



Folsom City Council Meeting

Additional Information Transmittal

MEETING DATE:	5/26/2026
AGENDA SECTION:	Old Business
STAFF REPORT TITLE	Consideration of Potential Ballot Measure(s) Amending the City Charter and/or the Folsom Municipal Code for the 2026 General Municipal Election and Direction to Staff
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: Shelley Hudson <pooh7411@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2026 5:17 PM
To: City Clerk Dept
Cc: Anna Rohrbough; Michael Kozlowski
Subject: Item 15
Attachments: IMG_1765.HEIC; IMG_1764.HEIC

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from pooh7411@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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.

Because I am unsure if this will be brought up again, with the full board I wanted to submit my public comment from the last city council meeting.

Please honor your previous vote.

2

Once services like solid waste are privatized, the city also loses institutional knowledge and operational capacity, making it far more difficult and costly to bring services back in-house if problems arise.

Residents are then left with less oversight, fewer options, and reduced accountability if service quality declines or costs increase. Meanwhile, profits go to private corporations and executives, while residents take on the long-term financial risk and consequences.

This is precisely why voter approval exists today—to ensure the public has the final say before essential public services and assets are transferred or contracted away.

If these decisions are truly in the public interest, they should be able to earn public approval through a vote.

I urge you to reject this proposal and preserve the requirement for voter approval.

Thank you.

Shelley Hudson
Have a safe day.

Public Hearing- 10

Good evening, Mayor and Council Members,

My name is Shelley Hudson and I am a 28-year Folsom resident.

I oppose the proposal recommended in Section 2.07D to remove the requirement for voter approval before the sale, lease, or long-term contracting of city-owned utilities and enterprises.

These are not routine administrative decisions. This proposal shifts control of long-term public assets and essential community services from the voters to the City Council alone.

Once services are privatized or locked into multi-year contracts, they become difficult and expensive to reverse. That represents a major reduction in public oversight of public property and essential infrastructure.

For a city of about 95,000 residents, privatization also carries added risk due to limited bargaining power. A smaller customer base can mean fewer bidders, weaker negotiating leverage over time, and reduced competition among contractors.

Solid waste services are a clear example. In many cities, privatization has resulted in the loss of stable public jobs, replacement with lower-wage private positions, rate increases through contract escalations, and reduced transparency in pricing and service changes.

Business from the Floor

Regarding Raises: Section 2.06

Good evening, Mayor and Council Members,

My name is Shelley Hudson and I am a 28-year Folsom resident.

I oppose the automatic annual raises for City Council members, which you will cover this evening during the Public Hearing, specifically section 2.06

As a former city and state employee represented by unions, (Local 99 and BU 97) I can assure you employees did not get automatic raises. We negotiated, justified increases, and sometimes went years without them depending on budgets and economic conditions.

So, it is hard to justify why elected officials should receive guaranteed annual increases while the employees doing the day-to-day work of the city do not.

A 3% cap does not make this better. Automatic is automatic. If residents, city employees, and taxpayers are expected to live with economic uncertainty, Council members should too.

Setting up a system where your pay rises automatically year after year—especially after a recent major increase—sends the wrong message to city employees and the taxpayers paying for it. That is exactly the kind of policy that erodes public trust.

If you believe you deserve a raise, then vote on it publicly, explain why, and let the public see it. That is accountability.

I urge you to reject automatic salary adjustments.

Thank you.