

For Steering Committee discussion on Draft CERP public comments

Comment Type	Comment	Staff Recommendation
<p>General/Funding Allocation</p> <p>UM – 3: Increasing Tree Canopy</p>	<p>Submission # 18, Date: 2/16/2026 (Received after comment period) Page 36, received from Herman Barahona, Sacramento Environmental Justice Coalition (Sac-EJC)</p>	<p>Steering Committee discussion</p>
<p>UM-3 Increasing Tree Canopies</p>	<p>Submissions #15, received from City of Sacramento (page 15) and #16, received from Sacramento County (page 24) Request that 50% tree canopy be adjusted to a more realistic goal.</p> <p>Submissions #11, received from T.J. Friesen (page 6), and #12, received from Jesse Reese (page 7) Suggest strategically planting trees near high-traffic corridors, schools, and transit stops.</p>	<p>Revise UM-3 tree canopy goal to say <i>prioritize incentive funding to projects</i> that will provide the most exposure reduction and/or that will provide at least 50% tree canopy within 15 years in the <i>planting</i> area.</p> <p>No change to UM-3: Implementation suggestion consistent with action (Identify areas of concern and potential project locations). Comment will be considered in the implementation process</p>
<p>UM-4a Safe & Resilient Streets – Quick builds</p> <p>UM-4b Safe & Resilient Streets - Standards</p>	<p>Submission #15, received from City of Sacramento (page 16) Distinguish actions and partner responsibilities between UM-4a and 4b since these are two distinct strategies</p>	<p>Revise UM-4a: to focus on actions and responsibilities on short-term goals.</p> <p>Revise UM-4b: focus on action and responsibilities on systemic improvement.</p> <p>Please see the attached <u>strikeout</u> strategy.</p>
<p>UM-8 Increase Public Ridership on Public Transportation</p>	<p>Submission #17, received from ECOS (pages 34-35) Reduce the number of stops on the lines</p> <p>Submission #17, received from ECOS (pages 34-35) Investing in more robust shade structures may be fiscally and operationally responsible solution</p>	<p>No change to UM-8:</p> <p>Response: Stop spacing depends on numerous factors and is route and site-specific. Staff will pass the comment on to SacRT and encourage the commentator to work with SacRT on the SacRT 2050 initiative, which will update their Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) and Long Range Transit Plan (LRTP).</p> <p>Revise UM 4a and 4b: Recommend adding SacRT as a potential partner, specifically the</p>

For Steering Committee discussion on Draft CERP public comments

		<p>Safe Routes to Transit plan and the Heat-Resilient Bus Shelters Project.</p> <p>Response: Can be implemented through safe and resilient streets (4a/b).</p>
<p>UM-9a Industrial and Warehouse Uses/Zoning</p> <p>UM-9b Truck Route Study</p> <p>UM-10 Community Input on Truck Routes</p>	<p>Submission #15, received from City of Sacramento (page 17) Suggest updates to timelines to align with the City of Sacramento AB98 implementation timelines and they encourage CSC to prioritize funding to implement AB98.</p> <p>Submission #15, received from City of Sacramento (page 17) Consolidate UM-9a and UM-10 to focus on AB98. (Include community input on Truck Routes as part of AB98 implementation for UM-9a)</p>	<p>Revise UM 9a- Adjust timeline for AB 98 consistent with SacCity/SacCounty timelines, consolidate UM-10 into UM-9a.</p> <p>Recommendation: The steering committee may reconsider prioritizing incentive funding for the truck route study in Year 1 to align with the new timeline.</p>
<p>UM-6 Reduce Idling at Schools and Sensitive Receptors</p>	<p>Submission #17, received from ECOS (page 34) Encourage an action item that involves working with schools to ensure that there are security/monitoring resources dedicated to anti-idling policy enforcement.</p> <p>Submission #3, received from Jesse Reese (page 2) At drive-thrus, you see a lot of vehicles just sitting and idling. This is probably hard to control, but something to think about.</p>	<p>No change to UM-6:</p> <p>Response: Idling in light-duty vehicles at pick-up is legal; anti-idling at schools is a voluntary, outreach, and educational program.</p> <p>Response: Drive-thru uses are approved by local jurisdictions; the Sac Metro Air District recommends best practices to minimize impacts through existing programs.</p>
<p>R-2 Residential Lawn and Garden</p>	<p>Submission #10, received from Joey Wraithwall (page 6)</p> <p>Disappointed not to see the CERP seek out to phase out gas-powered lawn equipment, especially leaf blowers, at all. (Submission #10)</p>	<p>No change to R-2:</p> <p>Response: California Assembly Bill 1346 phased out the sale of new gas-powered small off-road engines. New sales of most small off-road engines, including leaf blowers, must be zero-emission by 2024.</p>