



FOLSOM
DISTINGUISHING BY DAYLIGHT

Folsom City Council Meeting

Additional Information Transmittal

MEETING DATE:	5/12/2026
AGENDA SECTION:	Public Hearing
STAFF REPORT TITLE	Resolution No. 11613 - A Resolution Receiving the 2026 Ad Hoc Charter Review Committee Report to City Council with Recommended Amendments and Dissolving the Committee and Direction to Staff Regarding Preparation of Potential Ballot Measure(s) Amending the City Charter and/or the Folsom Municipal Code for the 2026 General Municipal Election
FROM:	City Manager's Office

Staff is providing the attached additional information for the above-referenced agenda item.

Instructions to staff: Deliver original and 30 stapled/double-sided copies to the City Clerk's Department; City Clerk's Department will distribute via email and hardcopy to City Council, City Manager, City Attorney, and City Clerk.

Updated: Jan 2026

From: Karen Pardieck <karenpardieck@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2026 4:56 PM
To: City Clerk Dept
Cc: Karen Pardieck
Subject: ITEM 10 Resolution No. 11613 For the record

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

May 12, 2026

Council Members:

As a 21 year resident of Folsom I'd like to comment on your agenda for the May 12 Council meeting which I can't attend.

After having laid off city workers and discussed closing or privatizing various city amenities, including the beloved zoo, three of you, Mayor Raithel, Vice Mayor Rohrbough, and Council Member Kozlowski, voted to give yourselves raises despite the City of Folsom's tenuous economic situation.

Now, you want to disenfranchise city residents by changing the Charter that allows voters to make important decisions and allow you, the council, to make those decisions for us. Such an action by you evidences the fact that you realize the voters may not be on the same page as you.

You noted Solid Waste. Reading the state mandate, it appears that the requirement for 100% ZEV public fleet requirement is by 2042; 50% of new waste trucks between 2024 and 2026 must be ZEV's, and if you comply with certain milestones you can use existing natural gas vehicles purchased before 2024 until they reach the end of their useful life.

I simply do not understand why you want to outsource our solid waste department when you have 16 years to comply with the state mandate.

Might I ask, is this a ploy to set up the domino's; first franchise solid waste then the zoo, the parks and other amenities residents love?

Please do not do this. My neighbors and other Folsom residents are just as disappointed as I am.

Sincerely,

Karen Pardieck [REDACTED] (Diamond Glen Community)
karenpardieck@icloud.com

[REDACTED]
"Trees are poems that the earth writes upon the sky."

From: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2026 2:47 PM
To: Christa Freemantle; City Clerk Dept
Cc: Sari Dierking; Bryan Whitemyer; Barbara Leary; Justin Raithel; Sarah Aquino; Mike Kozlowski; Anna Rohrbough
Subject: Comments to Council re: Agenda Item 10 - City Charter

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Comments to the Folsom City Council for consideration of item No. 10 on the 5/12/2026 Regular Meeting Agenda

Dear City Council:

Regarding Agenda Item 10 of tonight's agenda, please reject the ad hoc committee's recommended amendments to the City Charter and dissolve the committee.

The City Council established a seven-member committee, five of which committee members were each appointed by a Councilmember and the other two of which committee members are City Councilmembers. This composition suggests an ad hoc committee directly representative of the current Council and fails to reflect a meaningful effort for independent and objective review of the City Charter. This lack of independency will be exacerbated if the two Councilmembers who served on the ad hoc committee also participate in the Council's decision of whether to place the Charter amendments on the ballot.

The recommended Charter revisions have no benefit to the City's residents and would diminish responsible decision-making and transparency... and, while doing so, would also give the Council a guaranteed annual salary adjustment. The recommended amendments should be rejected by the Council.

Section 2.01(E), City Council Term Limit, amendment is unnecessary. Worse; it is self-serving to existing Councilmembers as it could be interpreted to allow Councilmembers who have already been on the Council for multiple terms to continue for three additional terms after 2026 enabling certain Councilmembers to serve more than the existing 4-term limit.

Section 2.06 amendments would establish an automatic adjustment of Councilmember annual salaries every year. While a maximum increase limited by the CPI and a 3% cap might make sense, an automatic adjustment of up to 3% per year should be rejected by the Council. The current Charter allows the City Council to consider and increase Council salaries through a transparent public hearing process that allows consideration of all relevant factors. The notion that the Charter should be amended to build in an automatic adjustment should be rejected.

Section 2.07(D) amendments would eliminate the voter approval requirement for changes to City owner utility/enterprises. This change should be rejected and is mischaracterized in the ad hoc committee's recommendation which states that, "to ensure transparency and public trust, any change to the authority for contracted or franchise services must be presented as a standalone ballot question." In fact, the proposed amendment appears to eliminate any ballot questions by eliminating any voter approval requirement.

Section 4.03 amendments would place the already challenging role of City Attorney directly under the thumb of the City Council. Under current processes, the City Attorney may be under substantial pressure to give the Council advice that the City Attorney thinks the Council wants to hear creating potential conflicts with sound legal advice. As with other department heads, the City Attorney should be retained by the City Manager and not serve at the whim of a particular City Council.

Section 4.07 amendments appear to be an unnecessary knee-jerk reaction to the City's recent defeat in Sac Superior Civil Case 23WM000125 resulting from the City Council and City Attorney's refusal to respect the plain language of this section of the Charter. In adopting the Charter, the citizens of Folsom allowed that the Council may create boards and commissions, but wisely restricted those boards and commissions to an advisory role. Such a structure is appropriate and need not be tampered with. The ad hoc committee's report discusses that "the adjustment would ensure the Charter does not inadvertently block the Council from empowering commissions and committees to take direct action on specialized matters." However, the Charter's existing language is not an inadvertent block of such power, it serves as an important intentional check on the Council's ability to delegate away decision-making that should fall squarely on the City Council. Additionally, textually the ad hoc committee recommendation adds "or Committee" in the last sentence, but as written (original and proposed) the section is limited to the creation and roles boards and commissions. Adding a single reference to Committee will create confusion and potential inconsistent interpretations.

FMC 2.48.030 - The Council established an ad hoc committee to explore the City Charter, yet, the committee's recommendations include an increase in the campaign contribution limit which is not part of the Charter. The committee says this is necessary to balance the influence of political action committees and special interests on local elections. I disagree. The current limits are appropriate and should not be increased. Moreover, a recommended change to contribution limits exceeds the role assigned to the Charter review committee and should be rejected.

For these and other reasons, please reject the ad hoc committee's recommended amendments to the City Charter and dissolve the committee.

Thank you,
- Bob Delp


bdelp@live.com