</td>
<td>$303,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Remove Paving</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Updated Pavement Marking/Striping</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>New Concrete Curb Ramp</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Retaining Walls</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
<td>$7,565</td>
<td>$7,565</td>
<td>$7,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12&quot; Storm Drain Pipe</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>18&quot; Storm Drain Pipe</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Trail Signage</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2&quot; Commercial Water Service Connection Fee</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,200.00</td>
<td>$25,200</td>
<td>$25,200</td>
<td>$25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Water Meter</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Backflow Preventer</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$3,250</td>
<td>$3,250</td>
<td>$3,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL**

|               |                |               |               | 886,255     | 886,255     | 886,255          |

**Contingency (10%)**

|               |                |               |               | $87,781     | $87,781     | $87,781          |

**Construction Management/Contact Administration**

|               | $974,036       | $974,036      | $974,036      |

**Total participating costs**

|               | $974,036       | $974,036      | $974,036      |

**Maximum Federal Funds (88.53%)**

|               | $862,314       | $862,314      | $862,314      |

**Current Status of Project:** Feasibility Study, P5R, Environmental, 30% Design, 60% Design, 90% Design, 100% Design
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Emissions Benefit Calculations for CMAQ
EMISSIONS BENEFIT CALCULATIONS FOR CMAQ

Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail Gap Closure Project

The new Class 1 bike trail is a critical link in the city’s bikeway network, allowing cyclists and pedestrians access to several major destinations including, employment, shopping, and transit. The population of Folsom is 70,000.

Inputs to Calculate Cost-Effectiveness:
Funding Dollars (Funding): $1,048,036
Effectiveness Period (Life): 20 years
Days (D): 200
Average Length (L) of bicycle trips: 1.8 miles
Annual Average Daily Traffic (ADT): 35,000
Adjustment (A) on ADT for auto trips replaced by bike trips from the bike facility: 0.0020
Credit (C) for Activity Centers near the project: 0.002

Emissions Factors (From Table 3, for a 16 – 20 year Life):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Factor</th>
<th>Auto Trip End Factor</th>
<th>Auto VMT Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG Factor</td>
<td>0.353 grams/trip</td>
<td>0.119 grams/mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx Factor</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10 Factor</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculations:

Annual Auto Trip Reduced = (D) * (ADT) * (A + C)
= (200) * (35,000) * (0.0020 + 0.002)
= 28,000

Annual Auto VMT Reduced = (Auto Trips) * (L)
= (28,000) * (1.8)
= 50,400

Annual Emission Reductions (ROG, NOx and PM10) in lbs. per year

= [(Annual Auto Trips Reduced) * (Auto Trips End Factor)]
+ [(Annual Auto VMT Reduced) * (Auto VMT Factor)] / 454

ROG:  [(28,000 * 0.353) + (50,400 * 0.119)]/454 = 34.98 lbs. per year

NOx:  [(28,000 * 0.162) + (50,400 * 0.130)]/454 = 24.42 lbs. per year

PM10: [(28,000 * 0.004) + (50,400 * 0.087)]/454 = 9.90 lbs. per year
Bicycle Facilities, Continued . . .

Capital Recovery Factor (CRF): \[
\frac{(1 + i)^n - 1}{(1 + i)^n} = 0.068 \quad \text{Where } n = \text{project life (20 years)} \text{ and } i = \text{discount rate (3%)}
\]

Cost-Effectiveness of Funding Dollars: \[
(CRF \times \text{Funding}) / (\text{ROG} + \text{NOx} + \text{PM10}) = \frac{0.068 \times 1,048,036}{69.30} = \$1,028.37 \text{ per lb.}
\]

FOR CMAQ PROJECTS ONLY:
Once emissions reductions have been calculated, for each pollutant convert lbs. of emissions reductions per year to kg/day:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{lbs. reduced per year} & = 34.98 \quad = 0.043 \text{ kg/day ROG} \\
\frac{2.2 \text{ lbs./kg} \times 365 \text{ days/year}}{\text{lbs. reduced per year}} & = 2.2 \times 365 \\
\text{lbs. reduced per year} & = 24.42 \quad = 0.030 \text{ kg/day NOx} \\
\frac{2.2 \text{ lbs./kg} \times 365 \text{ days/year}}{\text{lbs. reduced per year}} & = 2.2 \times 365 \\
\text{lbs. reduced per year} & = 9.90 \quad = 0.012 \text{ kg/day PM10} \\
\frac{2.2 \text{ lbs./kg} \times 365 \text{ days/year}}{\text{lbs. reduced per year}} & = 2.2 \times 365
\end{align*}
\]
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Project Location Map
Project Site Photos
View looking south along the JPA Rail Corridor where the trail will be located. On the right is a large office complex that will have direct access to the trail. In this view the trail would be on the right side of the tracks.
View looking north along the JPA Rail Corridor. Trail will be located on the left side of the tracks. Just out of view at the top of the picture is where the Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail connects with the Humbug-Willow Creek Trail.
View of the existing Humbug-Willow Creek Trail where it would connect with the proposed Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail.

Another view of the existing Humbug-Willow Creek Trail looking north where the proposed Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail would make the connection.
View of the existing Humbug-Willow Creek Trail as it parallels the same railroad tracks. The proposed Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail would be very similar.
View of California Family Fitness, located adjacent to the proposed trail.

View of bikes parked in front of California Family Fitness. Just think how many there will be once the new trail is completed.
This is the trail connection from Californian Family Fitness to the proposed Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail. In anticipation of the new trail, family fitness built this stub out already to connect with the new trail.

This is a view of the same trail stub out from California Family Fitness. This view is from the new trail.
View of another segment of the rail corridor where the trail will be located. East Bidwell Street is in the background.

This shows another view of where the trail would be located. It also shows a pedestrian (student going to Folsom Lake College) having to walk along the shoulder of East Bidwell, because there is no sidewalk.
View of entry to Folsom Lake College. This would be the view from the new trail. The college already has a sidewalk in place to connect with the new trail.

View of Creekside Manor Apartments located adjacent to the proposed Trail. This complex is restricted to very low median income residents.
This is an example of one of many multi-family housing complexes located adjacent to the project.
Appendix H

Copy of CCC & CALCC Correspondence
Dear Wei Hsieh & Danielle Lynch

The City of Folsom is applying for grant funding from the Regional ATP grant program and wanted to coordinate with you regarding a possible partnership. The project is called the Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail Project.

The project includes the construction of almost 1 mile of Class I Bike Trail, parallel to the old southern pacific railroad tracks. Also includes the planting of approximately 50 trees along the trail with irrigation.

The estimated schedule for the project is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Approval:</th>
<th>September 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Analysis:</td>
<td>January 2016 – May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Engineering:</td>
<td>May 2016 – October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction:</td>
<td>March 2017 – June 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have also attached the following items for your review.

- Project Location Map
- Detailed Cost Estimate

Thanks so much and I look forward to hearing from you.
Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jim Konopka
City of Folsom
Hi Jim,

Baldeo Singh of the Sacramento Regional Conservation Corps has responded that they are able to assist with the following:

Item 2 – Temporary Fence
Item 6 - Clearing and Grubbing
Item 13 – Fencing
Item 16 – Remove Fence
Item 20 – Retaining Walls
Item 23 – Trail Signage
Item 28 – Irrigation System
Item 32 – Tree Planting.

Please include this email with your application as proof that you reached out to the Local Corps. Feel free to contact Baldeo (bsingh@saccorps.org) directly if your project receives funding.

Thank you!

On Mon, Jun 8, 2015 at 5:15 PM, Jim Konopka <jkonopka@folsom.ca.us> wrote:

Dear: Wei Hsieh & Danielle Lynch
The City of Folsom is applying for grant funding from the Regional ATP grant program and wanted to coordinate with you regarding a possible partnership. The project is called the Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail Project.

The project includes the construction of almost 1 mile of Class I Bike Trail, parallel to the old southern pacific railroad tracks. Also includes the planting of approximately 50 trees along the trail with irrigation.

The estimated schedule for the project is the following:

Grant Approval: September 2015
Environmental Analysis: January 2016 – May 2016
Design/Engineering: May 2016 – October 2016
Construction: March 2017 – June 2017

I have also attached the following items for your review.

Project Location Map
Detailed Cost Estimate

Thanks so much and I look forward to hearing from you.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jim Konopka
Monica Davalos | Legislative Policy Intern
Active Transportation Program
California Association of Local Conservation Corps
1121 L Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814
916.426.9170 | inquiry@atpcommunitycorps.org
Dear Wei Hsieh & Danielle Lynch,

The City of Folsom is applying for grant funding from the Regional ATP grant program and wanted to coordinate with you regarding a possible partnership. The project is called the Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail Project.

The project includes the construction of almost 1 mile of Class I Bike Trail, parallel to the old southern pacific railroad tracks. Also includes the planting of approximately 50 trees along the trail with irrigation.

The estimated schedule for the project is the following:

- **Grant Approval:** September 2015
- **Environmental Analysis:** January 2016 – May 2016
- **Design/Engineering:** May 2016 – October 2016
- **Construction:** March 2017 – June 2017

I have also attached the following items for your review.

- Project Location Map
- Detailed Cost Estimate

Thanks so much and I look forward to hearing from you. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jim Konopka
City of Folsom
Hi Jim,

Thank you for contacting the CCC. Unfortunately, we are unable to participate in this project. Please include this email with your application as proof that you reached out to the CCC.

Thank you,

Wei Hsieh, Manager
Programs & Operations Division
California Conservation Corps
1719 24th Street
Sacramento, CA 95816
(916) 341-3154
Wei.Hsieh@ccc.ca.gov
Appendix I

Any Additional Exhibits
1.2 GUIDING PRINCIPLE

The guiding principle of this Plan is that streets are vital linear public spaces that should be designed to enhance the lives of the City of Folsom’s residents and support commerce. The City of Folsom views streets as valuable assets to the community and recognizes that they can be the centerpiece of a vibrant downtown, commercial area, neighborhood, transit center, or civic core. By implementing designs that respond to the community’s values, and that enhance the pedestrian scale, safety, and connectivity for all modes, people will walk and bike more, drive less, feel safer, and park once and explore. In conjunction with streetscape improvements, complete streets can attract additional quality development, increasing property values, and fostering economic development.

2. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND FEEDBACK

Recognizing the importance of active and meaningful engagement with both those interested and those potentially affected by the project, the project team developed a multi-faceted Community Engagement Strategy at the onset of the project. This documentation, a copy of which is included in Appendix A, addresses the key elements of community engagement for the project including:

- PowerPoint* presentations that, in addition to including material tailored to the specific focus of the workshop, include an introduction to the project and overview of the Corridor. The team has relied heavily on renderings, photos, and other visual techniques to make these presentations understandable to a broad audience.

- Multiple opportunities for participants to provide input either verbally, written, or through the use of one of several interactive formats including:
  - The use of colored dots that are placed on various options as “votes” from the public
  - Large scale aerial maps of the corridor with permanent markers and stickies available for writing
  - Strategically stationed maps and other graphics with staff available for discussion
  - A coordinated on-line campaign that provides both notifications and opportunities for input prior to and after events

Consistent with the Community Engagement Strategy, the project team has conducted multiple stakeholder and public meetings to discuss the project and to obtain valuable input, feedback, and recommendations. Based on input from the City, four Focus Groups were established, through invitation, to enable the project team to collaborate and interact with representatives from the following four general groups: Active Transportation, Business & Commerce, Municipal, and Service.

Furthermore, the project Community Meetings were envisioned to include the following elements to maximize input from participants:
EXHIBIT 1: OVERVIEW MAP

LEGEND:
- Study Corridor
- Corridor Segment
- Parallel Capacity/
  Circulation
- Primary Regional
  Connection
- Identified Future
  Connection Opportunity
To date, the following community engagement activities have been undertaken:

- February 2013: Project Kick-Off Meeting
- June 2013: Focus Group Meetings
- July 2013: Community Meeting #1
- August 2013: Online Survey
- June/July 2014: City Council Briefings
- July 2014: Combined Focus Group Meeting
- August 2014: Community Meeting #2
- November 2014: Community Meeting #3

Summaries of these meetings are provided in Appendix B.

While all of the feedback received has been valuable and will ultimately influence the direction of the Plan, the following are the primary recommendations as expressed by the stakeholders and the general public:

- Reinvent Central Business District (CBD)
- Maintain Existing Vehicular Capacity in CBD (4 lanes)
- Improve Aesthetics and Corridor Identity
- Provide Bike and Pedestrian Gap Closures for Improved Connectivity
- Emphasize all Travel Modes
- Consider Alternate and Parallel Routes (Divert Non-Local Traffic)
- Preserve the Rail Corridor for Future Use and Accommodate Multi-Use Trail
- Integrate Folsom Lake College into the Corridor

In fact, through the use of an online survey in August 2013, respondents reinforced many of these points by ranking the importance of bicycle facilities and bicycle safety, the significance of traffic congestion, and the attractiveness of the rail corridor for multi-modal use as the most important Corridor considerations. All of these recommendations will guide the development of corridor improvements and enhancements in order to arrive at a Plan that is mutually beneficial and acceptable by all stakeholders and the general public.

3. CORRIDOR OVERVIEW AND DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS

As depicted in Exhibit 2, the East Bidwell Street Corridor has been divided into four distinct districts. These districts have been developed in conjunction with the City of Folsom and on-going public outreach activities. Each of the four segments has its own particular characteristics including adjacent land uses, access control, and vehicular volumes.

As shown in Exhibit 1, the Corridor is complimented by several parallel capacity/circulation roadways and has several links providing more broad regional connections. There are also several identified locations for possible additional connections including:

- The City's envisioned Oak Avenue interchange at US-50 which is anticipated to provide a critical link to the Corridor resulting in significant changes to study corridor traffic patterns and circulation.
- The Riley Street connection to East Bidwell Street in the vicinity of Folsom Lake College would be anticipated to potentially reduce corridor traffic by enhancing an alternative route to East Bidwell Street through the Central Business District.

Other parallel capacity/circulation roadways including Riley Street, School Street, Cavitt Drive, and Clarksville Road, are acknowledged to play a significant role in the character of East Bidwell Street. Based on observations and public feedback, these roadways are acknowledged to currently experience increased traffic levels when East Bidwell Street is congested. This existing diversion of traffic to residential roadways, in particular to School Street, is an understood challenge associated with the Central Business District's transportation network and the identification of viable improvement opportunities.
East Bidwell Street
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EXHIBIT 8: RAIL CORRIDOR CONSIDERATIONS
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Overall Design Character:

Broadstone offers a unique opportunity in the corridor with a large undeveloped opportunity site. With pedestrian linkages to the neighborhoods to the east and the commercial center to the west, this site is ideally suited for mixed-use and campus office development.

Campus Office

With the high demand in this corridor for commercial office, a campus office development would create an ideal employment center. With the potential for light rail to eventually serve this site and with its proximity to residential neighborhoods and major retail services, the environment would be ideal for high tech, financial, or corporate headquarters.

The character of the campus development is one of a pedestrian-oriented podium with parking on the periphery or integrated into the lower portions of buildings (preferred). Buildings surround large open spaces with amenities and an internal pedestrian network. Buildings are 3 to 4 stories with distinctive architecture.

Mixed Use

Mixed use designations provide for a variety of uses in either a vertical or horizontal configuration. The land use designation allows for commercial uses to be intermixed with residential units to be intermixed with commercial uses, providing convenience to residents and helping to create a vibrant community with active street life. The mix of uses provides a pedestrian-oriented environments with shops and restaurants in close proximity to residents.

The character of mixed use buildings is 2 to 5 stories with retail on the ground floor. The upper floors can be commercial office or housing as well as a mix of both. The buildings frame the streets with minimal setback. Parking is in the rear or surface lots or structures.
Overall Design Character:

The College District presents several opportunities. Folsom Lake College has established a pattern of development with the design of its campus at the top of the hill. The vacant parcels along East Bidwell suggest an opportunity for mixed use, while the vacant parcels further east offer a chance for additional educational or institutional development, or for related uses, such as student housing.

Education/Institutional or Related Uses

Building on the existing educational campuses, development of a similar type is appropriate for this site. The configuration can follow the existing "top" layout, or the development could be more formal depending on the program and site conditions. Uses could include additional educational facilities, supporting institutional uses, or student-focused residential uses, which may be related to the campus or privately developed.

The character of the institutional development is similar to campus offices. It is one of a pedestrian-oriented precinct with parking on the periphery or integrated into the lower portions of buildings. Buildings surround large open spaces with amenities and an internal pedestrian network. Buildings are 3 or 4 stories with distinctive architecture.

Stanford

Mixed Use

Mixed use designations provide for a variety of uses in either vertical or horizontal configuration. The land use designation allows residential units to be intermixed with commercial uses, providing convenience to residence and helping to create a vibrant community with an active street life. The mix of uses promotes a pedestrian-oriented environment, with shops and restaurants in close proximity to residences.

UC Santa Cruz

Mixed Use

The character of mixed use buildings is 2 to 5 stories with retail on the ground floor. The upper floors can be commercial office or housing as well as a mix of both. The buildings frame the streets with mixed setback. Parking is to the rear in narcot kiosks or structures or tucked under buildings.

Kimley Horn
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1.0 PURPOSE/OBJECTIVES

This comprehensive Public Involvement and Strategic Communication Plan (the Plan) is designed to educate, engage, and seek input from a diverse public for the City of Folsom’s East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan (herein referred to as the Bidwell Corridor). The Plan is designed to achieve the following communication objectives:

- An open, transparent process
- Consistent communication
- Proactive education
- Active participation by all
- Consensus building
- Relationship networking
- Integrity in process

To accomplish the objectives, the plan will employ a number of tools and tactics to reach a geographically broad and varied public within the project corridor and key targeted regional stakeholders. The Plan will set the course for the communications program guiding the project towards building community awareness and understanding of the planning process and soliciting valuable input and support for potential Complete Street improvements for the Bidwell Corridor. It should be viewed as a living document that may evolve throughout the course of the planning effort is recommended to be reviewed within the first several months of implementation to ensure that the original approach and tactics are appropriate after initial communications with the key stakeholders and general public.

2.0 BACKGROUND

East Bidwell Street is a vital transportation and commercial corridor bisecting the City of Folsom and providing a direct link between the Historic District and US 50. This roadway also connects key City areas and significant land uses including the Central Business District, the Creekside medical/healthcare center, Folsom Lake College, Broadstone, and the Palladio.

The corridor has a broad range of adjacent uses including residential, commercial, office, and retail. As one of the most significant transportation corridors in the City, East Bidwell Street is anticipated to serve increasing travel demand in the future. Given that some segments of the Corridor are still developing or are likely to redevelop in the future, there is significant opportunity to improve the overall transportation system to better meet future needs through the provision of a more comprehensive and multimodal system.

The City is carrying out this study using a Caltrans grant. The resulting Plan will serve as a guide for future development and transportation improvements. The Plan will also include several specific recommendations including: a streetscape vision; improvements to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities; green and sustainable roadway and landscape improvements; and transportation improvements to meet the needs of existing and future development.
What is a "Complete Street"?
A complete Street is a street for EVERYONE! It is designed and operated to enable safe access for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclist, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities. Complete Streets make it easy to cross the street, walk to shops, and bicycle to work. They allow buses to run on time and make it safe for people to walk to and from train stations. The East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan will improve the overall street network to be better and safer for drivers, transit users, pedestrians, and bicyclists - making our City a better place to live.

3.0 APPROACH TO PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Today's public is increasingly savvy, demanding transparency, brevity and a voice. They are proactive, organized and knowledgeable, hold a better understanding of the environmental process, and have direct access to mass communication technology. Therefore, it is critical to develop a communication plan that is a seamless extension of the technical work and offers the public clear and concise opportunities to participate. The communication tools identified for the Bidwell Corridor must take into account the diverse communities and project stakeholders and their needs, understand the technical challenges, and utilize both traditional means of communication and newer technologies to ensure a broad reach in "their" preferred communication method. The Plan will create the opportunity to educate, inform, build public partners and trust in the process, assure awareness, and most importantly, result in informed decision-making. In developing the plan, there are three basic steps:

1. **Identification of Target Audiences:** A crucial step and the heart of the communication program is identifying the diverse stakeholders what we refer to as the four I's: interested, impacted, influential, and invisible.

2. **Establishing Key Messages:** In order to be effective in our communications while managing expectations of the public, we must establish clear and concise key messages that will be targeted to different audiences. The messaging will establish the "Project Givens" and, the areas where the public can influence.

3. **Identifying Tools/Tactics:** The tools identified will provide the best opportunity to capture the widest audience and include online and electronic tactics blended with traditional tools like mailers, in person meetings, and print pieces.

4.0 TOOLS AND TACTICS

**Stakeholder Coordination (Focus Group Meetings)**

Identification of key stakeholders to engage in the project will be a critical step in ensuring our reach is broad and effective. The communication strategy for the Bidwell Corridor begins with working directly with City leaders, business owners, and interested stakeholders as the first point of contact with the public. Stakeholder engagement will be implemented by way of formation and facilitation of focus groups and presentations to target organizations or individuals. The focus groups will be split into four categories: Active Transportation; Business and Commerce; Municipal; and Service.
The City will work in partnership with the identified stakeholders to help share information and promote the project to their larger constituencies. The first activity and opportunity to garner initial input from the broad public will be through engagement and facilitation of the focus groups. The focus group participants will be contacted via electronic invitation from the City to participate in this important planning process. The meetings will be held at corridor venues for convenience such as Folsom Lake College or area schools or the Fire House. Each meeting will occur over the lunch hour and the participants will have the opportunity to view a power point presentation that walks them through the planning process, and provides a short education of what types of elements can be found within a “Complete Street” before engaging in an interactive discussion and engagement session.

The following table identifies potential key stakeholders who will be solicited to play an active role in the focus group meetings.

**ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION**

- 50 Corridor Transit Management Association
- FEDS Historical Railroad
- Folsom Area Bicycle Advocates (FABA)
- Sac Regional Transit

**BUSINESS/COMMERCE**

- Bernau Development Corporation
- Elliott Homes
- Folsom Chamber of Commerce
- Folsom Lake Community Concert Association
- Sean Roth, DDS
- Tri-Commercial (Folsom Health and Wellness Center)
- Sacramento Association of Realtors
- Inter-Cal Real Estate Corporation
- Folsom Lake Bowl & Sports Bar & Casino
- Big 5 Sporting Goods Center
- Nalasco Properties

**MUNICIPAL**

- Public Information Officer
- Sr. Traffic Engineer/Folsom Traffic Committee
- Senior Trails Coordinator
- Planning / Housing Coordinator
- Public Works
- Fire Chief
- Police Commander

**SERVICES (CHURCHES, HEALTHCARE, EDUCATION)**

- Folsom/Cordova School District
- Folsom Lake College
- Kaiser Permanente
- Kindred Hospital
- Lakeside Church
- Mercy Hospital, Folsom
- St. John the Baptist Catholic Church
- Sunshine Retirement Community
- Twin Lakes Food Bank

**Project Database**

Along with the identification of the key stakeholders for the focus group component, a larger database of property owners and occupants will be established and maintained for potential mailings and other notifications. The database will be no larger than 1,500 in size and be maintained throughout the planning process. The interested public will have the opportunity to sign up at public meetings or via the website to receive project updates via e-blasts and all information will be maintained in one central contact database for the entire Project Team to access.
Project Website

As communication technologies continue to improve and identify new ways to engage directly, it is critical to not only understand who to communicate with but also the most appropriate tools to utilize. A project specific webpage will act as the primary resource for the public to garner updated information about the project. The City will host one page on their website and will work closely with the project team to garner key information to populate the site. Besides the page, the City will also work to promote key public meetings on their homepage under news and events.

http://www.folsom.ca.us/depts/community_development/planning/projects/east_bidwell_street_complete_streets_corridor_plan.asp

Social Media/Online Tools

National studies indicate that the majority of households contain at least one smart phone that has direct access to social media sites and the world-wide-web and that these online tools are used regularly to share and gather information. Although not everyone has access to in home computers, most every home has access to a smart phone. Understanding the evolving dynamics of our audiences and how they wish to communicate, the Plan must include use of the newer technologies and tools such as social media and other online tactics. For the Bidwell Corridor, the project team will work closely with the City to ensure that all milestone information is uploaded to their established social media sites in a timely manner. The plan also includes working closely with the City’s consultant on the General Plan Update, Mintier Harnish, to utilize their existing Mind Mixer site to promote the Bidwell Corridor Project. Mind Mixer is a multi-faceted online tool that acts as an ideas generator and dialogue centric site. The Project Teams for the Bidwell Corridor Project and the General Plan Update will coordinate and collaborate closely on these two important efforts on behalf of the City.

Project Materials (Meeting Notices/Fact Sheet/Electronic Flyer)

Project materials will be created and distributed both electronically and in hardcopy for purposes of further education about project components. Potential materials may include meeting notices, fact sheets, electronic newsletters and presentation materials including aerial maps, and display boards that help to educate and inform the public about the purpose and need for the planning effort, key project elements, and schedule, etc. Distribution method will focus on electronic promotion with some hand deliveries and potential mailing as needed.

Survey

A survey will be developed that will help guide the public in addressing specific concerns and opportunities for the Bidwell corridor. The survey will also help determine priorities from the public's perspective and will be distributed both in hard copy at meetings and electronically via the online survey housed on the project website. The survey will be promoted via an e-blast to the contact database to ensure active participation.
Media Relations (3 Press Releases)

Getting the attention of the public during a planning exercise can be a challenge and therefore we need to utilize existing and trusted communication resources to aid in establishing a presence. The Folsom Telegraph and City electronic newsletters are potential news oriented media tools that will be tapped to help spread the word. It is anticipated that three press releases will be generated and distributed at key milestones working closely with City staff to identify timing. The first release will go out at the onset of the planning project to promote the effort and the initial public meeting. The second will be distributed during the draft alternatives stage and the third release will be timed when the preferred alternative is identified.

Public Meetings

The Plan will include up to three public meetings that will be interactive, provide updated information, and actively solicit feedback from the public. The first public meeting will occur at the onset of the project to begin the open dialogue about what the Bidwell Corridor visions are for the community. The second meeting will occur at the draft alternatives stage to introduce potential concepts and show the public how their input has been reflected in the potential alternatives and garner additional feedback. The final public meeting will occur once a preferred alternative has been identified based on the project objectives, purpose and need.

Each meeting will be held in the evening at a central and convenient venue within the corridor. The meetings will include a brief presentation, question and answer session and large and small displays. Key to the meetings will be the interactive stations designed to get the public to work side by side with the project team to identify issues and concerns as well as key visions and desires for the corridor.

Promotion of the meetings will occur through a number of tactics as mentioned above. The meetings will be promoted via the website, social media sites, media, e-blasts and hand deliveries of invitations within the corridor to ensure active participation.

Final Report

The final component of the Plan is to develop a Public Involvement Report for the Bidwell Corridor Project. The report will document all activities implemented as part of the plan as well as the valuable input that was received from the public during the planning process. The report will include each communication piece and highlight the key themes of discussion amongst the participating public.
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Summaries of Community Engagement Activities
Meeting Summary

Re: Kick-Off Meeting and Corridor Tour
East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan

Date: February 13, 2013, 9:00 am
Folsom City Hall

Attendees: Scott Denny, City of Folsom
Scott Johnson, City of Folsom
Mark Rackovan, City of Folsom
Dan Wolfe, City of Folsom
Larry Brohman, Caltrans
Eric Fredericks, Caltrans
Chelsea Richardson, JOA
Sean Richardson, JOA
Scott Colvin, Kimley-Horn
Mike Schmitt, Kimley-Horn
Matt Weir, Kimley-Horn

The following is an overview of the key points discussed as part of this Kick-Off Meeting and Corridor Tour:

- **Overall Corridor Discussion**
  - Numerous examples exist of poor bike/pedestrian connectivity exist
  - Today the corridor is a “barbell” with East Bidwell as the connection between the Historic District and the Plan Area. There is interest in having a more distributed and revitalized street.
  - There is the need to improve sidewalks along the entire corridor (where deficient)
  - City has deviated from standards (use of narrow lanes) along Natoma Street and Natoma Station Drive to add bike lanes and lower speeds. If narrow lanes are considered elsewhere, need to consider:
    1. Corner radii and truck turning templates as goods-movement has become increasingly more reliant on the use of large (STAA) trucks.
    2. Locations of designated truck routes
  - Southbound, south of Woodsmoke widening opportunities are limited due to an existing protected oak tree.

- **South End near US-50 and Palladio**
  - The study should consider future development and the potential relationship of land in this area to the undeveloped land in front of the college
  - Provides an important connection to the “new town” (Plan Area) to the south
  - Capacity and lane utilization are key issues. Dedicated/improved signage for drivers (southbound approaching Iron Point and US-50) was identified as one option.
• Central Business District
  o There could be an opportunity to channelize left-turns, potentially with raised medians. The resulting medians could be landscaped which is desirable to local merchants and can be financed using finance/assessment districts.
  o Verify u-turn availability at intersections if medians/access restrictions are proposed.
  o Section lacks consistent bike lanes.
  o Parking lot layouts and locations (including separation from the street and pedestrian facilities) is a concern.
  o Sidewalks should be wider and brought up to current design standards.
  o Consideration should be given to developing a fluid transition from East Bidwell onto Riley Street, the Historic District, and across the American River.

• Rail Corridor
  o There is interest amongst several groups in the community to support “excursion” rail service to El Dorado County. El Dorado County has not been supportive of “excursion” rail service.
  o Given the rail right-of-way, Folsom plans to accommodate both rail and trail within the right of way.
  o Active rail service would require treatment at ~7 grade crossings.
  o One option that could be considered is the provision of BRT along rail corridor. It was noted that Blue Ravine Road may be a better option for a BRT corridor given that it already has right-of-way (originally set aside for light rail).

• US-50 Corridor
  o Oak Avenue Interchange
    1. Has significant design challenges due to proximity to Prairie City interchange. Alternatively, Rowberry Drive interchange has been discussed recently as an alternative location for full access, east of Oak Avenue.
    2. Likely won’t need to be constructed until 2035 or beyond considering recent traffic projections.
    3. Currently evaluating effect of removing direct US-50 access at this location in the near-term (Plan Area build-out).
  o Empire Ranch Road Interchange
    1. Would likely be constructed before Oak Avenue Interchange given regional traffic demand.
    2. Would be an important connection due to connectivity to El Dorado County’s Business Park (Carson Crossing Road) and future Connector alignment.

• Upcoming Community Meetings
  o City is hosting a US-50 Planning Charrette, March 7th, 10-3 at the City Library, Kimley-Horn to attend.
  o City is hosting a General Plan Update Community Workshop, April 2nd, 5-8 at the Community Center. Kimley-Horn to potentially attend and setup an informational table regarding this project.
Focus Groups

- City requested a "Focus Group" strategy instead of the Committee approach originally envisioned as part of the grant application
- 4 Primary Groups were identified
  1. Active Transportation
     - Bike,
     - Ped,
     - Rail,
     - Local Transit (Include Sac RT?)
  2. Service
     - Healthcare
     - Folsom Lake College
     - Churches
  3. Business/Commerce
     - Desired to include land owners/business owners
     - Coordinate with Fedcorps to have them select 3-4 participants to represent business owners
  4. Municipal (City)
     - Park and Rec
     - Public Works
     - Fire
     - Police
     - Transit?
     - Healthcare may also participate with this group

Anticipated Format

1. 30 min presentation to provide a project overview, an introduction to Complete Streets, and set the tone for the focus groups
2. Emphasis on gathering participants' ideas/concerns
3. Could include representative examples of the results

Immediate Next Steps

- City/Caltrans/Kimley-Horn to complete a Grant Administration meeting the week of February 18th.
- Kimley-Horn/City to coordinate on compiling existing/baseline information to facilitate the development of the corridor basemap. As-buils, GIS info, utilities, 24-hour traffic profiles, and other information are needed.
Meeting Summary

Re: Stakeholder Meeting – Powerhouse Ministries
East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan

Date: July 10, 2013, 1:00 pm – 2:00 pm
Powerhouse Ministries, 311 Market Street, Folsom

Attendees: Tom Carden, Powerhouse Ministries
Kevin Hein, Powerhouse Ministries
Matt Weir, Kimley-Horn

The following is an overview of the key points discussed as part of this stakeholder meeting:

- **Operations**
  - Been in operation for approximately 20 years
  - Provide utility and lodging assistance, spiritual/prayer, guidance, youth outreach (poverty, gangs, drugs), and life support guidance
  - Have men’s, women’s, and children programs with weekly meetings, also have services on Sundays, and provide winter shelter as needed
  - Primarily serves the Central Business District and the residential area bounded by East Bidwell Street, Natoma Street, and Blue Ravine Road/Montrose Drive
    1. Folsom’s lowest income population
    2. 2-3 block area primarily
    3. Bidwell Street apartments are also served
    4. Some are from Orangevale
  - Serve approximately 3,000 people per year with approximately 70-80% of those served arrive by walking or bicycle
  - One means of communications is an information board in lobby and flyers left on the front desk

- **Transportation**
  - Most of those served are surviving and may not be overly concerned with the absence of bicycle lanes, sidewalks, or other roadway features.
  - Folsom Stage Line services is relatively expensive, most can’t afford it, and most consider it not be cost effective or direct.
  - Trolley service along the East Bidwell Street corridor is considered to be “attractive”
  - Primarily rely on ministry vehicles but sometimes have to use own personal vehicles for transportation
- **Other**
  - Powerhouse Transition Center is a sister facility that provides services to women
    1. 20 people total (women plus children)
    2. Mobility is a significant challenge for those served
  - Translation needs (Spanish) are increasing
    1. Recently added a staff member and several volunteers who speak Spanish
    2. Has increased participation from those who speak Spanish
  - Consider as an economic and geographic disconnect between the Central Business District and the newer Broadstone and Palladio areas of the East Bidwell Street corridor
Meeting Summary

Re: Stakeholder Meeting – Helping Hands, St. Vincent de Paul Society
East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan

Date: July 10, 2013, 10:00 am – 11:00 am
St. John The Baptist Catholic Church, 307 Montrose Drive, Folsom

Attendees: Dom Puglisi, St. John The Baptist Catholic Church
John Hight, Helping Hands
John Knight, Helping Hands
Matt Weir, Kimley-Horn

The following is an overview of the key points discussed as part of this stakeholder meeting:

- Operations
  - Helping Hands is affiliated with the St. Vincent de Paul Society
  - Facility relocated from Parish property in 2011 to its current location
  - Open Monday, Wednesday, and Friday
    1. 9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
  - Facility not currently used for another other services/events
    1. Parish recently initiated Social Justice Ministries which may use facility in afternoons/evenings in the future
  - Primarily serves the Central Business District and the residential area bounded by East Bidwell Street, Natoma Street, and Blue Ravine Road/Montrose Drive
    1. 2-3 block area primarily
    2. Some arrive via van from White Rock Road facility in El Dorado Hills (via East Bidwell Street)
  - Provides (free of charge) groceries, clothing, limited/small appliances, toys, utility bill assistance, and limited lodging assistance
    1. Those served are only required to sign in to facilitate tracking/frequency
    2. Serves those in need, don’t have to be a resident of Folsom or a parishioner
  - Serve 20-25 families per day, 200-300 people per month (groceries), 700-800 total people per month

- Transportation
  - Approximates that 50% of those served arrive by car, and 50% walk (very little biking)
  - Folsom Stage Line has a bus stop adjacent to the facility and is used as well
    1. Approximately 6 of 200-300 served for groceries arrive via transit

- Other
  - Translation is not currently a big issue but, when needed, the majority are Spanish
    1. Those needing translation typically have a child or family member with them to assist in translation
    2. Approximately 15% of those receiving groceries require translation assistance
  - Twin Lakes Food Bank has expanded operations and a broader service area
Re: Municipal Focus Group

East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan

Date: June 26, 2013, 11:30 am – 1:30 pm
Folsom City Hall, Public Works Conference Room

Attendees: Kent Gary, City of Folsom (Solid Waste, Transit, & Fleet)
Rick Hillman, City of Folsom (Police)
Jim Konopka, City of Folsom (Parks and Recreation)
Ron Phillips, City of Folsom (Fire Chief)
Mark Rackovan, City of Folsom (Traffic)
Sue Ryan, City of Folsom (Public Information Officer)
Scott Johnson, City of Folsom
Mike Schmitt, Kimley-Horn
Matt Weir, Kimley-Horn

The following is an overview of the key points discussed as part of this Focus Group Meeting:

- Segment I (CBD)
  - Not bike/pedestrian friendly, uncomfortable, and travel way is not aesthetically pleasing
  - Bikes routinely travel, in both directions, on the sidewalks
  - Numerous mid-block driveways complicate conditions
  - Suggestion to consider on-street parking, along with Class II (on-street) bike lanes
    1. Likely in conjunction with redevelopment with buildings closer to street, wider sidewalks, and parking “in the back” away from the street
    2. On-street parking will need to consider bus routes/stops
  - Aesthetically could benefit from the provision of additional trees/landscaping
  - Considered as a bypass route for Riley Street and can be very congested
  - Higher car-car and car-pedestrian crashes along this segment as compared to other segments.
  - Suggestion to consider removing medians in vicinity of Montrose to improve storage (into two-way left-turn lane)
  - The 90 degree curve at Coloma Street is not pedestrian friendly
  - Is a primary emergency response route for City and region given proximity to Mercy Hospital at Blue Ravine Road
  - Old, outdated segment that needs some enhancements to bike and pedestrian facilities
  - Suggestion that there is local unmet demand for outdoor dining and gathering, however proximity to traffic congestion is a challenge, needs buffers
  - Suggestion to consider changes to mix of land uses that shifts/spreads traffic demand over a longer period
- **Segment II (Creekside)**
  - If increased from 4 to 6 lanes would affect bike and pedestrian operations
    1. Future improvements should at a minimum include bike lanes, sidewalks and consideration for medians
    2. Current width makes it difficult for pedestrians to cross, should consider narrowing as much as possible at intersections
  - Is a primary emergency response route for City and region given proximity to Mercy Hospital at Blue Ravine Road
    1. Treatments need to consider emergency responder needs
  - Operational perception changes south of Blue Ravine Road and speeds are higher
  - Congestion in this segment is pretty much limited to the vicinity of Blue Ravine Road
    1. Blue Ravine Road intersection is routinely in the top 5 for City intersection crash frequency locations
  - No viable alternate route for cars to this section of the corridor
  - Other challenges:
    1. ADA requirements caused closure of sidewalk segment (now barricaded)
    2. Oak tree avoidance has resulted in a “chunky” cross section and unfavorable build-out
    3. Wetland avoidance has restricted the ability to provide sidewalk gap closures as evident by worn pedestrian paths

- **Segment III (FLC)**
  - Folsom Lake College is currently a significant user of local transit
  - Noted that City is beginning construction on the additional northbound through lane approaching Oak Avenue Parkway
  - Existing Class I bike trail exists in sections but needs to be comprehensively treated in Sections III and IV
    1. Should consider focusing on the north side along FLC frontage for bikes/pedestrians
    2. An elevated crossing of East Bidwell should also be considered
  - Segment has high speeds
  - Limited connectivity to community other than FLC
    1. Segment essentially a regional arterial accommodating traffic to/from US-50

- **Segment IV (Broadstone/Palladio)**
  - Side-streets may need treatments as well
  - Significant congestion during peak hours and on other periods as well
  - Congestion will be significantly worse during holiday shopping season once Palladio is fully occupied
  - High speeds and congested create less desirable pedestrian conditions
  - Iron Point Road intersection is heavily congested
  - Consider a pedestrian overcrossing which could double as a gateway/architectural feature
    1. Incorporation of Palladio parking structure could be a possibility
  - US-50 interchange is difficult for bike and pedestrians to cross
    1. Consider focusing/funneling bikes/pedestrians to existing Old Placerville Road undercrossing for connectivity with Plan Area
• Rail Corridor
  o Excursion rail service would need to be significant and viable, otherwise would be a financial burden on City due to investment required
  o Likely not politically popular given current financial conditions
  o Can’t afford a “novelty”, need to identify clear value for the community
  o Consider using corridor for BRT service and connect to Plan Area (Easton Valley Parkway)
    1. Would need to consider park-and-ride facilities
  o Ultimately who would operate/maintain a rail segment would need to be addressed
  o Desire to protect and preserve rail corridor including tracks

• Other
  o Public likely identifies with retail anchors rather than other district names (e.g., CBD).
Meeting Summary

Re: Business/Commerce Focus Group
East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan

Date: June 25, 2013, 11:30 am – 1:30 pm
Fire Station 35, 535 Glenn Drive

Attendees: Ed Anderson, Cornerstone Real Estate
Jerry Bernau, Bernau Development Corporation
Craig Burnett, Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito & Vector Control
Jeremy Dreher, Folsom Lake Bowl
George Econome, Model Plaza
Joe Gagliardi, Folsom Chamber of Commerce
Kathleen Kirklin, Folsom Lake College
Bob Nolasco, Folsom Lake Shopping Center
Sean Roth, Sean Roth, DDS
Gordon Stevenson, TRI Commercial
Michael Wilson, Inter-Cal Real Estate
Scott Johnson, City of Folsom
Larry Mintier, Mintier Harnish
Mike Schmitt, Kimley-Horn
Matt Weir, Kimley-Horn
Kim Pallari, HDR

The following is an overview of the discussion:

**Overview**
- Question over what problem is corridor plan trying to fix? Suggestion that this needs to be clearly articulated in the Plan.
- Due to limited funds, initial efforts should focus on “hot spots” in corridor
- People use multiple segments of the corridor during a typical trip, therefore care needs to be given to segment-by-segment identities and treatments
- Perspective residents are interested in “walk scores” of communities, having a robust pedestrian system is important to remaining attractive
- Historic District and Outlets (service employees) struggle with employees who have to rely on LRT due to limited service times and connectivity along the corridor
  1. Need late night service
  2. Should have a broad transit collaboration amongst all providers to improve connectivity
- Parking (park-and-ride) should be considered in the corridor’s future. Suggestion that it could be located on the southern edge of the corridor and that some form or rail service could provide local circulation.

**Medians**
- Would affect access which is a major concern
- Observation was made that Sutter Street was improved by removing medians
Consider use of brick pavers or other pavement treatment instead of physical median barriers can preserve access while improving appearance and reinforcing spatial separations.

Desire to focus on improving traffic flow and provide beautification along corridor.

**Corridor Users, Function, and Regional Influences**

- An origin-destination study could be useful to understand travel patterns and the role of the corridor in the City and region.
- Corridor has two primary user groups, through traffic and local (destined for businesses along corridor) traffic
  1. Need to address the through traffic component
- Oak Avenue is a primary regional route connecting East Bidwell with Granite Bay and El Dorado County via Broadstone/East Natoma
- Riley Street (Rainbow Bridge) bottleneck has a significant effect on East Bidwell traffic operations
- Folsom Boulevard turn restrictions resulting from LRT preemptions pushes traffic over to Riley and East Bidwell
- Recent elimination of turn restrictions at the Riley/Sutter intersection creates congestion when turning vehicles block traffic
- The signal at Old Placerville Road has significant delay and congestion
- School Street is a common alternative route to East Bidwell in CBD, although it was noted that this is not desirable to neighbors fronting School Street
- Left-turn pockets in Section II are too short
- The Oak Avenue Interchange will reduce traffic on East Bidwell
- Golf Links Drive experiences a lot of diverted traffic from East Bidwell
- A Saratoga Way connection to El Dorado County would help alleviate some US-50 interchange congestion
- Alternative routes should be publicized – suggestion to consider providing an “Insiders’ Guide” detailing the best routes to avoid congestion
- The corridor has large, regional destinations that will likely continue to rely on personal vehicle access. Alternate modes are less useful given the need to transport purchases which can be large and bulky.
- FCUSD should be engaged to proactively address pedestrians, pick-up and drop-off, and containment of activities on the Sutter Middle School property

**Capacity and Connectivity**

- Question as to why portions of corridor were only built to 4-lanes when right-of-way dedication is sometimes required for 6-lanes
  1. Is there a General Plan policy that could affect the outcome of this study?
  2. Example provided of right-of-way being dedicated for 6-lanes, but only 4-lanes built in Section II
- Should consider pedestrian over crossings (across East Bidwell) to improve connectivity and pedestrian safety
- No consensus on viability of rail service as a major mode in corridor.
- General interest in preserving rail corridor
- Rail corridor could be used to accommodate bike/pedestrian facilities without removing track
- There have been studies completed for the use of rail transit along Iron Point Road
Aesthetics and Other Treatments
- Standardization of lighting features is important
- Parking lots that spill into roadway are a safety concern, such as those that occur in the CBD

Folsom Lake College
- Plan to triple enrollment to 20,000 over next decade
- College Parkway perceived as being unsafe and having frequent accidents
- Three Stages events attract ~1,000 patrons per stage and generate a lot of traffic
- Scholar (via Cavitt) and College Parkway are only access points for college
- Gaps in nearby RT system make LRT less attractive for students
- A Rail transit option could assist with getting students out of cars
- Alternate modes are important to student access and local connectivity
Meeting Summary

Re: Active Transportation Focus Group
East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan

Date: June 24, 2013, 11:30 am – 1:30 pm
Fire Station 35, 535 Glenn Drive

Attendees:
- Bill Anderson, FEDS Historical Railroad Association
- Kelley Butcher, Unico Engineering
- Rebecca Garrison, 50 Corridor TMA
- Chris Pair, Sacramento Regional Transit
- Scott Johnson, City of Folsom
- Chelsey Norton, Mintier Harnish
- Mike Schmitt, Kimley-Horn
- Matt Weir, Kimley-Horn
- Kim Pallari, HDR

The following is an overview of the discussion:

• Congestion/Safety
  - Congestion approaching Blue Ravine in conjunction with medians can create response issues for Fire
  - Some walking in the CBD but becomes less as you move south through the corridor
  - Pedestrians are reluctant to walk the corridor due to volumes and speeds
  - Peak-hour traffic volumes and there resulting congestion are an issue
  - The distance between corridor destinations and traffic congestion, particularly for multi-destination trips, makes pedestrian and bicycle travel challenging
  - Corridor needs to be more "welcoming"
  - Suggestion to provide additional bike facilities on parallel corridors rather than expanding on existing corridor facilities.
  - Parents need to have a high level of trust in a pedestrian facility for children to use it routinely

• Aesthetics
  - Corridor feels like a "concrete jungle", not enough "green" (needs landscaping)
  - Strong desire to have consistent approach to transportation/connectivity with the Plan Area as development occurs
  - Corridor is almost a "stroll through history of planning", old to new - many different decades of design and transportation approaches are represented. Some of which are in need of updating.

• Connectivity
  - Folsom Lake College is essentially an "island" and needs connectivity to all modes
    1. Mixed-use development is envisioned around the college with high density residential uses
    2. College students have been observed to walk along rail corridor
  - Schools generate pedestrian traffic along and across the corridor
  - Need to provide better connections between some pedestrian facilities
Corridor would benefit from consistent connectivity for bikes, pedestrians, and cars.

There was a suggestion to consider creating a “grid” system similar to a more “old town” arrangement in CBD to divert traffic around (possibly using Riley Street).

Corridor segment transitions could include “green” areas.

Corridor-wide signage/way-finding could assist in “telling a story” of the history of the corridor.

Clear and concise messaging in the corridor is important to effective routing.

Parallel, “back-door” streets are often used to avoid existing corridor congestion.

Oak Avenue intersection is a key route for commuters and patrons from Granite Bay and El Dorado County (Green Valley Road/E Natoma Street to Blue Ravine to Oak Avenue to E Bidwell).

Because there are significant neighborhoods adjacent to the corridor, bikes can provide an important link to the corridor.

### Alternate Travel Modes

- Sac RT envisions “High Bus” (High Quality, High Frequency) in their 2035 Vision.
  1. Folsom Lake College would be a major destination on the corridor.
  2. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is a possibility, if installed it would likely be limited to segment IV (Broadstone/Palladio).
  3. Requires vertical curbs for ADA compliance.

- Rail Corridor.
  1. Rail can be a major mode in the corridor and the outlook for ridership is positive.
  2. Several different options for rail service ranging from local to regional.
  3. Strong interest in preserving rail corridor.
  4. Suggested that it could connect Historic District with Plan Area and out to Placerville.
  5. Could provide local connectivity.
  6. A trolley system could be a tourism attraction.
  7. Rail is attractive in and of itself.
  8. Hand Car Derby has been taking place for 22 years and demonstrates public interest in use of rail facility.
  9. Should also consider street cars as they may be easier to implement than train/LRT service.
  10. Strong interest in providing connections to RT system.

- Alternate mode options need to be frequent and reliable solutions (need to be equivalent to traveling in personal vehicle).

- Bike facilities should be accommodating to “non-professional” users as well.
  1. Consider providing combination bike/pedestrian separate from roadway travel lanes.
  2. City is a “Bike Friendly City” and will be offering training later this summer.

- Should consider park-and-ride facilities.

- Bike parking and other worksite amenities are needed to incentivize alternate travel modes.
  1. A dedicated circulator connecting business parks with restaurants/retail could reduce weekday local trips between corridor uses (hop on, hop off). This could also be a link to some form of rail service.

### Corridor Identity

- Concern about being associated with specific corridor segment names that conjure particular images (particularly those that emphasize particular land uses) - expressed interest in having strong continuity along the corridor.
CITY OF FOLSOM
E. BIDWELL STREET COMPLETE STREETS CORRIDOR PLAN
PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE

Thursday, July 18, 2013 | 5:30 pm to 7:30 pm
Folsom Lake College, Community Room (FL1 20)

Meeting Summary

Project Team Attendees
Scott Johnson, City of Folsom
David Miller, City of Folsom
Matt Weir, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Chelsea Richardson, Jeffery Demure + Associates
Kim Pallari, HDR Engineering, Inc.
Terry Barragan, HDR Engineering, Inc.
Chelsey Norton, Mintier Harnish

On Thursday evening, July 18, 2013, the City of Folsom held a Public Open House for the East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan. The Public Open House was held from 5:30 pm to 7:30 pm at the Folsom Lake College, Community Room (FL1 20) located at 10 College Parkway, Folsom, CA.

The City of Folsom and community outreach consultant firm, HDR Engineering, Inc., in conjunction with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., made multiple efforts to contact the community and stakeholders to invite them to the meeting. Approximately 61 emails announcing the public open house were sent to community members and key stakeholders. Flyers were also hand delivered to key businesses, shopping centers, and residents on East Bidwell, Creekside, and School Street, beginning near the Folsom DMV all the way to Starbucks Coffee near Highway 50. Shopping centers included the Palladio Shopping Center, Broadstone Shopping Center and many more. Media announcements were sent and published in the Sacramento Business Journal. As a result of these efforts, approximately 20 members of the community attended the meeting along with project staff and team members.

The meeting was set up as an informal open house that allowed attendees to walk around the room, view a variety of project displays and illustrations of the study area and potential alternatives, and talk one-on-one with the project team staff and consultants. Along with the informational boards, there were also to interactive stations set up where the public could use “dot” voting to evaluate their concerns related to different elements within the project corridor. The second interactive station included a large aerial that divided the corridor into sections and the public was asked to use sticky notes to write their comments/concerns/issues and place the sticky note right onto the map. The results are listed below as part of the summary of comments received.
At 6:00 pm, community outreach consultant Kim Pallari opened with welcoming remarks and noted the project team members present to answer questions. She then introduced Michael Schmitt, who gave the audience a brief overview of the project's background through a PowerPoint Presentation. Prior to opening the floor to questions and comments (see below), Kim thanked community members for their critical participation and continued patience during the project planning process and then outlined the next steps.

Once all questions and concerns had been addressed, the meeting format reverted to the open house style, and attendees were encouraged to continue visiting with project staff to discuss their specific questions in more detail.

_During the question and answer session, HDR recorded all comments and questions. These have been placed in no particular order below._

- As far as right now, are there any plans currently in place?
- When will you make East Bidwell Street a complete street?
- Will there be any assurances in regards to how the project will be funded?
- Is the Caltrans grant specifically for this study?
- Will there be any assurances that there will be an assessment?

During sign-in and throughout the evening, attendees were given the opportunity to write comment cards, which could be turned in to the comment box during the meeting or brought home to mail or fax later.

_The following comment cards were submitted at the meeting:_

**Comment #1:**
Very interesting presentation! Thank you.

Submitted by:
Dennis Battrick
754 Sheringham Court
Folsom, CA 95630
(916) 983-1930
dtbatt@msn.com

**Comment #2:**
Folsom Lake College feels landlocked. Can more access paths (vehicle, bike, and path) be added between campus core and surrounding areas? Would this reduce congestion on East Bidwell?

Submitted by:
Anonymous
Below is a tally of surveys submitted at the meeting:

The survey asked the attendee to indicate their level of agreement by selecting the appropriate statement. The attendee was asked to select one of the following answers to each question: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

Results below:

1. The Corridor is broken down into the right segments.  
   Agree: 3 
   Neutral: 1

2. Corridor segments can have their own unique identity but all segments should have a uniform feel/appearance.  
   Strongly Agree: 2 
   Agree: 2

3. The Corridor, in general, is not comfortable or safe for pedestrians.  
   Strongly Agree: 1  
   Agree: 1 
   Neutral: 1 
   Disagree: 1

4. The Corridor, in general, is not comfortable or safe for bicycles.  
   Strongly Agree: 1  
   Agree: 1 
   Neutral: 2

5. Traffic congestion during peak commute times is a significant problem.  
   Agree: 2 
   Disagree: 2

6. Parallel side streets are often used to avoid existing corridor congestion.  
   Agree: 4

7. The length of most trips in the Corridor make anything other than car travel challenging.  
   Agree: 2 
   Disagree: 2

8. The roadway is not aesthetically pleasing and needs landscaping and/or other treatments.  
   Agree: 3 
   Disagree: 1

9. Transit is hard to use in the Corridor because of limited service times and connectivity.  
   Strongly Agree: 1 
   Neutral: 3
10. Medians should not be introduced into the CBD (Segment I).
   Agree: 1
   Neutral: 1
   Disagree: 2

11. Bike facilities connecting the Corridor to adjacent neighborhoods are important.
    Strongly Agree: 1
    Agree: 3

12. The rail tracks should be preserved for the future.
    Strongly Agree: 1
    Agree: 2
    Neutral: 1

13. The rail corridor is an attractive place to provide pedestrian/bicycle facilities.
    Strongly Agree: 1
    Agree: 3

Additional Comments (feel free to use the back as necessary):

In regards to questions #12 & #13; can rail and pedestrian/bicycle coexist (i.e. can pedestrian/bicycle be run alongside each other)?

Four interactive boards were provided on which participants were encouraged to “vote” with colored dots indicating their level of satisfaction with the facilities provided for each of the following travel modes: Pedestrian, Bicycle, Car, and Transit. Green dots indicated “Satisfied”, yellow dots indicated “No Opinion/Neutral”, and red dots indicated “Dissatisfied”.
Interactive Board 3

Interactive Board 4
Four interactive maps were laid out on tables which allowed attendees to communicate on (post-it notes) their thoughts, ideas, and concerns.

Interactive Map 1

- Consider 2-lane roundabouts
- Bidwell/East Bidwell needs to be reconfigured
- Concerned on cut-thru and commute traffic in Old Town
- Roundabouts
- Sidewalks
- Concerned about noise
- Congestion
- Agree. Study effectiveness - Coloma St. to Riley turn.

Transportation Elements
- Transit
- Rail Line
- Class I Bike Path
- Proposed Class I Bike Path
- Proposed Bike Blvd.
- Land Use Opportunity

North Signal System
South Signal System
Isolated Signals
CCTV

July 18, 2013
Interactive Map 2

Please share your thoughts, ideas, and concerns on these maps.

- Really good bike and walking system
- Continue trolley service to Historic District; Extension of light rail
- Phase 1 trolley service needs to go to Mercy Hospital
Pedestrian access between college hub and key intersection and retail is poor; requires long walk around routes.

Would love to see light rail/trolley connection run through this corridor.

Add bike connection to Folsom Lake College designed for most users.

More trolley services as with section 4.

Sections 3 and 4 need dedicated ROWs for pedestrians, bikes, rails, and cars.

Can we fix the signal light so it is not so long to wait to get in/out of the college? Wait is 2-3 minutes.

Add vehicle, pedestrian, and bike path.

Definitely agree (with comment below).

Pedestrian access between arts center and campus entrance is poor and requires long walk around routes.

Add bike Blvd.
Two "right hand turn lanes" into the shopping areas. Areas on the right would help with traffic on this section. Approximately after Home Depot to eastbound highway 50.

We need an operating trolley from In and Out Burger Restaurant to Mercy Hospital and bordering land use compatible therewith.

Continue trolley service thru Folsom annexation (SOI).

If there is a trolley line, how frequent does it run? Does it create more traffic storage when it crosses major streets?

Dedicated ROW needed for Pedestrian, Bike, and Rail.

Sidewalks, bike designation.
### 1. The Corridor is broken down into the right segments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.9% (4)</td>
<td>36.8% (25)</td>
<td>42.6% (29)</td>
<td>8.8% (6)</td>
<td>5.9% (4)</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Level of Agreement:**
  - Strongly Agree: 5.9% (4)
  - Agree: 36.8% (25)
  - Neutral: 42.6% (29)
  - Disagree: 8.8% (6)
  - Strongly Disagree: 5.9% (4)

- **Answered Question:** 68
- **Skipped Question:** 7

### 2. Corridor segments can have their own unique identity but all segments should have a uniform feel/appearance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.4% (23)</td>
<td>32.4% (23)</td>
<td>22.5% (16)</td>
<td>11.3% (8)</td>
<td>1.4% (1)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Level of Agreement:**
  - Strongly Agree: 32.4% (23)
  - Agree: 32.4% (23)
  - Neutral: 22.5% (16)
  - Disagree: 11.3% (8)
  - Strongly Disagree: 1.4% (1)

- **Answered Question:** 71
- **Skipped Question:** 4

### 3. The Corridor, in general, is not comfortable or safe for pedestrians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.4% (22)</td>
<td>35.7% (25)</td>
<td>18.6% (13)</td>
<td>10.0% (7)</td>
<td>4.3% (3)</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Level of Agreement:**
  - Strongly Agree: 31.4% (22)
  - Agree: 35.7% (25)
  - Neutral: 18.6% (13)
  - Disagree: 10.0% (7)
  - Strongly Disagree: 4.3% (3)

- **Answered Question:** 70
- **Skipped Question:** 5
4. The Corridor, in general, is not comfortable or safe for bicycles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40.6% (28)</td>
<td>46.4% (32)</td>
<td>5.8% (4)</td>
<td>4.3% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Average: 1.83
Rating Count: 69

Level of Agreement: 40.6%

5. Traffic congestion during peak commute times is a significant problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.0% (36)</td>
<td>31.9% (23)</td>
<td>6.9% (5)</td>
<td>11.1% (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Average: 1.79
Rating Count: 72

Level of Agreement: 50.0%

6. Parallel side streets are often used to avoid existing corridor congestion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.7% (18)</td>
<td>48.6% (34)</td>
<td>11.4% (8)</td>
<td>10.0% (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Average: 2.19
Rating Count: 70

Level of Agreement: 25.7%
7. The length of most trips in the Corridor make anything other than car travel challenging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.9% (9)</td>
<td>55.7% (39)</td>
<td>10.0% (7)</td>
<td>14.3% (10)</td>
<td>7.1% (5)</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Agreement: 12.9% (9) 55.7% (39) 10.0% (7) 14.3% (10) 7.1% (5) 2.47 70

8. The roadway is not aesthetically pleasing and needs landscaping and/or other treatments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.3% (24)</td>
<td>30.6% (22)</td>
<td>19.4% (14)</td>
<td>15.3% (11)</td>
<td>1.4% (1)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Agreement: 33.3% (24) 30.6% (22) 19.4% (14) 15.3% (11) 1.4% (1) 2.21 72

9. Transit is hard to use in the Corridor because of limited service times and connectivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.7% (10)</td>
<td>19.1% (13)</td>
<td>63.2% (43)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>2.9% (2)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Agreement: 14.7% (10) 19.1% (13) 63.2% (43) 0.0% (0) 2.9% (2) 2.57 68

answered question: 70
skipped question: 5

answered question: 72
skipped question: 3

answered question: 68
skipped question: 7
10. Medians should not be introduced into the CBD (Segment I).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.5% (5)</td>
<td>22.4% (15)</td>
<td>53.7% (36)</td>
<td>10.4% (7)</td>
<td>6.0% (4)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Agreement: 7.5% (5) 22.4% (15) 53.7% (36) 10.4% (7) 6.0% (4) 2.85 67

answered question 67

skipped question 8

11. Bike facilities connecting the Corridor to adjacent neighborhoods are important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.9% (28)</td>
<td>48.6% (35)</td>
<td>8.3% (6)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>4.2% (3)</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Agreement: 38.9% (28) 48.6% (35) 8.3% (6) 0.0% (0) 4.2% (3) 1.82 72

answered question 72

skipped question 3

12. The rail tracks should be preserved for the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.8% (24)</td>
<td>23.9% (17)</td>
<td>16.9% (12)</td>
<td>15.5% (11)</td>
<td>9.9% (7)</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Agreement: 33.8% (24) 23.9% (17) 16.9% (12) 15.5% (11) 9.9% (7) 2.44 71

answered question 71

skipped question 4
13. The rail corridor is an attractive place to provide pedestrian/bicycle facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.0% (27)</td>
<td>46.5% (33)</td>
<td>7.0% (5)</td>
<td>5.6% (4)</td>
<td>2.8% (2)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question: 71

Skipped question: 4

14. Additional Comments

Answered question: 19

Skipped question: 56

15. Thank you again for your participation in this survey! If you would like to be included on our email list for future East Bidwell Update announcements and notifications, please provide your contact information below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question: 41

Skipped question: 34
CITY OF FOLSOM
EAST BIDWELL STREET COMPLETE STREETS CORRIDOR PLAN
FOCUS GROUP MEETING & PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE

Thursday, July 31, 2014 | 11:30 am – 1:30 pm
Fire Station 35
Meeting Summary

Project Team Attendees
Mark Rackovan, City of Folsom
Scott Johnson, City of Folsom
Matt Weir, Kimley-Horn
Dave Sorenson, Kimley-Horn
Chelsea Richardson, JDA

On Thursday afternoon, July 31, 2014, the City of Folsom held a focus group meeting for the East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan. The meeting was held from 11:30 am to 1:30 pm at Fire Station 35 (535 Glenn Drive, Folsom).

In addition, a public open house was held on Thursday evening, August 7, 2014, from 5:30 to 7:30 pm at the Folsom Public Library (411 Stafford Street, Folsom).

The City of Folsom and community outreach consultant firm, HDR, invited stakeholders and business owners via email and phone calls. The open house was also advertised on the City's newsletter and website. As a result of these efforts, approximately 23 stakeholders and business owners attended the focus group meeting, and 31 attended the open house along with project staff and team members.

The meetings were set up as an informal open house that allowed attendees to walk around the room, view a variety of illustrations of the study area and potential ideas, and talk one-on-one with the project team staff and consultants.

City Project Manager, Mark Rackovan, opened the meeting with welcoming remarks and talked about
the Caltrans grant for the study. He then introduced Matt Weir, who gave the audience a brief overview of the project’s background through a PowerPoint Presentation.

Prior to opening the floor to questions and comments (see below), Kim thanked community members for their critical participation and continued patience during the project planning process and then outlined the next steps.

Once all questions and concerns had been addressed, the meeting format reverted to the open house style and attendees were encouraged to continue visiting with project staff to discuss their specific questions in more detail.

**During the question and answer session, HDR recorded all comments and questions. These comments have been placed in no particular order below.**

**Focus Group Meeting:**
- Homeless is an issue along Bidwell and benches could attract more.
- Making the corridor look better is good but not taking roadway to do so.
- Sutter Street lost business during the project
- With development south of 50, how are these people headed north going to get across the river?
- Pedestrian path should be in front of the stores rather than out by the street.
- Don’t want to lose travel lanes or parking at expense of pedestrians in CBD.
- Bike consideration is great in residential areas but not in business areas.
- There are trails all over Folsom. We shouldn’t be encouraging riding on the streets.
- What bike counts or studies have been conducted on Bidwell corridor.
- Need a balance between bikes and motorists.
- Are there any studies that show comparison of frequency of accessing stores via bike or car?
- Use parallel roads for adding bike/pedestrian access, not Bidwell.
- Has there been multi-model studies done within this corridor?
- Can I get a copy of the traffic study report? (George Econome)
- Sutter School — Is there still a crosswalk @ the roundabout?
- Is it safer to have a roundabout at the Sutter/Riley corner if you have 2 lanes?
- Does narrowing of the lanes take into consideration commercial vehicles that are wider?
Voting Tally:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE RATING</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continues Bike Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use buffer w/o taking traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thursday, August 7, 2014 | 5:30 am – 7:30 pm
Folsom Public Library
Meeting Summary

Public Open House:

• (Referring to presentation): Does that take into account the actual usage on the streets or just opinions?
• When you go down to two lanes, there will not be enough room. You will choke out businesses and force traffic onto the side streets. No one shops with bikes. You will impact businesses if you eliminate parking and cut into the lots. What is the purpose of going down to one lane?
• The most heavily populated street for businesses is East Bidwell. Is the study doing anything to show the effects the businesses would have?
• Fair vision would show how heavily populated businesses are effected.
• The lack of taking impacts to businesses is major issue. Making case harder rather than easier. Most of us would embrace amenities in instance of not reducing lanes. That is why the majority of us are here. A number of cars go by everyday. You are battling a lot by reducing lanes.
• The ability of people to get to businesses: fewer lanes of traffic = less cars seeing the shops and businesses.
• Operate on a margin. What you are talking about is eliminating margins.
• Resident: do not want more traffic coming onto residential streets.
• I avoid East Bidwell because of having to stop at all the traffic lights. I would rather drive slowly with all green lights vs. stopping all the time at high speed.
• The current speed limit is 35. If you lessen the lanes, will the speed limit reduce?
• Ongoing battle if reducing lanes.
• I am a resident of 22 years and get around via bike. The function of the City is safety and wellbeing of people. The more important issue is to feel safe for bikers. Not a decent way to walk or bike on East Bidwell, so nobody does.
• The Sutter Street revitalization impacted businesses. Businesses suffered because of lost street parking on Sutter.
• Sidewalks not safe to walk on. Will sidewalks be fixed? What are the different amenities/elements? Why do you have to reduce lanes? Is there an accidents study of bikes/pedestrians on East Bidwell? Can you add bike lanes without complete separation?
• How much are you going to encroach on private property? Rock wall on East Bidwell. Are you just going to do it or assist property owners if they want assistance?
• If possible and could be done, make the current four lanes narrower and add bike lane/trail with a flat median in the center would be a decent compromise, if it could be done.
• Our CBD is the least attractive. The business districts around the country are trying hard to get projects like this. If it is more attractive, you will get more business.
• It is not what you do; it is how you do it.
• No benches as people will sleep on them. Have separators with arms. The homeless is a growing aggressive element.
• Businesses in the CBD see maybe three pedestrians daily. The pedestrians/bikers are not shopping. There is already a lot of traffic and not enough lanes. Already existing trails and do not see bikers using East Bidwell.
• Make Glenn & East Bidwell safer and Riley better for cyclists.
• I moved to Limby Drive to walk to the CBD. Anything you can do for people to walk, a lot of us like to walk. Someone mentioned margins; there is a margin for pedestrians too.
• Regarding residential traffic comment, would you welcome bicycle traffic (on School Street)? Create bike lanes that parallel East Bidwell, make everyone happy.
• Has anyone asked how revitalization happens? I don’t think the person who created this slide understands. Present/future view: the bloodline that created this town is gone with new businesses. Revitalization is a tricky word to use. How about “regenerating”?
• Who is providing money for the shopping centers to remodel?
• Make/create/upgrade image with fancy light bulbs, flag system, etc.
• If the public and business owners do not think the plans are a good idea, why force it down?
• What about making East Bidwell a one way from Riley to Blue Ravine?
• CBD – if it fits narrower travel lane (four lanes) and bike lanes.
• Not opposed to midblock pedestrian crossing if a traffic light is used.
• Creekside District – transit option: trolley using tracks to connect with rest of corridor and historic district. Can have stop at hospital.
• College District – use tracks for trolley to connect with light rail and other districts. Harris Center connected to dining in neighboring Broadstone District.
• Broadstone District – What is the “opportunity site”? Add equestrian along rail trail (colline – Natomas) not just foot and bike. For transit option, use tracks for trolley to connect with historic district, light rail and other East Bidwell corridor districts. Lots of dining options here. Trolley can connect with residential areas between East Bidwell and historic district.
**CREEK DISTRICT**

- Construct a multi-use path (for bicycles and pedestrians) along the railroad corridor.

- Preserve the rail corridor for future transit service.

- Construct buffered bicycle lanes, rather than widening the roadway to three thru lanes in each direction.

**CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT**

- Reduce the travel lanes on East Bidwell Street in the CBD to one lane in each direction to allow for buffered bicycle lanes, wider sidewalks, and/or on-street parking.

- Replace traffic signals with roundabouts:
  - East Bidwell St./Riley St.
  - East Bidwell St./Coloma St.

- Add one or two mid-block pedestrian crossings with curb extensions and median refuge within the CBD.
E. Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan - Meeting Summary
July 31 & August 7, 2014

**COLLEGE DISTRICT**
Construct a multi-use path (for bicycles and pedestrians) along the railroad corridor.

**COLLEGE DISTRICT**
Encourage mixed use development to occur on the north side of East Bidwell Street adjacent to Lake Folsom College.

**COLLEGE DISTRICT**
In College and Broadstone Districts, provide three thru lanes in each direction, but narrow lane widths to provide a striped buffer between vehicular and bicycle lanes.

**BROADSTONE DISTRICT**
Construct a multi-use path (for bicycles and pedestrians) along the railroad corridor.

**BROADSTONE DISTRICT**
In College and Broadstone Districts, provide three thru lanes in each direction, but narrow lane widths to provide a striped buffer between vehicular and bicycle lanes.

**BROADSTONE DISTRICT**
Encourage the construction of a bicycle and pedestrian bridge to connect the Patridge to the opposite opportunity site.
During sign-in and throughout the evening, attendees were given the opportunity to write comment cards, which could be turned in to the comment box during the meeting or brought home to mail or fax later.

The following comment cards were submitted at the Focus Group meeting:

**Comment #1:**
First of all, thank you for all your hard work putting together the Focus Group Meeting. I found it very interesting. My area of interest in this project and why I attended is related to the fact that my residence on School Street is near the Central Business District of East Bidwell Street. I am quite often a pedestrian in the area. I do have concerns about the concept of going from four lanes to two lanes. School Street, Duchow, Glenn, and Whales already get a large amount of cut-through traffic. My concern about narrowing and slowing lanes by going from four lanes to two lanes in the CBD may lead to motorist frustration and send even more cut-through traffic to residential side streets. Consideration should be given to this sort of impact. If there is a way to discourage this, it would be better for the businesses because they’d keep their street traffic, and it would keep our residential streets from being used as expressways.

Submitted by:
Karen Forster
1030 School Street
Folsom, CA 95630
983-54323
sterogirl@gmail.com

**Comment #2:**
My main concern is CBD going down to two lanes. It will kill business. Business is a transaction based on ease, speed, and convenience. They will also divert to School Street or Riley due to delays. Narrow to 4 instead.

Submitted by:
Tom Econome
480 Williams Street
Folsom, CA 95630
tom@collectionplus.com
Comment #3:
The two main points that we both agree on are safety of the public and access for the public to businesses. By not implementing this project, bicyclists stay safer by not increasing mix use of bicycle and motor vehicles. By keeping the general plan you increase accessibility to businesses for our customers. As a business owner and Folsom resident we are firmly against this proposal.

Submitted by:
Dan Dreher
511 E. Bidwell Street
Folsom, CA 95630
(916) 716-0100
dan@flb365.com

Comment #4:
I would like to discuss this dead end lane at 2310 East Bidwell. I have some ideas of pedestrian/bike/traffic movement here.

Submitted by:
Sean Roth
2310 East Bidwell
Folsom, CA 95630
(916) 812-4775
Sroth66@hotmail.com

Comment #5:
Do not want any reduced traffic lanes! I am open to all other ideas depending on what they are other than lane reductions.

Submitted by:
George Econome
9923 Valley Pines
Folsom, CA 95630
(916) 9878-5466
basiliki@comcast.net

Comment #6:
Need to develop bicycle/walking trail next to railroad tracks ASAP.

Submitted by:
Craig R Burnett
9849 Oakplace West
Folsom, CA 94630
(916) 849-3344
FLCCA-CRAIG@comcast.net
Comment #7:
Examples show no loss of lanes. Sutter Street Successful? Not! Slower speed will move traffic to Riley Street. Presentation very skewed and reflect that the concerns for business owners are not as important.

Submitted by:
Jenny Briggs
(916) 983-3688

The following letter was submitted via fax after the Open House:

Howard Thomas
Pioneer Center
P.O. Box 5185
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

August 12, 2014

Ms. Kim Pallari
c/o Public Outreach
2365 Iron Point Road, Suite 300
Folsom, CA 95630

RE: Objection to Squeezing Traffic into Two Lanes in Central Business District
East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan

Dear Ms. Pallari:

Since 1975, our family has owned the Pioneer Center located in the 400 block of East Bidwell Street which is in the Central Business District of the corridor plan. As a bit of history, the Pioneer Center and the 300 block were developed by Jack Kipp and his friends in the late 50's as the first "modern" retail development away from Sutter Street. I have upgraded the exterior, utilities, and signage but the footprint remains largely as Jack built it.

The Pioneer Center is a local business center. We take pride in housing local merchants who don't fit in big boxes or malls. These merchants earn a living, pay their employees, and give the community a local flavor that chain stores don't.

Local merchants don't have slick TV campaigns or internet teams like chain stores do. Rather, they depend on being discovered by local motorists who will spread the word among their friends. The more often potential customers see a local store, the more likely they will think of the local merchant when a need arises. Thus, traffic counts and visibility are vital to local merchant success. In the shopping center business, traffic counts, sightlines and demographics are considered the key metrics of site potential.
Because traffic counts and visibility are critical to local merchants, squeezing cars down to two lanes and hiding stores behind trees is a recipe for urban blight rather than urban renewal. As a member of the International Council of Shopping Centers, I have studied both successful and disastrous designs. I am an avid cyclist and have enjoyed the streets of Davis and Portland, Oregon which are often cited by bicycle advocates. However, Folsom is a low density community built on the aspirations of the Great Generation for micro estates far from commerce. During the post war years, the essence of residential zoning was segregation and minimum lot size. Unlike Portland, it is now impractical for any significant number of Folsom residents to bike from their single family residences, past local stores, to their jobs. Unlike Davis, Folsom isn't a college town where thousands of fit, young students live within a mile of their campus and apartments. Converting a few blocks of East Bidwell Street into a bicycle parkway won't change Folsom into a Portland or Davis because the density is too low. What squeezing Bidwell Street will do is drive out local merchants.

As an avid cyclist and someone who has publically spoken on the perils of global warming and acid rain since the '70's, I support reasonable efforts to make Folsom bicycle friendly and energy efficient. To me, it appears that there is room in the Central Business District to make East Bidwell Street safer for cyclists by adding either colored bicycle lanes or using shared lane markings (if there isn't enough room for dedicated lanes) while maintaining four traffic lanes. The City's traffic engineers are looking at these options. In particular, they are looking at installing dedicated, state specified, green bicycle lanes through the Central Business District which may require some narrowing of the traffic lanes. I would welcome this improvement because it would make cycling safer while preserving the vitality of local merchants.

Thank you for allowing me to participate in the recent stakeholder's luncheon and community meeting. Prior to my being contacted by another property owner, I was unaware of this study. In the future, please keep me on your mailing and outreach lists. My email is hmthomas@msn.com and I can be reached at (925) 274-0432 any time. I look forward to working with the City regarding the particular challenges and opportunities of improving the infrastructure we have inherited.

Best Regards,

Howard Thomas
CITY OF FOLSOM
EAST BIDWELL STREET COMPLETE STREETS CORRIDOR PLAN
PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE MEETING SUMMARY

Thursday, November 13, 2014
5:30 - 7:30 pm
Folsom Public Library

Project Team Attendees
Mark Rackovan, City of Folsom
Matt Weir, Kimley-Horn
Dave Sorenson, Kimley-Horn
Chris Gregerson, Kimley-Horn

Chelsea Richardson, JDA
Steven Balliet, JDA
Kim Pallari, HDR
Tammy Teurn, HDR

On Thursday evening, November 13, 2014, the City of Folsom held a public open house for the East Bidwell Street Complete Streets Corridor Plan. The meeting was held from 5:30 to 7:30 pm at the Folsom Public Library (411 Stafford Street, Folsom).

The City of Folsom and community outreach consultant firm, HDR, invited stakeholders and business owners via email. The open house was also advertised on the City’s newsletter and website. As a result of these efforts, approximately 31 stakeholders and business owners attended the open house along with project staff and team members.

The meeting was set up as an informal open house that allowed attendees to walk around the room, view a variety of illustrations of the study area and potential ideas, and talk one-on-one with the project team staff and consultants.

Throughout the meeting, attendees were given an opportunity to submit comments via comment cards. These comments have been placed in no particular order below.

Comment #1:
Thanks for listening to the local merchants in the CBD.

Submitted by:
Howard Thomas
Pioneer Center
925-274-0432
Comment #2:
I understand that currently there is not enough right-of-way to include bike lanes in the Central Business District. However, most of the reasons for biking in that area is to bike to the business in that area. If bike traffic is rerouted to local/residential streets, there is no access to the businesses along Bidwell, which completely nullifies the “whole street” concept. There should be enough room to acquire right-of-way for bike lanes without taking out any existing business. Without bike lanes, it is also an abrupt transition from the south end of Bidwell where bike travel on the main road to the business is encouraged. All of a sudden you’re saying that bikes are no longer allowed on the same road, and in the area that would benefit the most from being more bike accessible.

Submitted by:
Bryan Fraser
180 S. Lexington Drive #626
Folsom, CA 95630
541-646-0031
b.fraser1@u.pacific.edu

Comment #3:
In the Broadstone and College segments, the idea shows the bike trail to follow the road across the railroad tracks and then making a 90° turn across the free right turns. As a bicyclist, this would be a hard turn to make as you have to look directly behind you to make sure no traffic is coming. It would be a lot easier if the trail can 90° to the sidewalk at the crosswalk so that it is easier for bicyclists to see cars moving through the right turn. It would also keep it a Class I bike lane as it would be separated from the sidewalk, instead of being down graded to a Class II.

Submitted by:
Bryan Fraser
180 S. Lexington Drive #626
Folsom, CA 95630
541-646-0031
b.fraser1@u.pacific.edu

Comment #4:
Not in favor of the Creekside plan. The general plan of action wasn’t favorable. Keep the streets as is. Roundabouts will not help the flow of traffic in the Business District, I believe it will make things worse.

Submitted by:
Kayla Harris
115 Remington Drive
Folsom, CA 95630
916-996-0254
kayla@wallyspizzabar.com
Comment #5:
Still concerned with not sticking to the general plan on keeping three lanes in each direction in the Creekside District. There is a need now and it will increase in the future for access to the hospital in this District. I think it’s best to stick to the general plan. I also am not in favor of any reduction in lane width or count in any District along E. Bidwell Street.

Submitted by:
Dan Dreher
511 E. Bidwell Street
Folsom, CA 95630
916-716-0100
dan@flb365.com

Comment #6:
As an agent for the property owner of Folsom Landing Shopping Center (618-654 E. Bidwell), I am greatly concerned about the proposed Complete Street Project. This is the first I am hearing of the project and am I glad to be included in the discussion. I understand there are changes in the works of the original plan, possibly keeping the four lanes of traffic in existence on E. Bidwell Street – that is wonderful news!! I am certainly in favor of helping Central Folsom Business District, it just needs to support the businesses. Thank you.

Submitted by:
Stephanie Paschal-Jividen
Lawrence Properties
5740 Windmill Way #11
Carmichael, CA 95608
916-486-0209
lawprop@sbcglobal.net

Comment #7:
Very happy about maintaining four lanes on the Central Business District. I am overall happy about the change and the project.

Submitted by:
John Steiner
488 Rockport Circle
Folsom, CA 95630
916-878-7583
sbarkles@comcast.net
Comment #8:
I recommend to stay with the general plan that has been in existence. Any reduction in lanes or lane size would be a detriment to access. Local traffic is already operating at a high volume/capacity.

Submitted by:
Jeremy Dreher
511 E. Bidwell Street
Folsom, CA 95630
916-983-4411
Jeremy@fjb365.com

Comment #9:
I just learned tonight that the Central Business will have few to no changes in the traffic lane. I'm very happy to hear that!!! Thank you.

Submitted by:
Charles Thurman
186 Price Way
Folsom, CA 95630
916-825-3548
Appendix J

Partner Support
June 12, 2015

Lacey Symons-Holtzen, Program Coordinator
Active Transportation Team Manager
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Symons-Holtzen:

Thank you for the opportunity to express Folsom Lake College's support for the City of Folsom's 2015 Active Transportation Program and Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program grant application for the Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail Gap Closure Project.

Folsom Lake College (FLC) is a strong supporter of the City of Folsom's grant application to improve conditions for cyclists and pedestrians along the East Bidwell Street Corridor. The current condition of high speeds and traffic volumes along East Bidwell Street is unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians. Adding the bicycle and pedestrian trail along East Bidwell Street will significantly decrease the propensity for collisions between cyclists/pedestrians and automobiles and increase the number of students and faculty who would like to walk and/or ride their bike to the campus.

Currently, approximately 8,000 students attend FLC and within the next five years is projected to reach 15,000 students. Past surveys have shown that almost 60% of FLC students reside within a 3-5 miles radius of the campus. With the addition of the East Bidwell Trail it is anticipated that many of our students will walk or ride on the new addition. This will have the additional benefit of making the campus more accessible to many, including those unable to drive.

We are very excited about the Active Transportation opportunities this project offers and the positive impact it will have on Folsom Lake College students and employees as well as the entire Folsom community. Realizing the proposed project has been a high priority for Folsom Lake College and we have worked with the City of Folsom over the years to plan this much needed trail segment. Completing this project will enable FLC and the City of Folsom to offer healthier transportation alternatives through the promotion of more active transportation modalities.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this letter in enthusiastic support of the grant application for the City of Folsom's - Folsom/Placerville Rail Trail Gap Closure Project.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Kirklin
Vice President, Administration
**Fixed Route Fares**

- Adult One-Way: $2.50
- Adult Ticket Booklet (20 One-Way): $50.00
- *Discount One-Way*: $1.25
- *Discount Monthly Pass*: $50.00
- *Discount Ticket Booklet (20 One-Way)*: $25.00
- Children 3 & Under: Free
- Sac RT Monthly/Daily Passes: Accepted

*Student/Senior (55 and up)/Disabled/Medicare Cardholder*

**Drivers Do Not Make Change**

---

**Folsom Stage Line Dial-A-Ride**

**General Information**

What is Dial-A-Ride?
Dial-A-Ride is a curb-to-curb transportation service that provides residents who have a physical, developmental, or mental disability, means of commuting within the Folsom city limits. Senior citizens who are 55 years of age or older also qualify for this program.

Passengers must register and be given verification that they qualify for ridership before they can ride. Registration materials and all Dial-A-Ride information can be obtained by calling the Folsom Dial-A-Ride office (916) 355-8347 or online at www.folsom.ca.us

- Monthly Pass: $95.00
- One-Way: $4.00
- Ticket Booklet (10 One-Way): $40.00

---

**LEGEND**

- Bus Stops
- Route 10
- Route 20 Peak
- Route 30 Peak
- School
- Medical
- Sheltered Bus Stop
- Transfer Points
- Public Locations
- Light Rail Stations
- Both Ways
- One Way

---

**What is Dial-A-Ride?**

Dial-A-Ride is a curb-to-curb transportation service that provides residents who have a physical, developmental, or mental disability, means of commuting within the Folsom city limits. Senior citizens who are 55 years of age or older also qualify for this program.

Passengers must register and be given verification that they qualify for ridership before they can ride. Registration materials and all Dial-A-Ride information can be obtained by calling the Folsom Dial-A-Ride office (916) 355-8347 or online at www.folsom.ca.us

- Monthly Pass: $95.00
- One-Way: $4.00
- Ticket Booklet (10 One-Way): $40.00

---

**Folsom Stage Line Transit System Information & Map**

**Phone: (916) 355-8395**

**WWW.FOLSOM.CA.US**

**Español:** Para obtener información en Español, por favor marque (916) 355-8395 y diga “Español”. Gracias.

**Jumper 30, 2014**
**HELPFUL TIPS WHEN RIDING FOLSOM STAGE LINE**

Plan your trip prior to taking the bus. For assistance information call (916) 355-8395 or go to www.folsom.ca.us. We will be happy to assist you with planning your trip.

To ensure a ride, please be at your bus stop location prior to the time listed. As the bus approaches, stand or signal the driver. For safety, stand clear until the bus comes to a complete stop.

If you are transferring to another Folsom Stage Line bus, please inform the driver when boarding.

Standing on the bus is only stored so as not to block the aisle way. Child shall be held by parent.

Do not block the aisles with large items. Baby strollers must be folded and have to stand, please use the handrails for safety.

Children are to be kept seated. No running or climbing in the bus.

No food or beverage allowed on the bus. Please limit cell phone use.

Passenger Rules
No animals except service animals. Small animals in a secure container are permitted.
No tolerance of behavior, loud noises, etc. that might distract the driver and create a nuisance to others.
No tolerance of unsafe behavior, graffiti or vandalism in and around Folsom Stage Line buses or bus stops.

Front-mounted bike racks are also provided.

**ACCESSIBILITY**
The Folsom Stage Line buses are wheelchair equipped with a hydraulic lift.  

The Folsom Stage Line uses a hybrid bus which can run on both electricity and diesel. These buses are equipped with a wheelchair lift and have a number of safety features.

**CLOSED THE FOLLOWING HOLIDAYS**

**WEkirDAY SERVICE ONLY**

---

### FOLSOM STAGE LINE FIXED ROUTE 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route 10</th>
<th>M-F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Folsom Light Rail Station</td>
<td>4:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley Natomas Glen Drive</td>
<td>4:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Bidwell @ Montrose Creekside &amp; Oak AVE</td>
<td>4:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom Lake College (Route 20)</td>
<td>4:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadstone Center Palacio &amp; Folsom Gateway</td>
<td>4:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natomas Station</td>
<td>4:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Folsom Light Rail Station</td>
<td>4:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ravine Prairie City (near Intel)</td>
<td>5:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom High School Kaiser</td>
<td>5:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom Gateway Palacio &amp; Broadstone Center</td>
<td>5:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom Lake College (Route 20)</td>
<td>5:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ave. Pkwy Creekside Drive (Mercy Hospital)</td>
<td>5:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Bidwell &amp; Blue Ravine Montrose</td>
<td>5:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natomas Station</td>
<td>5:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Folsom Light Rail Station</td>
<td>5:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Lake Natomas Drive</td>
<td>5:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Greenback Sac RT 24</td>
<td>5:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American River Canyon</td>
<td>5:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Folsom Light Rail Station</td>
<td>5:45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FIXED ROUTE 20 PEAK AM**

| Empire Ranch Road Palomino CL Woodhead St. | 7:10 |
| E. Natomas Empire Ranch Dr. - Wesley Dr Bonhill Dr. | 7:15 |
| E. Natomas Haddington Blvd. Ballou Circle | 7:20 |
| Parkway Drive Bonanza Ln. Thurman Way | 7:25 |
| Parkway Drive Scheidigecir Circle Willow Bend Bridge | 7:30 |
| Blue Ravine Jorgensen Rd. Big Valley Rd. Oak Ave. Pkwy | 7:35 |
| N. Lexington Drive Arisworth Way | 7:40 |
| N. Lexington Drive Wesleyan Way | 7:45 |
| Prewett Drive Community Park Kiilby Way | 7:50 |
| Prewett Drive Silberhorn Drive | 7:55 |
| Silberhorn Drive S. Lexington Drive | 8:00 |
| Silberhorn Drive Willow Lane Wentham VLay | 8:05 |
| Folsom Lake College Route 10 | 8:10 |
| Vista del Lago High School | 8:15 |

---

**FIXED ROUTE 20 PEAK PM**

| Vista del Lago High School | 3:15 |
| Folsom Lake College Route 10 | 3:20 |
| Silberhorn Drive Wrenham Way S. Lexington Dr. | 3:25 |
| Silberhorn Drive Fayette Way Trowbridge Lane | 3:30 |
| Prewett Drive Newlon Way Community Park | 3:35 |
| N. Lexington Westleyan Way Wrenham St. | 3:40 |
| Oak Avenue Parkway & Blue Ravine | 3:45 |
| Parkway Drive Humbug Creek Drive | 3:50 |
| Parkway Drive Kiddie Way | 3:55 |
| Parkway Drive Dall Way Morganite Court | 4:00 |
| E. Natomas Ballou Circle Ferguson | 4:05 |
| E. Natomas Golf Links Wesley Empire Ranch | 4:10 |
| E. Natomas Broadstone Pkwy. | 4:15 |

---

**FIXED ROUTE 30 PK**

| Glen Station | 6:20 |
| Woodmere Drive | 6:25 |
| Glen Station | 6:00 |
| Folsom Prison | 6:10 |
| Glen Station | 6:20 |

---

**TIMES ARE SUBJECT TO TRAFFIC, ROAD, AND WEATHER CONDITIONS**
Most Significant Accomplishment

Children in Folsom sign a bicycle contract stating they understand and will follow all safety rules and municipal laws related to bicycling. Law enforcement officers help to reinforce this safety effort by paying special attention to bicyclists' behavior at the start of the school year.

Highlights

Folsom has worked with the Army Corps of Engineers to ensure a shared use path and bike lanes were included in the new bridge that will cross the American River. Adding the bikeway was funded by the city at a cost of more than $3 million. This facility is important because it makes a connection between the existing 30-mile regional American River Parkway Trail on one side and the future Folsom Lake Trail on the other. The new roadway and bridge is about a mile long and provides a much needed bike commuter route across the American River.

Folsom just installed 22 bike lockers and bike racks at three new light rail stations. To illustrate the demand for secure bike parking, the four lockers installed at one of the stations were reserved within 24 hours of installing the lockers.

Each quarter, city staff and bicycle advocates come together for a bike ride through Folsom to take note of problems and potential improvements for cyclists. The ride helps city staff understand firsthand the issues and concerns facing cyclists. A specific route is determined and detailed notes are taken during the ride. City staff follows up with a written summary of the issues encountered.

The city has taken proactive steps to prepare a comprehensive bikeway plan that addresses safety, enforcement, education and provides a network of integrated bikeway facilities. This plan has been successful, since its original adoption in 1999, in committing developers to construct more than 20 miles of bike lanes as new roads are constructed or widened.

The city's well-attended annual Bike-to-Work Day fosters steady improvement in the bike facilities and policies provided by local employers, who seek to be designated the most bicycle-friendly employer of the year.