



DATE: September 9, 2024

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council through City Manager

FROM: Brian Oh, Community Development Director
Heather Hines, Special Projects Manager
Heather Gurewitz, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Presentation and Discussion of the Draft Policy Frameworks in order to provide a summary of the community engagement and feedback received and to receive input to inform revisions as part of the development of the Draft General Plan. This will not include the recently released Draft Land Use Framework, which will be discussed at a subsequent City Council meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council receive a presentation on the community engagement and feedback received on the 13 General Plan Policy Frameworks (excluding the newly released Draft Land Use Framework), including an in-person open house (PlanFest), online survey engagement, 14 total meetings with all City's Committees and Commissions, and seven General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) working groups. Additionally, it is recommended that the City Council provide feedback on the frameworks to inform revisions as part of the development of the Draft General Plan. In addition to framework specific questions included in discussion below, the City Council may wish to consider the following general questions:

- What do you see as the most important policies in each framework?
- What concerns do you have about the policies in each framework? For example, are they unclear? Should they be softened or strengthened? Do you disagree with the policy direction?

The Draft Land Use Policy Framework was recently released and is the focus of ongoing public engagement activities. The Draft Land Use Framework will be discussed at a subsequent City Council meeting and will not be part of this agenda item.

BACKGROUND

General Plan Update

The current General Plan Update process was initiated in 2020 with an extensive public engagement process to identify community and decision-maker priorities for the General Plan. In partnership with consultant Raimi + Associates the update process kicked off in 2021 and is anticipated to be before the City Council for adoption in late 2025. The General Plan is a guiding document, providing policies and implementation programs to achieve the City's goals, and generally has a planning horizon of around 20 years. The General Plan also serves as the City's foundation for regulating Land Use. Eight mandatory topical areas, or Elements, must be included in a General Plan pursuant to California State Law, including Land Use, Open Space, Conservation, Housing, Circulation, Noise, Safety, and Environmental Justice. Unlike other elements, the Housing Element is required by State regulations to be updated every eight years. Petaluma's Housing Element was adopted by City Council and certified by the State of California in March 2023.

In early 2021, the City also assembled a General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) to provide insight and recommendations throughout the General Plan Update process. The committee is made up of a diverse group of residents, business owners, educators, and other members of the community who serve as advisors and ambassadors of the General Plan Update. The GPAC works collaboratively with the consultant team, led by Raimi + Associates, and City staff, to provide input on General Plan issues and offer feedback on draft materials. Further information on the GPAC, including meeting materials, can be found here: <https://www.planpetaluma.org/gpac-page>.

Existing Conditions

Following an initial period of data gathering in 2021, the consultant team completed 19 Existing Conditions Reports, which establish baseline conditions for key policy areas. The reports covered the key topics to be addressed in the general plan and can be found on the [General Plan website](#).

Vision Pillars, and Guiding Principles

Simultaneous to the existing conditions effort, the City engaged in a [robust public engagement process](#) that included public surveys, listening sessions, geographical area meetings, pop-up workshops, focus groups, and engagement with the GPAC. This work informed the Existing Conditions Reports as well as development of the Vision Statement, Pillars, Guiding Principles, and Supporting Concepts which were unanimously recommended by GPAC to the City Council on February 17, 2022, and accepted by the City Council on March 21, 2022 (<https://www.planpetaluma.org/documents#gpuvision>).

The Vision Statement describes the desired future conditions and characteristics of the City. The Pillars are the core community values. The Guiding Principles and Supporting Concepts provide broad direction and pathways to achieve the vision and honor community values, focusing on the community's specific challenges and opportunities. The complete [Vision, Pillars, and Guiding Principles](#) are on the [PlanPetaluma](#) website (planpetaluma.org).

As the General Plan Update process has progressed and in response to some of the public comments received, there is awareness that revisions to the vision, pillars, and guiding principles may be appropriate to consider as part of the development and adoption of the General Plan.

Policy Frameworks

Context and Foundation

The General Plan is made up of both the Land Use Map, which displays General Plan Land Use designations, and policies that relate to a wide range of topics. Draft goals, policies, and actions for each of the topic areas are included in the Draft Policy Frameworks and will largely inform the development of the General Plan Elements. The Policy Frameworks were developed based on a series of inputs, including much of the work that has been done to date as part of the General Plan Update, such as the Existing Conditions Report, Vision and Guiding Principles, the Blueprint for Climate Action, and the Housing Element. Additionally, the Policy Frameworks were shaped through the input from the GPAC, expertise from the consultant team, operational expertise from City staff, and input from the community.

Twelve of the 14 Policy Frameworks were published for public review on March 21, 2024 (<https://www.planpetaluma.org/policy-frameworks>). The Flood Resiliency Framework was released for public review on April 23, 2024. All of the Frameworks (with the exception of the subsequently published Land Use Framework) were discussed with the various City CCBs based on their expertise. The GPAC established working groups to review and provide feedback on all of the Policy Frameworks. Additionally, each of the 13 Frameworks had a topic specific station at the community PlanFest held in May 2024 and public feedback was also received through online comment forms for each of the Frameworks.

The [Land Use Framework](#) was released on August 23, 2024, and is going through a separate review process, including a separate engagement process with the public and discussion with the GPAC and Planning Commission. The Land Use Framework will be presented to the City Council for discussion at a subsequent public meeting that is tentatively scheduled for October 2024.

While the Policy Frameworks will inform the development of the Draft General Plan, it is important to realize that the Policy Frameworks are very different from the General Plan itself in that:

- Policy Frameworks are very text-based while the General Plan will present a compelling and visual approach for achieving the community’s vision
- Policy Framework topics are siloed by topics and correspond with the technical expertise of City staff and consultants while the General Plan will be organized differently, in a manner aligned with community priorities and to facilitate implementation
- Connections and consistency between Policy Frameworks are not clear in the individual frameworks while the General Plan will provide a holistic, integrated overall strategy that demonstrates the connections among different plan elements
- Policy Frameworks do not include any quantitative metrics and related targets while the General Plan will include performance metrics, which can be used to monitor the City’s progress toward achieving community goals
- While the Implementation and Governance Policy Framework includes strategies for implementing the General Plan, individual Policy Frameworks do not identify

implementation roles and timing while the General Plan will include an Implementation Plan that identifies the implementing department, priority, and timeframe for each action.

DISCUSSION

Staff received over 2,000 individual comments from members of the GPAC, CCBs, and members of the public. Comments were summarized and reviewed by the General Plan consultant team and each comment was designated into one of three categories for consideration during the development of the Draft General Plan. The three categories include:

- **Support/no change:** The comment is generally supportive and no change to the goal or policy is needed
- **Refinement:** The comment is generally supportive of the intent, but a slight revision to the language is suggested
- **Policy Shift:** The comment asks for the removal or a significant revision to a draft goal or policy, or recommends the addition of a new goal, policy, or action

Overall, comments received from both the public and the CCBs were largely supportive of the direction of the General Plan Update. Almost half of the comments recommended refinements to the Frameworks to either strengthen the language or broaden the scope of the policy.

There were very few comments that disagreed with the policy direction or the intended outcomes of the frameworks. Nearly a quarter of the comments categorized as “policy shift” recommended adding policies or actions to the Frameworks. A significant portion of those recommendations had already been addressed by inclusion in a different framework.

A number of comments focused on the desire to prioritize certain policies or actions over others. Many of these types of comments will be addressed in the General Plan as part of the implementation plan. However, other of these comments went beyond the scope of the General Plan as a long-range policy document for the City.

All of the comments received will inform the development of the Draft General Plan moving forward. The item before the City Council is an overview of the public engagement process conducted and to provide an opportunity for the City Council to ask any clarifying questions or provide final direction on the Policy Frameworks. A more focused summary of feedback for each of the policy frameworks is outlined below.

Arts and Culture Framework

The Arts, Culture, and Creativity Policy Framework was reviewed by the Petaluma Public Art Committee, the Planning Commission, and was the focus of a GPAC working group. Public comments on this framework were received as part of the PlanFest event, through the online public survey, and as public comment at the public meetings when the framework was discussed.

The vast majority of comments received on the Arts, Culture, and Creativity Policy Framework were supportive of the concepts and goals in the framework, and in most cases, comments

recommended strengthening the language, adding additional categories of art and artists, and increasing opportunities to incorporate art into both the City's operations and Petaluma's local economy.

Public comments supported the City integrating more public art into public projects including streetscape design, fairground master planning, individual neighborhood improvement projects, and park design. Stronger language was recommended around the inclusion of and support for arts in the community and City operations and development projects, including several comments suggesting that the City increase the 1% for public art requirement to increase funding for public art within Petaluma.

There were not any comments to this framework that were in opposition to the overall policy direction, although one comment did suggest that the framework was too long and should be simplified.

In addition to the general questions posed as part of the recommendation at the beginning of this report, the City Council may want to consider providing feedback to the following questions specific to the Arts, Culture, and Creativity Framework:

- Public-private collaboration is necessary to advance the arts. Does the framework appropriately capitalize on the distinct roles that the City, other public entities, and the private sector are well-suited to play?
- Does the framework ensure equitable, inclusive access to Petaluma's arts opportunities, programs, and facilities?

Economic Development

The Economic Development Policy Framework was reviewed by the Planning Commission and a GPAC working group. Specific review on this framework was also undertaken by the Chamber of Commerce's Government Affairs Committee as a topic focused stakeholder group. Additionally, public comments on this framework were received as part of the PlanFest event, through the online public survey, and as public comment at the public meetings when the framework was discussed.

Comments on the Economic Development Framework provided a diverse cross section of opinions on how the City should focus its resources to grow Petaluma's economy, but most comments supported the overall goals and policies. Many comments focused on the need for workforce housing to support Goal ED-2: Equitable Economy.

This framework, more than the others, received comments that showed varying opinions on what types and sizes of businesses the City should focus on and what role the City should play in Economic Development. For instance, comments from the Chamber's Government Affairs Committee recommended adding an additional goal for affirmative leadership in economic development, including the City taking an active role in guiding its economy and dedicating staff resources to assess and advocate.

The role of agriculture in Petaluma's local economy was another topic that came up in several comments on this framework. More specifically, comments recommended things such as using land use to incentivize and preserve agricultural support businesses, exploration of resources to support small family farms, and the need for economically viable land uses to preserve open space.

There were also comments on the topic of economic development that recommended reducing permitting barriers, providing resources to better assist businesses in navigating the permit and development process, and better incorporating economic development into City processes.

Flood Resilience

The Flood Resilience Policy Framework was reviewed by the Climate Action Commission, the Planning Commission, and a GPAC working group. Additionally, public comments on this framework were received as part of the PlanFest event, through the online public survey, and as public comment at the public meetings when the framework was discussed.

Overall, comments received on the Flood Resilience Policy Framework were very supportive of the policy direction and appreciative of the high level of technical input that had gone into the development of the framework.

There were a number of comments that recommended changes in land use to support the Petaluma River Greenway project and limit development opportunity in the upper reaches of the River. Similarly, some comments recommended prohibiting building in the floodplain or near the river and several comments suggested prohibiting underground parking.

Recognizing the benefit of the new modeling done to inform the Flood Resilience Framework, several comments focused on ensuring that the modeling was periodically updated and applying the most conservative flood modeling to development applications. Additionally, a few comments suggested looking beyond end of century for flood and sea level rise impacts.

Several comments, specifically from GPAC, Climate Action Commission, and Planning Commission, acknowledged the cost and impact of implementing the policy direction in the Flood Resilience Policy Framework and suggested refinement of policies such as the ability to rebuild after catastrophic loss and limitations on construction of capital projects.

Governance and Implementation

The Governance and Implementation Policy Framework was reviewed by the Planning Commission and a GPAC working group. Additionally, public comments on this framework were received as part of the PlanFest event, through the online public survey, and as public comment at the public meetings when the framework was discussed.

The vast majority of comments received on the Governance and Implementation Policy Framework indicated support of the framework's overall intent to improve transparency, accessibility, and public engagement. Most of the comments received focused on strengthening the draft policies to achieve these goals. For instance, there were several comments about

development of interactive resources to encourage public participation in City government and ways to better diversity community representation on CCBs and City Council.

In addition to the general questions posed as part of the recommendation at the beginning of this report, the City Council may want to consider providing feedback to the following questions specific to the Governance and Implementation Policy Framework:

- Does this framework address the barriers to General Plan implementation?
- Does this framework adequately advance equitable participation in local governance?

Health, Equity, and Environmental Justice

The Health, Equity, and Environmental Justice Policy Framework was reviewed by the Senior Advisory Committee, the Climate Action Commission, the Planning Commission and a GPAC working group. Additionally, public comments on this framework were received as part of the PlanFest event, through the online public survey, and as public comment at the public meetings when the framework was discussed.

The comments on the Health, Equity, and Environmental Justice Policy Framework generally expressed support for the policy direction and recommended changes were focused on expanding the scope or strengthening the language in the goals and policies. Most comments focused on the goals and policies around advancing equitable public health and developing an age friendly community.

A comment from the GPAC working group focused on the need for the City to develop more resources (leadership position, manual, etc) to prioritize community engagement and ensure regular and ongoing engagement. Additionally, comments from the Senior Advisory Committee focused on expanding or adding goals and policies specific to seniors, disability, the health care crisis, and public access to restrooms.

There were not significant policy shifts recommended by comments on this framework. However, there were comments from members of the public focused on addressing mental health care more explicitly in the Health, Equity, and Environmental Justice Policy Framework.

In addition to the general questions posed as part of the recommendation at the beginning of this report, the City Council may want to consider providing feedback to the following questions specific to the Health, Equity, and Environmental Justice Policy Framework:

- Other than the Equity Priority Areas identified in Figure 1, are there additional low-income areas that are disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation?
- Does the framework address the challenges residents face in reducing their exposure to pollution and accessing health, social, and other services through the City?

Historic Resources

The Historic Resources Policy Framework was reviewed by the Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee (HCPC), the Planning Commission and a GPAC working group.

Additionally, public comments on this framework were received as part of the PlanFest event, through the online public survey, and as public comment at the public meetings when the framework was discussed.

The vast majority of comments on the Historic Resources Policy Framework were supportive of the goals and policies and recommended changes focused on strengthening the language to formalize and improve the protection and preservation of Historic Resources. Most comments wanted to see expanded or stronger language around establishing proactive programs that would fund or reduce the costs and challenges to increase designation and preservation of the community's historic resources.

As the CCB with specific expertise in historic preservation, the HCPC was the primary reviewer of this framework. The HCPC's comments focused on creating a robust historic preservation program and recommended emphasizing the co-benefits of historic preservation with other community goals like carbon neutrality and housing, acknowledging the role of the historic downtown with the City's economic development, and importance of unifying local codes to encourage preservation.

There were several comments that uplifted the importance of having more assessment of existing resources proactively, such as creating a citywide historic context and evaluating all buildings in the downtown core. Additionally, there were several public comments that expressed concern about increasing height limits in the downtown area.

While there are a number of recommendations for additional actions that are under review, there are no significant changes to the policy direction established by the framework.

In addition to the general questions posed as part of the recommendation at the beginning of this report, the City Council may want to consider providing feedback to the following questions specific to the Historic Resources Policy Framework:

- What historic resources that are currently unprotected (not currently designated locally or in National Register or California Register) are the most vulnerable?
- Does this framework include the necessary incentives for residents and businesses to be able to conduct preservation, rehabilitation, and adaptive reuse projects?

Infrastructure and Utilities

The Infrastructure and Utilities Policy Framework was reviewed by the Planning Commission and a GPAC working group. Additionally, public comments on this framework were received as part of the PlanFest event, through the online public survey, and as public comment at the public meetings when the framework was discussed.

Comments received on the Infrastructure and Utilities Policy Framework focused on language refinement and in some specific instances such as Goal IU-10: Resilient High-Speed Internet recommended expanding language to create more robust policy direction.

While there were a number of comments recommending policy shifts in this framework, many of those policy recommendations are addressed in other frameworks such as the Parks and Recreation Framework, Flood Resilience Framework, Health Equity, and Environmental Justice Framework, and Public Facilities Framework. The Draft General Plan will incorporate cross references and search capabilities to ensure clarity of goals and policies across the different elements of the final document.

It is also important to note that many of the recommendations on this framework were related to strategies identified in the Blueprint for Climate Action. As the policies in this framework are incorporated into the Draft General Plan, they will be reviewed for consistency with the Blueprint to ensure that the two documents are mutually supportive.

Natural Environment

The Natural Environment Policy Framework was reviewed by the Recreation, Music, and Parks Commission, the Tree Advisory Committee, the Climate Action Commission, the Planning Commission, and a GPAC working group. Additionally, public comments on this framework were received as part of the PlanFest event, through the online public survey, and as public comment at the public meetings when the framework was discussed.

Generally, comments on the Natural Environment were supportive of the policy direction and suggested refinements to language or organization. There was consistent feedback from both CCBs and members of the public that policies in this framework needed to be strengthened to better uplift and focus the community's commitment to the preservation of the natural environment.

A primary area of feedback related to urban forestry policies and the need to better incorporate those policies either across frameworks and particularly the Natural Environment Policy Framework or in a separate Urban Forestry element instead of concentrated in the Parks and Recreation Framework. The Draft General Plan will address this comment by looking at the location and organization of urban forestry goals and policies.

Comments from the Climate Action Commission focused on the need to be clearer about the City's holistic vision for the natural environment and the need to expand Goal ENV-5 to include other tribes/nations and to add more specificity and substance.

GPAC comments recommended creating land use overlays or easement categories for ecologically beneficial portions of private land that could be applied to new development. Accompanying suggestions included mapping these identified ecologically beneficial areas and including strong language and policy direction to discourage or prohibit destruction of valuable natural resources. The GPAC also recommended adding a new/stronger policy language to require private development to support the creation of public open spaces and plazas and expansion of the urban forest.

Suggested refinements covered topics like better recognition of the Petaluma River as a living corridor, reduction in use of harmful chemicals, and more recognition of street trees as part of the

City's future green infrastructure. Comments reflected the community's desire for environmental stewardship and prioritization of the natural environment.

Noise

The Noise Policy Framework was reviewed by the Planning Commission and a GPAC working group. Additionally, public comments on this framework were received as part of the PlanFest event, through the online public survey, and as public comment at the public meetings when the framework was discussed.

Comments on the Noise Policy Framework were generally supportive of the concepts but centered around whether it was possible to strengthen or regulate noise beyond what was identified in the framework. Examples of these comments ranged from concern about barking dogs, noise from truck routes, noise impacts from the Petaluma Airport, and noise from idling vehicles. Addressing these comments will largely be part of regulatory updates to the Municipal Code and Zoning Ordinance.

There were a number of comments recommending a ban on leaf blowers within the City. This comment was also received in response to the Blueprint for Climate Action as it relates to emissions. Appropriate response to these comments must take into account issues with available technology and equity impacts.

Parks and Recreation

The Parks and Recreation Policy Framework was reviewed by the Recreation, Music, and Parks Commission, the Tree Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission, and a GPAC working group. Additionally, public comments on this framework were received as part of the PlanFest event, through the online public survey, and as public comment at the public meetings when the framework was discussed.

The Parks Policy Framework provides high level goals, policies, and actions that would facilitate the development of more parks and more connectivity between parks. It also calls for a development of a Parks Master Plan that would identify the specific needs of the community. In general, comments on the Parks and Recreation Policy Framework were supportive of the policy direction but focused on specific facilities such as the inclusion of pickleball courts or dog parks, which would be evaluated through the more specific Parks Master Planning process.

There were a number of comment specific to the Petaluma River Park, recommending that this facility specifically be discussed in the General Plan. Similar comments were received to specifically identify about the Greenway initiative along the upper reaches of the Petaluma River.

As previously mentioned under the Natural Environmental Policy Framework, there was generally consensus among commenters that goals and policies related to trees and urban forestry should not be concentrated in the Parks and Recreation Policy Framework. Instead comments suggested that urban forestry be identified across numerous general plan elements or concentrated in a separate Urban Forestry Element. Also related specifically to trees, there were

several comments recommending that the City should retain maintenance responsibility for street trees to provide a more consistent and equitable public tree canopy throughout the city.

Public comments in response to Goal P-3: Petaluma River Recreation expressed the desire for more and enhanced public access and connectivity along the River. GPAC comments suggested expanding this goal to apply to all waterways instead of solely focusing on the River.

In response to goals about interconnected access to City parks, there were a number of comments calling out specific areas where improved trail maintenance or sidewalk repair are needed. Additionally, the trestle was specifically identified as a priority in a number of comments on this topic.

Maintenance was another topic that commenters focused on in the Parks and Recreation Policy Framework. More specifically, comments recommended prioritizing budget to maintain parks and to consider needs of maintaining existing parks over the acquisition of new parks in the City.

Public Facilities

The Public Facilities Policy Framework was reviewed by the Recreation, Music, and Parks Commission, the Tree Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission, and a GPAC working group. Additionally, public comments on this framework were received as part of the PlanFest event, through the online public survey, and as public comment at the public meetings when the framework was discussed.

There were limited comments received on the Public Facilities Policy Framework. Many of the recommendations in this Framework are consistent with strategies identified in the Blueprint for Climate Action. Upon adoption of the Blueprint and prior to drafting the General Plan the policies in this Framework will be reconciled with the Blueprint to ensure consistency.

There were several comments that recommended language to add new public facilities such as additional public restrooms, a new or additional satellite senior center(s), and a new animal services facility. There were several comments regarding schools, however, many of these recommendations are outside the scope of the City's authority.

Several comments emphasized the importance of identifying and ensuring accessibility for all public facilities.

Safety

The Safety Policy Framework was reviewed by the Climate Action Commission, the Planning Commission, and a GPAC working group. Additionally, public comments on this framework were received as part of the PlanFest event, through the online public survey, and as public comment at the public meetings when the framework was discussed.

Comments on the Safety Policy Framework were relatively evenly split between recommending refinements and policy shifts. Having a plan for extreme heat and a plan to address the mental health crisis beyond police and fire resources were two topics that commenters recommended additional policies to adequately address.

There were also several comments about the importance of the City having resilient infrastructure to respond to hazards and generally the importance of getting more information distributed proactively before a major event to clarify what individuals can do, where to go, what requirements are, etc.

In addition to the general questions posed as part of the recommendation at the beginning of this report, the City Council may want to consider providing feedback to the following questions specific to the Safety Policy Framework:

- In this framework, were there any agencies, groups, or resources that should be utilized by the City that were not reflected?

Transportation

The Transportation Policy Framework was reviewed by the Airport Commission, the Transit Advisory Committee, the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee, the Climate Action Commission, the Planning Commission, and a GPAC working group. Additionally, public comments on this framework were received as part of the PlanFest event, through the online public survey, and as public comment at the public meetings when the framework was discussed.

There was a robust response to the Transportation Policy Framework with more than 300 comments, more than any other framework. Because of the reach of the Transportation Policy Framework across many other topics and the number of related CCBs, this Framework also received review by a number of committees and commissions to ensure that considerations were broad reaching and inclusive of different segments of the larger transportation system including the airport, public transit, multi-modal mobility, climate initiatives, and the transportation/land use connection.

There was broad support for the policy direction of the Framework and the inclusion of multi-modal mobility. Many of the comments recommended refinements to language to increase clarity and strengthen policy. Many of the comments overlapped with current policy and program efforts such as the Active Transportation Plan, the Blueprint for Climate Action, and the City's fare free program.

The Airport Commission was generally supportive and pleased to see the Airport incorporated into the Framework. Comments recognized that the Airport needs to be economically viable and self-sufficient and provides significant economic benefit to the city in terms of jobs provided. Therefore, related decisions about land use, transportation, and climate initiatives need to be thoughtful about impacts to the ongoing operations and growth of the Airport. Several comments from the Commission focused on safety considerations as the top priority for airport operation.

The PBAC and Transit Advisory Committee discussed the Transportation Framework at a joint meeting and comments overwhelmingly focused on the need to modify language to be clear, directive, and action oriented. Comments were concerned that the framework organization and discussion was confusing and recommended replacing language like plan for, explore, etc. with

more definitive action words. There were also comments asking for more specificity with regard to how the framework tied into the City's climate initiatives and land use planning. The Climate Action Commission recommended that the General Plan include a comprehensive map incorporating all modes and connections to the regional transportation network

The Climate Action Commission had a range of recommendations for refining language, adding enforcement considerations, and making information more accessible to a broad range of the public to encourage the use of transit and multi-modal opportunities. The Climate Action Commission recommended development of a comprehensive map incorporating all modes and connections to regional transportation network and recommended a single source of transit information available to schools to encourage student ridership.

In addition to the general questions posed as part of the recommendation at the beginning of this report, the City Council may want to consider providing feedback to the following questions specific to the Transportation Policy Framework:

- Does this framework establish a clear path to transforming the City's transportation system, reducing VMT, and removing barriers to safe walking, biking, and transit use?
- The Transportation Policy Framework establishes a modal hierarchy (Policy 1.1), includes actions related to developing complete and green streets (Actions 1.1.2 and 1.2.1), and includes a draft street typology framework in Appendix A. Does this approach appropriately reflect the community's transportation priorities, when taking into account more specific plans such as the draft Active Transportation Plan?

Review Process and Next Steps

As discussed below, the policy frameworks (with the exception of the Land Use Policy Framework) have gone through a robust public engagement process with the City's CCBs, GPAC, and the public. The discussion above provides a general summary and asks more pointed questions on some of the frameworks. The General Plan team, including consultants and staff, are reviewing all of the comments received for discussion and incorporation into the Draft General Plan. Any feedback from the City Council will further help inform that review and ultimately the incorporation of goals, policies, and actions in the Draft General Plan. While the policy frameworks themselves will not be revised and republished, the information in each framework and the comments and feedback received on each framework will be foundational to the development of the General Plan.

As previously mentioned, the Land Use Policy Framework was recently published and is undergoing a separate engagement process through the end of September 2024. It is anticipated that the Land Use Framework will be brought to the City Council for discussion and feedback in October following that engagement effort.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

The Frameworks were released for early public review in March and the official public comment period began on April 25, 2024, after the Flood Resiliency Framework was published. The public comment period for the first 13 of the Policy Frameworks concluded on July 1, 2024.

During the public comment period, the City provided an online form for feedback, held a public open house (PlanFest), and presented the Frameworks at thirteen meetings of Petaluma's CCBs. The details for all outreach events and recordings of the public meetings can be found on the [General Plan website](#).

Also, during the approximately two-month public review time, the Frameworks underwent extensive and detailed review by the GPAC. Seven GPAC working groups were formed for the purpose of conducting a detailed review of each of the Frameworks. The working groups were encouraged to connect with members of the community and stakeholders with specific expertise or interest to solicit feedback. The comments and feedback from the GPAC working groups are summarized in the [June 20, 2024 Meeting Summary](#).

The Draft Land Use Framework was subsequently released on August 23, 2024, and the City is currently undergoing a public comment period that will run through September 2024.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

There are no action items before the City Council, therefore this item is not a project under the California Environmental Quality Act. Following review of the draft policy frameworks and development of the draft Land Use Framework, the General Plan Update project will begin preparation of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project. When the General Plan is brought forward for adoption in late 2025 it will include a programmatic EIR for certification.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

This item is part of the General Plan Update process under contract with Raimi + Associates and has budget previously allocated to the project