

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

REPORTER' S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING
HELD BEFORE SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT BOARD
IN THE MATTER OF
SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
STATEMENT/SUBSEQUENT DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE SOUTH SACRAMENTO CORRIDOR PHASE 2

Monday, March 12, 2007

22 REPORTED BY: SHERRI STARR, CRR; CSR #10245 (01-392013)

23

24

25

1

SAM PANNELL COMMUNITY CENTER

2

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2007

3

6:17 P.M.

4

--oOo--

5

THE CLERK: Public Hearing Item Number 12,

6

Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact

7

Statement/Subsequent Draft Environmental Impact Report

8

for the South Sacramento Corridor Phase 2 introduced by

9

Dave Mansen, project manager from Parsons Transportation

10

Group.

11

MR. MANSEN: Chairman Tretheway, Ladies and

12

Gentlemen of the Board, my name is Dave Mansen. I'm

13

going to keep my comments very brief this evening

14

because the purpose of this meeting this evening is to

15

hear from the general public. There are a number of

16 boards in the back of the room if you want some more
17 detail than what I am providing, the public is welcome
18 to view those boards.

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

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

2

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

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

9 There will be four stations: Morrison Creek
10 Station, Franklin Station, Center Parkway Station with a

11 terminus at the college. And the RT Board a couple of
12 years ago adopted the Phase 2 terminus at the college
13 which is a good terminus location.

14 As all of you know, this is one of the
15 fastest-growing portions of Sacramento County, so
16 there's an increase in population and jobs. State Route
17 99 is projected to be twice its capacity in the year
18 2025. We're also a non-attainment area and congestion
19 on the freeways is suspected to reach Level of Service F
20 shortly.

21 This is a project for which we're seeking
22 federal funding. We have submitted applications to the
23 Federal Government over the years to obtain that
24 funding. The most recent submittal indicates a medium
25 rating which keeps us eligible for federal funding for

3

1 this extension. We have circulated the Environmental
2 Impact Statement and the preliminary engineering is
3 ongoing and will wrap up fairly soon.

4 I'm not going to cover the criteria but this

5 gives you an idea of what the Federal Transit
6 Administration is asking us to evaluate and submit to
7 them. We are compared with other cities around the
8 United States for these federal funds. For instance,
9 the Federal Government is very interested in land use,
10 transit area development types of evaluations and what
11 the city is doing and what the possibilities are for
12 this extension and so on.

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

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

23 The larger boards are in the back showing some
24 of the details of this 4.3-mile extension. I do want to
25 mention that we're still coordinating with the Los Rios

1 Community College District and with the college about
2 the location and the various facilities at that station,
3 including a proposed parking structure. So what's on
4 that board in the back are several options and maybe
5 some other options on how to locate that facility

6 MS. PANNELL: There's only one option.

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

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

18 We sent out almost 5,000 notices of the
19 availability of this document. We've placed 14,000
20 flyers on the light rail and bus vehicles. We sent out
21 253 computer disks of the EIS offering them a hard copy
22 if they wanted it to elected officials and to agencies.

23 The EIS availability was placed in -- the notice was
24 placed in the Sacramento Bee and in the Federal Register
25 on February 16th, and we did a press release to the

5

1 local media.

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

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

14 This information is available in the back on a
15 board, so these are the addresses that comments should
16 be sent to. There are also comment cards available for

17 people to fill out tonight, or on the back of those
18 cards is an address you can just put a stamp on it and
19 mail it to us in advance of April 3rd.

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

25 We won't be answering questions at the

6

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

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

8 MR. DICKINSON: I would like to ask a couple
9 of questions. You've got 45 million, almost 46 million
10 in the project budget for stations. That's obviously,
11 for four stations, a considerable amount per station as

12 in 10 million bucks plus. Is a parking garage built
13 into that number or is there some other explanation for
14 that figure?

15 MR. MANSEN: Parking garage is included.

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

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

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

25 MR. MANSEN: Absolutely.

7

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

5 MR. MANSEN: We hope to do it faster than

6 that, but that's the current schedule.

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

10 MR. MANSEN: Thank you.

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

21 MR. MANSEN: The environmental document
22 includes those but, yes, we've gone past that document.
23 With discussions with the college -- to back up a bit,
24 on January 3rd, a lot of the comments we received at
25 that public meeting were questions about the parking

1 garage on the southeast corner, saying that was too
2 distant from the light rail platforms and that's why, as
3 you know, we met with the college and the college has --
4 the staff at the college has been receptive to some
5 alternatives to that.

6 MR. TRETHERWAY: Mr. Nottoli.

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

13 MS. PANNELL: Thank you very much.

14 MR. NOTTOLI: I wanted to inquire about this.
15 As we did some of the scoping of this initially, and
16 certainly the City of Elk Grove has needed to refine
17 their look at light rail which would be a Phase 3
18 approach, but part of the background of this was
19 maintaining connectivity to the east side of Highway 99
20 where we have a Park-and-Ride, there's been right of
21 way. It's been held, the understanding, that that may
22 not be the ultimate direction it goes for future
23 extension.

24 I guess I'm curious though what work either as
25 a premise to this next extension and/or what is being

9

1 looked at relative to either connectivity via walking,
2 bicycling, maybe a shuttle service with the east side
3 there because recognizing a lot of the congestion
4 particularly in the morning hour in the northbound
5 direction but also all the development that's occurring
6 certainly to the east that would have to cross the
7 Calvine overcrossing and make its way into the
8 Park-and-Ride area on the west side of the freeway,
9 certainly could be accommodated adequately with a number
10 of parking spaces that are being contemplated. So where
11 is that left in this overall look?

12 MR. WILEY: Dave, I'll take that. Basically
13 the Board adopted as the end-of-the-line station for
14 this Phase 2, Consumnes River College. We have in fact
15 maintained as an option the ability to cross east over
16 99. We have basically a design that we've worked with
17 the City of Sacramento that allows for a light rail if

18 that's the direction that the Board chooses, to run east
19 and cross over 99 if in fact that's the direction. If
20 the direction is to ultimately extend this line south
21 along Bruceville into Elk Grove, that alignment is still
22 preserved to cross over 99 for bike/ped uses and other
23 uses.

24 The specific use and the specific direction
25 will in fact be determined by this Board through the

10

1 update of our master plan. We're in the process right
2 now of beginning the update of the master plan. We
3 expect to bring it ultimately back to the Board for
4 approval in 18 months and that master plan will
5 basically provide the next 20- to 30-year direction of
6 how the overall system will develop and including, you
7 know, answering those specific issues.

8 Now, we've also preserved right of way on the
9 east side of 99. That was originally set aside for a
10 light rail extension as well as the property that we own
11 at the vicinity of Calvin and Auberry Road. If you
12 recall, we have I think it's about four to five acres of

13 right of way that we currently own and preserve for
14 future potential use, again, depending on the direction
15 approved by the Board.

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

11

1 Calvi ne/99 interchange there.

2 So I trust that that's going to be taken into
3 account from discussion with Elk Grove as they plan for
4 the future alignment on any Phase 3 extension. And
5 also, if nothing else, to get some other additional
6 crossing even if it's dedicated to particular uses if

7 not the vehicle use, at least general vehicle use, I
8 think we need to make sure that we keep that in mind
9 because we preserved that right of way and I think we
10 can certainly keep some of the folks out of that mix if
11 we do it properly there.

12 MR. WILEY: Absolutely.

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

16 MR. TRETHERWAY: Ms. Hammond.

17 MS. HAMMOND: My hope especially with a new
18 majority at Elk Grove City Council is that before we
19 spend a lot of staff time and Board time talking about
20 connecting to Elk Grove, Elk Grove should first become a
21 full-fledged partner with Regional Transit. And I don't
22 mean that necessarily you have to give up your buses but
23 the reality is our light rail system is where we have
24 full-fledged partners, and so my hope is that some day
25 we will become full-fledged partners as a council member

2 We already have a lot of Elk Grove people, so
3 might as well just come on and join the whole way,
4 you've got three points instead of two and Folsom is a
5 full partner, so come on board.

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

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

15 MS. HAMMOND: To cross over 99?

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

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

24 MR. MANSEN: Well, for parking, no. We have

25 to put a structure up or something but it was fairly

13

1 expensive to cross 99 and did not produce substantial
2 increase.

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

6 MR. NOTTOLI: Right on the line.

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

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

13 MS. HAMMOND: Two high school s.

14 MR. MANSEN: We would need about 1100 spaces
15 of parking at that station. The Board decided to
16 shorten this phase to stop at the college and revisi t
17 that questi on.

18 MS. HAMMOND: Now, refresh my memory. When we

19 did the South Line Phase 1 that was \$222 million, we
20 completed it on time and on budget; am I correct?

21 MR. WILEY: Yes, you are.

22 MS. HAMMOND: How long did that take?

23 MR. WILEY: Four years.

24 MS. HAMMOND: That took four years and how
25 many miles was that?

14

1 MR. WILEY: 6.3 if I recall.

2 MS. HAMMOND: Six miles? So things just cost
3 more now than the original one that was 18 miles?

4 MR. WILEY: Costs certainly have gone up in
5 the last several years, yes.

6 MS. HAMMOND: In the last 30 years?

7 MR. WILEY: Definitely in the last 30 years.

8 MS. PANNELL: I'd just like to thank Dave for
9 his presentation, and even though the room is not
10 filled, we're all very excited about Phase 2 to the
11 college.

12 MR. MANSEN: Thank you.

13 MR. TRETHERWAY: We'll now open the public

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

23 MR. REEDE: Good evening, Ladies and
24 gentlemen. My name is Dr. James Reede and I was the
25 chairman of the Community Advisory Committee for the

15

1 South Sacramento Transit Alternatives Project. During
2 the final public hearing, I made a comment that being
3 the chair caused me to have two children. Well, those
4 two children are now old enough to ride light rail by
5 themselves. I might also add that I'm a professor of
6 environmental science part time at Sac State teaching
7 CEQA and NEQA and I have a couple of my students here

8 tonight because we're actually using this Draft
9 Subsequent and Draft Supplemental EIR and EIS as part of
10 the class because it is an excellent document.

11 However, there is a shortcoming in this
12 document that was caused by our Global Warming Solutions
13 Act AB32, which went into effect January 1st which this
14 particular document does not address. Even though we
15 have beneficial impacts on carbon dioxide and PM2.5s and
16 PM10s, it is not addressed in the environmental document
17 in the air quality section specifically starting at page
18 4-11. The document needs to state in the affirmative
19 that this will reduce carbon dioxide by taking vehicles
20 off the road. It's a beneficial impact but it needs to
21 be addressed.

22 The Orange County Transportation Authority in
23 their long-range transportation plan failed to address
24 AB32. And because they did, the California Attorney
25 General slammed them for it. There's been a number of

1 Environmental Impact Reports that have gone out since
2 this has crossed the Water District, their alternate

3 intake project that addressed on a cursory level -- and
4 I'm talking real technical right now so some people may
5 not have a clue, but your air quality engineers need to
6 address the beneficial impacts that would be caused by
7 this light rail segment being put in, because it's
8 taking vehicles off the road and it's taking buses off
9 the road. It's missing in this document.

10 Other than that, it's an excellent document
11 but it needs to be addressed or you will have -- you
12 will not have a litigation-proof document, and all of
13 you are aware that the way CEQA gets enforced in
14 California is through litigation. We don't need that.
15 We've been waiting on this for 12 years in the south
16 area. It was supposed to go to Grant Line in '99, our
17 previous Board chose to give the money to Folsom. We
18 want our segment now and we need to have it
19 litigation-proof. So please have your air quality
20 engineers address global and climate warming. Thank
21 you.

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

1 Somers.

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

13 So we also know that 40 percent of global
14 warming pollution comes from transportation, so
15 fortunately, public transit uses 1/3 of the energy of
16 single passenger cars. So I care, obviously, because I
17 don't own a car, as well as I run an office that is
18 staffed with approximately 20 people which most of them
19 as well use the Regional Transit here in Sacramento.

20 So in terms of what we're doing, CALPIRG is --
21 our advocates are meeting with legislators regularly to
22 advocate against these budget cuts, and so finally,
23 we're here today to say that we really would love to
24 work with the Transit Board to prevent the budget cuts
25 proposed by the Governor. So thanks so much.

18

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

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

6 MR. TRETHERWAY: Thank you very much. The next
7 item, please.

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

10 MR. TRETHERWAY: Seeing none, next item,
11 please.

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

14 MR. TRETHERWAY: Would anybody like to address

15 the Board?

16 THE CLERK: Hold on just a moment here.

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

19 My name is Moss Bittner and I live in Midtown.
20 I'd like to address the issue of the K Street
21 beautification project that also entails a transit
22 station move. I understand you had some people come and
23 speak on that issue at your last meeting. I was on K
24 Street today speaking to people about -- transit users
25 in particular, about -- their feelings about station

19

1 move and whatnot. Overwhelmingly, I'd have to say
2 people like the station where it is because it's close
3 to the destinations that they want to get to, and I hope
4 that that really becomes incorporated in the City of
5 Sacramento's development of a station move.

6 I was informed just a few minutes ago by
7 Mr. Tretheway that the City has actually put off its
8 vote on the K Street Beautification Project to three

9 weeks from now in order to examine an alternative which
10 keeps the station on the 700 block, I think that's a
11 great idea. I also think that from the City's
12 perspective, they could actually dissociate
13 beautification from transit alteration.

14 Now, you may be wondering why an issue that's
15 being handled by the City is of such concern to Regional
16 Transit. Well, it's because the City's project is
17 essentially a transit project and that creates some
18 confusion. So with that, I'd have to say that I'm
19 pleasantly surprised to learn that Regional Transit has
20 participated in the development of a sort of compromised
21 alternative that will allow the station to remain on the
22 700 block, I think that's really important.

23 And the more this Board and RT can participate
24 in dealing with transit mobility and accessibility
25 issues downtown, the more transit users can be folded

1 into the project and their preferences and their
2 opinions can be drawn on the decisions that the City and
3 RT collectively make, the better the project can be for

4 transit and the better ultimately it will be for
5 downtown revitalization.

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

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

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

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

16 --o0o--

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2

3 I, SHERRI STARR, a Certified Shorthand
4 Reporter, hereby certify that said proceeding was taken
5 in shorthand by me, a disinterested person, at the time
6 and place therein stated, and that the testimony was
7 thereafter reduced to typewriting, by computer, under my
8 direction and supervision;

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties to the said
11 proceeding, nor in any way interested in the event of
12 this cause, and that I am not related to any of the
13 parties thereto.

14

15

16

SHERRI STARR, CRR; CSR No. 10245

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25