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THE CLERK: Public Hearing Item Number 12, Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Draft Environmental Impact Report for the South Sacramento Corridor Phase 2 introduced by Dave Mansen, project manager from Parsons Transportation Group.

MR. MANSEN: Chairman Tretheway, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Board, my name is Dave Mansen. I'm going to keep my comments very brief this evening because the purpose of this meeting this evening is to hear from the general public. There are a number of
boards in the back of the room if you want some more
detail than what I am providing, the public is welcome
to view those boards.

This evening I'll talk about the project
status and overview of the Environmental Impact
Statement and we will then receive oral testimony from
the public.

In 1995, the RT Board of Directors adopted a
locally preferred alternative for the South Line that
ran from downtown Sacramento to Calvine/Auberry Roads.

And the alternatives adopted in 1994, as you all know,
that particular locally preferred alternative was split
into two phases. Phase 1 is in operation today. It is
carrying approximately 15 to 16,000 riders daily.

The subject of this evening's EIS --
Environmental Impact Statement -- Hearing is a 4.3-mile
extension from Phase 1 from Meadowview Road leading out
to Consumnes River College.

There will be four stations: Morrison Creek
Station, Franklin Station, Center Parkway Station with a
terminus at the college. And the RT Board a couple of years ago adopted the Phase 2 terminus at the college which is a good terminus location.

As all of you know, this is one of the fastest-growing portions of Sacramento County, so there's an increase in population and jobs. State Route 99 is projected to be twice its capacity in the year 2025. We're also a non-attainment area and congestion on the freeways is suspected to reach Level of Service F shortly.

This is a project for which we're seeking federal funding. We have submitted applications to the Federal Government over the years to obtain that funding. The most recent submittal indicates a medium rating which keeps us eligible for federal funding for this extension. We have circulated the Environmental Impact Statement and the preliminary engineering is ongoing and will wrap up fairly soon.

I'm not going to cover the criteria but this
gives you an idea of what the Federal Transit Administration is asking us to evaluate and submit to them. We are compared with other cities around the United States for these federal funds. For instance, the Federal Government is very interested in land use, transit area development types of evaluations and what the city is doing and what the possibilities are for this extension and so on.

The estimated capital cost for the extension is $226 million. That's in year-of-expenditure funds so the cost would be what it would cost if we were to build it and open it by the year 2011.

Various funding sources from the state and federal government, an important number is the bottom number, Section 5309. That is a section of the Federal Act that is for the federal share, that would provide us with 50 percent of the funding for this extension, $113 million.

The larger boards are in the back showing some of the details of this 4.3-mile extension. I do want to mention that we're still coordinating with the Los Rios
Community College District and with the college about the location and the various facilities at that station, including a proposed parking structure. So what's on that board in the back are several options and maybe some other options on how to locate that facility.

MS. PANSELL: There's only one option.

MR. MANSEN: We've done a number of technical studies and each of those studies lead to a section in the Environmental Impact Statement. You can go through the Environmental Impact Statement and read about each of the subjects in that document.

We have circulated the EIS, and the closing comment period is at 5:00 p.m. on April 3rd. In the fall of this year, we hope to certify the EIS and then get a record of decision which is the federal action on this document leading to design and construction between the years 2007 and the end of 2010.

We sent out almost 5,000 notices of the availability of this document. We've placed 14,000 flyers on the light rail and bus vehicles. We sent out 253 computer disks of the EIS offering them a hard copy if they wanted it to elected officials and to agencies.
The EIS availability was placed in -- the notice was placed in the Sacramento Bee and in the Federal Register on February 16th, and we did a press release to the local media.

The document is posted on the RT website. It's available in six libraries in this area and in downtown. We also hand-delivered 500 flyers along the Detroit Boulevard area because of the interest in the proposal to relocate a gas facility in that area.

We held a public meeting prior to the release of this document on January 3rd and we had over 50 people attend that meeting, had a number of comments, for instance, on the location of the parking lot at the college and we've had scoping meetings, bus tours, a number of open houses and so on throughout the course of the preparation of this EIS.

This information is available in the back on a board, so these are the addresses that comments should be sent to. There are also comment cards available for
people to fill out tonight, or on the back of those
cards is an address you can just put a stamp on it and
mail it to us in advance of April 3rd.

As we said earlier, if you'd like to speak,
please fill out a speaker card. Your name will then be
called. I'd like for you to keep your comments to a
maximum of three minutes. There will be a time limit up
here.

We won't be answering questions at the

microphone but there will be staff at the back to talk
to those people who have questions. And we would like
for you to respect each of the speakers as they speak,
and again, please make sure your cell phones and so
forth are turned off.

MR. TRETHEWAY: Thank you. Let's see if there
are any questions from the Board or comments.

MR. DICKINSON: I would like to ask a couple
of questions. You've got 45 million, almost 46 million
in the project budget for stations. That's obviously,
for four stations, a considerable amount per station as
is a parking garage built into that number or is there some other explanation for that figure?

MR. MANSEN: Parking garage is included.

MR. DICKINSON: That's the bulk of that then, I assume?

MR. MANSEN: And the other thing that happened, Mr. Dickinson, was over two years ago, three years ago, some of the things involved in the stations went up dramatically, concrete and steel.

MR. DICKINSON: Well, we're not spending $10 million a station I hope as a routine? We can see some further subdivision of that line item at some point?

MR. MANSEN: Absolutely.

MR. DICKINSON: Okay. And this is about a four-mile extension roughly and it's going to take us three years to complete the engineering and do the construction for four miles?

MR. MANSEN: We hope to do it faster than
that, but that's the current schedule.

MR. DICKINSON: You know, we built the entire starter line in that amount of time, 18 miles. So it just seems like an awfully long time to me. Thanks.

MR. MANSEN: Thank you.

MS. PANNELL: Dave, you mentioned several locations for the parking garage. I think you and Mike Wiley and several people know there's only one true location for the parking garage and we've had a great meeting with Brice Harris, the chancellor, and John Sharp, and they both agree that the original location that was proposed for that parking garage is not sufficient. So I don't know if you still have to say there's several locations for the parking garage even though there aren't.

MR. MANSEN: The environmental document includes those but, yes, we've gone past that document. With discussions with the college -- to back up a bit, on January 3rd, a lot of the comments we received at that public meeting were questions about the parking
garage on the southeast corner, saying that was too
distant from the light rail platforms and that's why, as
you know, we met with the college and the college has --
the staff at the college has been receptive to some
alternatives to that.

MR. TRETIEWAY: Mr. Nottoli.

MR. NOTTOLI: Yeah. My question for Dave and
for the RT staff, in our discussions as we progressed on
this over the year, I just want to commend Ms. Pannell's
leadership on this. She never misses an opportunity at
least twice a conversation to push the Light Rail South
Sacramento Phase 2.

MS. PANNELL: Thank you very much.

MR. NOTTOLI: I wanted to inquire about this.
As we did some of the scoping of this initially, and
certainly the City of Elk Grove has needed to refine
their look at light rail which would be a Phase 3
approach, but part of the background of this was
maintaining connectivity to the east side of Highway 99
where we have a Park-and-Ride, there's been right of
way. It's been held, the understanding, that that may
not be the ultimate direction it goes for future
extension.
I guess I'm curious though what work either as a premise to this next extension and/or what is being looked at relative to either connectivity via walking, bicycling, maybe a shuttle service with the east side there because recognizing a lot of the congestion particularly in the morning hour in the northbound direction but also all the development that's occurring certainly to the east that would have to cross the Calvine overcrossing and make its way into the Park-and-Ride area on the west side of the freeway, certainly could be accommodated adequately with a number of parking spaces that are being contemplated. So where is that left in this overall look?

MR. WILEY: Dave, I'll take that. Basically the Board adopted as the end-of-the-line station for this Phase 2, Consumnes River College. We have in fact maintained as an option the ability to cross east over 99. We have basically a design that we've worked with the City of Sacramento that allows for a light rail if
that’s the direction that the Board chooses, to run east and cross over 99 if in fact that’s the direction. If the direction is to ultimately extend this line south along Bruceville into Elk Grove, that alignment is still preserved to cross over 99 for bike/ped uses and other uses.

The specific use and the specific direction will in fact be determined by this Board through the update of our master plan. We’re in the process right now of beginning the update of the master plan. We expect to bring it ultimately back to the Board for approval in 18 months and that master plan will basically provide the next 20- to 30-year direction of how the overall system will develop and including, you know, answering those specific issues.

Now, we’ve also preserved right of way on the east side of 99. That was originally set aside for a light rail extension as well as the property that we own at the vicinity of Calvine and Auberry Road. If you recall, we have I think it’s about four to five acres of
right of way that we currently own and preserve for future potential use, again, depending on the direction approved by the Board.

MR. NOTTOLI: So if it’s going to come forward in an 18-month time frame, again, irrespective of whether the light rail crosses that location, I think the connectivity for folks at the east side wouldn't necessarily have to take the car across, you know, try to occupy one of those many hundreds of spaces there, but there is Park-and-Ride and the modest type that's already there, it's the park of CalTrans, but there's also another area there where we can shuttle across and maybe stay out of the mix as it relates to the Calvine/99 interchange there.

So I trust that that’s going to be taken into account from discussion with Elk Grove as they plan for the future alignment on any Phase 3 extension. And also, if nothing else, to get some other additional crossing even if it’s dedicated to particular uses if
not the vehicle use, at least general vehicle use, I think we need to make sure that we keep that in mind because we preserved that right of way and I think we can certainly keep some of the folks out of that mix if we do it properly there.

MR. WILEY: Absolutely.

MR. MANSEN: We do have in the EIS the option of still using those four acres as an optional parking lot.

MR. TRETWEAY: Ms. Hammond.

MS. HAMMOND: My hope especially with a new majority at Elk Grove City Council is that before we spend a lot of staff time and Board time talking about connecting to Elk Grove, Elk Grove should first become a full-fledged partner with Regional Transit. And I don't mean that necessarily you have to give up your buses but the reality is our light rail system is where we have full-fledged partners, and so my hope is that some day we will become full-fledged partners as a council member from the City of Sacramento.
We already have a lot of Elk Grove people, so might as well just come on and join the whole way, you've got three points instead of two and Folsom is a full partner, so come on board.

I have one other question about the EIS though. How much more would it cost to go to Auberry and to build a full station, if that's -- you know, that location already had its own controversies as a cancer cluster. So the question becomes with that as a known issue, how much does it cost just to put something there?

MR. MANSEN: That cost was estimated at $45 million.

MS. HAMMOND: To cross over 99?

MR. MANSEN: To cross over into the station at Calvine/Auberry. Interestingly, there was not a substantial change in the ridership by doing that additional station, and the other thing that has changed since then is the area that we were looking at for a parking facility over there is now developed as housing.

MS. HAMMOND: Is now developed as housing? So it's no longer available?

MR. MANSEN: Well, for parking, no. We have
to put a structure up or something but it was fairly expensive to cross 99 and did not produce substantial increase.

MS. HAMMOND: And Calvine and Auberry are not in the City of Elk Grove records, in the unincorporated county, right? It's in Mr. Nottoli's district?

MR. NOTTOLI: Right on the line.

MS. HAMMOND: Right on the line. So we just put parking there with a bunch of houses and there's no retail to kind of help draw people?

MR. MANSEN: At this point, there is a high school right next to it where the station is going to be.

MS. HAMMOND: Two high schools.

MR. MANSEN: We would need about 1100 spaces of parking at that station. The Board decided to shorten this phase to stop at the college and revisit that question.

MS. HAMMOND: Now, refresh my memory. When we
did the South Line Phase 1 that was $222 million, we
completed it on time and on budget; am I correct?

MR. WILEY: Yes, you are.

MS. HAMMOND: How long did that take?

MR. WILEY: Four years.

MS. HAMMOND: That took four years and how

many miles was that?

6.3 if I recall.

Six miles? So things just cost

more now than the original one that was 18 miles?

Costs certainly have gone up in

the last several years, yes.

In the last 30 years?

Definitely in the last 30 years.

I'd just like to thank Dave for

his presentation, and even though the room is not

filled, we're all very excited about Phase 2 to the

college.

Thank you.

We'll now open the public
hearing for the South Line Phase 2. As we mentioned earlier, if you have questions on the EIR, it's really best to take advantage of our staff in the back of the room as well as the consultants. If you have comments to the EIR, please sign up on speaker cards and hand them to our clerk over here. At this point, we just have two speakers. The first one is J.W. Reede who is on the advisory committee for the South Line. Thank you for your service.

MR. REEDE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Dr. James Reede and I was the chairman of the Community Advisory Committee for the South Sacramento Transit Alternatives Project. During the final public hearing, I made a comment that being the chair caused me to have two children. Well, those two children are now old enough to ride light rail by themselves. I might also add that I'm a professor of environmental science part time at Sac State teaching CEQA and NEQA and I have a couple of my students here
tonight because we're actually using this Draft Subsequent and Draft Supplemental EIR and EIS as part of the class because it is an excellent document.

However, there is a shortcoming in this document that was caused by our Global Warming Solutions Act AB32, which went into effect January 1st which this particular document does not address. Even though we have beneficial impacts on carbon dioxide and PM2.5s and PM10s, it is not addressed in the environmental document in the air quality section specifically starting at page 4-11. The document needs to state in the affirmative that this will reduce carbon dioxide by taking vehicles off the road. It's a beneficial impact but it needs to be addressed.

The Orange County Transportation Authority in their long-range transportation plan failed to address AB32. And because they did, the California Attorney General slammed them for it. There's been a number of Environmental Impact Reports that have gone out since this has crossed the Water District, their alternate
intake project that addressed on a cursory level -- and
I'm talking real technical right now so some people may
not have a clue, but your air quality engineers need to
address the beneficial impacts that would be caused by
this light rail segment being put in, because it's
taking vehicles off the road and it's taking buses off
the road. It's missing in this document.

Other than that, it's an excellent document
but it needs to be addressed or you will have -- you
will not have a litigation-proof document, and all of
you are aware that the way CEQA gets enforced in
California is through litigation. We don't need that.

We've been waiting on this for 12 years in the south
area. It was supposed to go to Grant Line in '99, our
previous Board chose to give the money to Folsom. We
want our segment now and we need to have it
litigation-proof. So please have your air quality
engineers address global and climate warming. Thank
you.

MR. TRETHEWAY: Thank you for your long
service and your very important point. I understand,
like you said, the AG's office is all over these kind of
plans. Very critical point. Our next speaker is Mike
Simers.

MR. SOMERS: Hi. My name is Mike Somers, I'm a representative with CALPIRG. CALPIRG is the California Public Interest Research Group. We're a state-wide, citizen-based organization and we have members all across the state including here in Sacramento. So right now one of our top priorities is preventing the Governor's 1.1 billion-dollar cuts in public transportation funding. So obviously, we care about public transportation because, like you, we know that traffic congestion costs commuters time and money. It also is only going to get worse.

So we also know that 40 percent of global warming pollution comes from transportation, so fortunately, public transit uses 1/3 of the energy of single passenger cars. So I care, obviously, because I don't own a car, as well as I run an office that is staffed with approximately 20 people which most of them as well use the Regional Transit here in Sacramento.
So in terms of what we're doing, CALPIRG is --
our advocates are meeting with legislators regularly to advocate against these budget cuts, and so finally, we're here today to say that we really would love to work with the Transit Board to prevent the budget cuts proposed by the Governor. So thanks so much.

MR. TRETHEWAY: Thank you very much. Are there any other speakers? Do we need a motion to close the hearing?

MR. SHELBY: The hearing is automatically closed by moving to the next item.

MR. TRETHEWAY: Thank you very much. The next item, please.

THE CLERK: Reports, ideas and questions from directors and communications.

MR. TRETHEWAY: Seeing none, next item, please.

THE CLERK: The public addresses the Board and I do not have any cards for that item.

MR. TRETHEWAY: Would anybody like to address
the Board?

THE CLERK: Hold on just a moment here.

MR. BITTNER: Rather than hold you up, I'll fill this out after I make my comment.

My name is Moss Bittner and I live in Midtown.

I'd like to address the issue of the K Street beautification project that also entails a transit station move. I understand you had some people come and speak on that issue at your last meeting. I was on K Street today speaking to people about -- transit users in particular, about -- their feelings about station move and whatnot. Overwhelmingly, I'd have to say people like the station where it is because it's close to the destinations that they want to get to, and I hope that that really becomes incorporated in the City of Sacramento's development of a station move.

I was informed just a few minutes ago by Mr. Tretheway that the City has actually put off its vote on the K Street Beautification Project to three
weeks from now in order to examine an alternative which keeps the station on the 700 block, I think that's a great idea. I also think that from the City's perspective, they could actually dissociate beautification from transit alteration.

Now, you may be wondering why an issue that's being handled by the City is of such concern to Regional Transit. Well, it's because the City's project is essentially a transit project and that creates some confusion. So with that, I'd have to say that I'm pleasantly surprised to learn that Regional Transit has participated in the development of a sort of compromised alternative that will allow the station to remain on the 700 block, I think that's really important.

And the more this Board and RT can participate in dealing with transit mobility and accessibility issues downtown, the more transit users can be folded into the project and their preferences and their opinions can be drawn on the decisions that the City and RT collectively make, the better the project can be for
transit and the better ultimately it will be for
downtown revitalization.

MR. TRETHEYAW: Thank you. I can assure you that RT has been in nearly -- if not every -- meeting of this subject, both public meetings and otherwise. They did come up with perhaps an option that we'll be looking at in two or three weeks. So no other items before us?

MS. PANNELL: You know what? This is the shortest meeting we've had.

MR. TRETHEYAW: It will be if you'll allow me to adjourn it. Meeting adjourned.

(Public Hearing was adjourned at 6:46 p.m.)
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