

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Executive Summary 1**
- II. Introduction..... 3**
 - A. Study Background and Project Description 3
 - B. Public Participation Program 3
 - C. Purpose of Scoping Process and Description of Scoping Meetings..... 4
 - Public Scoping Meetings*
 - Agency Scoping Meeting*
 - D. Purpose and Description of Stakeholder Interviews 5
 - E. Purpose and Description of Community Meetings 6
 - Community Leaders*
 - Annual Meadowview Community Meeting*
 - Valley Hi Neighborhood Association Meeting*
 - F. Purpose and Description of Resource Agency Bus Tour..... 7
 - G. Noticing of Public Meetings..... 7
- III. Summary of Key Issues 9**
 - A. Methods of Receiving Comment 9
 - B. Comments Summarized by Issue..... 10
- IV. Appendices 21**
 - Appendix A: Public Scoping Meetings
 - Agenda*
 - Sign-in Sheets*
 - Photographs*
 - Court Reporter Transcripts*
 - Comments Received*
 - Appendix B: Agency Scoping Meetings
 - Notice of Intent and Federal Register Announcement*
 - Notice of Preparation*
 - Invitation Letter*
 - Phone Call Script*
 - Agenda*
 - Sign-in Sheets*
 - Photographs*
 - Court Reporter Transcript*
 - Comments Received*
 - Mailing List*



Appendix C: Community Meetings

Agenda
Sign-In Sheets
Summary of Comments Received

Appendix D: Agency Bus Tour

Invitation
Agenda
Sign-In Sheets
Photographs
Summary of Comments Received

Appendix E: Other Comments Received

Information Line
General E-Mails

Appendix F: Information Pieces

Methodology Report
Scoping Booklet
Press Releases
Power Point Presentation
Display Boards
Web Site
Newsletter

Appendix G: Media Coverage

KCRA News Report
Sacramento Bee Newspaper Article
Access Sacramento, Channel 73 – Dates Scoping Meeting Replayed

Appendix H: Noticing Materials

Scoping Notice
Scoping Flyer
Rack Card
Legal Notice
Bus Placard
Display Ad

Appendix I: Written Responses

Federal Agencies

United States Department of the Interior – Fish and Wildlife Service
United States Environmental Protection Agency – Region IX

State Agencies

California Department of Transportation

Regional

Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District



*Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
Freeport Regional Water Authority*

County

Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency

City

*City of Elk Grove – Community Development Department
City of Sacramento – Department of Utilities
City of Sacramento – Environmental Planning Services*

Local/Community

*Cosumnes River College
North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association
Sacramento Transportation Equity Network
South Gate Recreation and Park District
Valley-Hi Covenant Church*

SCOPING REPORT

For The

SOUTH SACRAMENTO PHASE 2 CORRIDOR PROJECT

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) conducted a supplemental environmental scoping process for the South Sacramento Phase 2 Corridor Project, an extension of the South Line light rail system. This environmental review process supplements the 1994 Alternative Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report (AA/DEIS/DEIR). The 1994 Report approved a locally preferred alternative that identified a light rail alignment from downtown Sacramento south to Calvine Road at Auberry Drive.

The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIS/SEIR) scoping process conducted between March and May, 2002 is the focus of this report. Extensive outreach was conducted during this period including three scoping meetings, stakeholder interviews, small group meetings and distribution of information material. A court reporter attended each scoping meeting to record comments. In addition, numerous comments were recorded during stakeholder interviews and small group meetings as well as from the telephone information line and project e-mails.

A number of agencies, stakeholders, interest groups and the public provided input. On the whole, comments indicated positive support for extending light rail to the South Sacramento area. Specific comments addressed a range of issues that included station and alignment options, safety, and environmental issues. Many of the comments focus on coordinating the light-rail alignment with planned development and transit improvements along the corridor. RT will continue to conduct outreach with and seek comment from agencies, stakeholders, and the general public throughout the environmental review process.

A. STATION AND ALIGNMENT OPTIONS

The majority of the comments received pertained to station and alignment options. The South Sacramento area is undergoing numerous improvement and development projects. Comments emphasized the importance of coordinating the South Sacramento Phase 2 Corridor Project with current and future transit improvement plans as well as community, housing and business development plans.



Coordination was also the focus of some agency stakeholders who expressed concern about the station locations and rail alignment impact on existing utilities. Comments were also given about impacts to bike paths and traffic flow (existing and future) as well as connectivity to existing bus service. Station locations and accessibility, traffic flow into and out of the station, as well as station design were the subject of additional comments.

There are also existing community services, education centers, and residential areas that are in need of improved transit options. Comments requested specific stops for students attending Cosumnes River College, area high schools and for seniors who rely on public transit to reach medical facilities.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Environmental comments ranged from air quality and biological impacts to visual and noise impacts – especially those impacting existing residents. Safety was an issue for educators and parents who commented that the proposed Center station was near existing schools. Comments called for RT to provide mitigation efforts that ensure pedestrian safety. Comments about the light rail system stimulating increased development along the South Sacramento corridor were also raised.

A summary of key issues can be found starting on page 10 of this report and detailed scoping comments are recorded in the Appendices section. RT and participating agencies will review and consider these comments in determining the final scope for the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report.

II. INTRODUCTION

A. STUDY BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The goal of the South Sacramento Phase 2 Corridor Project is to improve public transit service in the congested South Corridor area by providing increased transit capacity and faster, convenient access throughout the Sacramento metropolitan region.

The proposed South Sacramento Phase 2 Corridor Project will extend light rail approximately five miles from Meadowview Road to Calvine Road at Auberry Drive (Calvine/Auberry). To date, four stations have been identified at Franklin Boulevard, Center Parkway, Cosumnes River College/College Square, and Calvine/Auberry. The proposed Phase 2 light rail extension will follow the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way south from Meadowview Road. The alignment will turn east and run north of the proposed extension of Cosumnes River Boulevard, following the Boulevard to Bruceville Road. Then it will turn south to serve Cosumnes River College/College Square development, turn east to cross State Route 99, and terminate at a station at Calvine/Auberry.

B. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAM

The purpose of the Public Participation Program is to establish and carry out meaningful interaction among the Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT), decision-makers, stakeholders, and the general public throughout the environmental review process. Key objectives are to assist RT in addressing issues that emerge and to develop consensus for alignment and other key design issues. The Public Participation Program is guided by regulations of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

An extensive Public Participation Program has been implemented as part of the South Sacramento Phase 2 Corridor Project. The Study asks for the input of all stakeholders including: federal, state, regional and local agencies, elected officials, business and economic interests, educational institutions, and adjacent property owners and tenants. By encouraging agency and community involvement and their feedback, RT will be able to gather appropriate information to help them balance community and agency issues with the need for efficient transportation in the South Sacramento area.

Using a combination of traditional and innovative strategies, RT conducted a series of meetings, provided literature, and embarked on an all-inclusive plan for public education and outreach during the scoping period (March – May 2002). More specifically, RT conducted stakeholder interviews and held one agency and two public scoping meetings. RT also participated in community meetings, neighborhood association meetings and strategized with community leaders about how to outreach to each leader's organization throughout the full term of the environmental Study.

Seeking to increase public participation, RT chose meeting sites that were convenient and accessible to residents and stakeholders along the corridor. Public meetings were held in various locations that were served by public transportation and accessible to people with disabilities. Each meeting provided background information and a detailed description about the project and the environmental review process. Staff and technical experts (Study Team) were available to answer questions and document issues raised by stakeholders and the general public.

To provide resource agency staff with a comprehensive look at the corridor, RT conducted a bus tour and field visit. Traditional methods of outreach were provided for stakeholders and the general public. Outreach methods such as printed hand out materials, scoping booklets, media articles and broadcasts, and a web site provided background information about the proposed extension and how to provide public comment.

C. PURPOSE AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SCOPING MEETINGS

Public meetings during the scoping period are a key component of the Public Participation Program. The meetings were held to facilitate effective two-way communication between the public and the decision-makers. Also, the meetings distributed general and technical information to interested groups and individuals in the project area. Finally, the meetings helped to obtain broad community input and ideas from interested parties and provide forums for affected parties to express their comments.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

To encourage public participation, the public scoping meetings were held in two different areas in South Sacramento after normal work hours. The public was informed of the meetings by newspaper display ads, notice cards along RT bus and light rail lines, bus placards, mailed notifications, and flyers and leaflets distributed along the corridor.

The public scoping meetings were held from 5:30 to 8:00 PM on the following dates:

- March 25, 2002 at the Cosumnes River College [8401 Center Parkway]
- April 11, 2002 at the Sam Pannell Meadowview Community Center [2450 Meadowview Road].

A description of the format for both scoping meetings follows. Participants were asked to sign in and were given a Scoping Booklet and Comment Card as well as instructions about how to provide comment during the evening or in the future. The Scoping Booklet offered a step-by-step explanation of the environmental review process as well as information about key issues, the project schedule and a map of the corridor and station locations for the Phase 2 extension.

The meetings began with an informal Open House session in which attendees were able to review exhibits that explained the proposed alignments for the Phase 2 corridor,

the environmental review process, and how stakeholders and the general public can participate throughout the Study. Representatives from the Study Team were present to help provide additional information and to answer questions.

A presentation by the Study Team followed the open house, giving the public a more detailed illustration of the preferred corridor alignment as well as an explanation of environmental and other key issues. The public participation process was also explained in detail. A facilitated Question-and-Answer session followed. Questions and comments raised were recorded by a court reporter and have been included, by issue, in the Summary of Comments Received section of this report. Transcripts from both public scoping meetings are found in Appendix A.

Following the Question and Answer session, the Open House continued, giving the public additional *one-on-one* time with the Study Team. Sign language and Spanish language interpreters were available at each meeting.

Approximately 100 persons participated in the open house during both public scoping meetings: March 25, 2002 and April 11, 2002. Of those, approximately 40 stayed for the presentations. Those unable to attend the meetings could view the rebroadcast of the April 11 meeting on Sacramento's Community Access Cable TV station - Channel 73. Information about how to submit comments was included during the rebroadcast.

AGENCY SCOPING MEETING

The agency scoping meeting was held on April 11, 2002 from 10:30 AM to 12:30 PM at the Sacramento Regional Transit District [1400 29th Street]. The format of the meeting was the same as the two public scoping meetings. A court reporter was available to record the meeting. (See the Summary of Comments Received section for comments by issue and Appendix B for a complete transcript.)

Approximately, 26 resource agency staff people attended the agency scoping meeting. The open house portion of the meeting provided an excellent opportunity for various agencies to brainstorm with each other and provide comment to the Study Team about current and future projects along the corridor which might impact the alignment or station locations for the Phase 2 light rail extension.

D. PURPOSE AND DESCRIPTION OF STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Prior to conducting the public and agency scoping meetings, the Study Team met with various stakeholders. Although not all the stakeholder interviews were conducted prior to the scoping meetings, the information gathered from the stakeholders was instrumental in assisting the Study Team shape the corridor alignment and environmental process.

Nearly 20 stakeholder meetings were conducted by the Study Team between December 2001 and May 2002. Some of the interviews were conducted with a team of agency staff members and others were conducted with individuals. Stakeholders interviewed represented the following agencies or businesses:



- City of Elk Grove Administration
- City of Sacramento City Council
- City of Sacramento Department of Public Works
- City of Sacramento Parks and Recreation Department
- City of Sacramento Planning Department
- College Square Development
- Cosumnes River College
- Elk Grove Unified School District
- North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association
- Regional Transit District Senior Staff
- Sacramento County Board of Supervisors
- Sacramento County Planning Department
- Sacramento County Regional Sanitation District
- Sacramento Flood Control Agency
- Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency
- Sacramento Municipal Utility District
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Union Pacific Railroad

Stakeholder interviews and briefings will continue throughout the term of the Study with individuals, agency staff and agency boards and commissions. Comments from these interviews will be distributed to the Study Team to assist them with further refinements of the corridor alignment.

E. PURPOSE AND DESCRIPTION OF COMMUNITY MEETINGS

Community issues vary in range and complexity such as: socio-economic levels of residents along the corridor; growth rate of the area; current traffic congestion; number of housing developments and business centers; number of recreational facilities; number of schools or other facilities frequented by children; number of services for families or seniors along the corridor; air quality; biological, geological and other environmental factors; and many other factors which would impact location and access to a new transportation system. Providing an opportunity for residents and the general public to comment about all these issues requires flexibility in outreach methods. RT committed itself to providing many convenient and accessible meetings, workshops, small discussion groups and information outlets. A variety of meetings and events have been planned during the term of the Study.

RT presented information at regularly scheduled, neighborhood organization meetings. At these meetings, the public was able to view a presentation describing the preferred corridor alignment, talk with the Study Team, and review printed materials designed to assist the public in its understanding of key issues related to the Phase 2 extension.

These community presentations contributed additional information to the Phase 2 Study during the scoping process. Community presentations were held in different locations along the proposed corridor.

COMMUNITY LEADERS

In March and April, RT spoke with the leaders of many neighborhood organizations, community groups and churches to gain a better understanding for the needs of each neighborhood. To further their outreach efforts, RT organized a meeting on Wednesday, May 1, 2002 6:00 PM – 8:30 PM with community leaders along the corridor. The meeting was held at the Greater Faith Missionary Baptist Church [5230 Ehrhardt Avenue]. Leaders not only outlined a number of issues that needed to be addressed, they improved RT's awareness of how to better contact and communicate with the community's diverse population.

From this meeting, RT was able to schedule subsequent presentations to individual associations and organizations and provide materials or information in a format that was more accessible to each group. For example, brainstorming with the community leadership at this meeting produced a more extensive outreach effort to diverse cultures. Comments from this meeting are included in the Summary of Comments Received section. A full summary of comments is found in Appendix C.

ANNUAL MEADOWVIEW COMMUNITY MEETING

RT was invited to present information about the South Sacramento Phase 2 Corridor Project to residents and interested public during the Annual Meadowview Meeting on May 9, 2002. This meeting is sponsored yearly by Sacramento City Council member and RT Board Chair, Bonnie Pannell. In addition to making a short presentation and answering questions during the two-hour meeting, RT set up a booth to provide individualized information to the attendees. Interested parties were able to pick up materials, put their name on the project mailing list, and view various displays.

VALLEY HI NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION MEETING

On Wednesday, May 15, 2002, 6:00 PM, RT met with residents attending the monthly Valley Hi Neighborhood Association Meeting. The meeting was held at Hope United Methodist Church [6161 Valley Hi Drive]. RT provided an overview of the project, distributed materials and offered to attend future meetings. Conversations and correspondence has continued with this association and resulted in scheduling a larger neighborhood association meeting.

The participants from each of these meetings were added to the project outreach mailing list. Their comments have also been recorded in the Summary of Comments Received section of this report.

F. PURPOSE AND DESCRIPTION OF RESOURCE AGENCY BUS TOUR

RT sponsored a bus tour and field visit for agencies and organizations that have jurisdiction, property and/or projects affected by the South Line extension Approximately

23 resource agency staff attended the tour and provided feedback to RT. The tour and field visit was held on May 16, 2002. Participants gathered at the Antioch Progressive Baptist Church and were welcomed by RT Board members. After an overview of the Phase 2 alignment, participants were taken on a facilitated bus tour. Several stops were designed to allow participants to exit the bus with the Study Team to better examine the placement of the alignment and discuss advantages or issues related to each alternative.

Following the tour, attendees participated in a facilitated consensus building session, focusing on key issues in each segment of the corridor. Notes were recorded during this discussion of the corridor and comments by issue are included in the Summary of Comments Received. The full summary is found in Appendix D.

G. NOTICING OF PUBLIC MEETINGS

Prior to scheduling any meetings, the Study Team compiled an extensive mailing list of residents, resource agency staff and interested parties. This list had over 5,000 entries and was used to mail scoping meeting notifications. The list has been continually refined and updated and will be used for all future mailings of project updates, notification of public meetings, notification of the completion of the Draft SEIS/SEIR, and notification of the public hearing to receive comments on the draft document.

Specific categories on the mailing list include: key stakeholders, property owners, residents, community groups, civic groups, neighborhood associations, advocacy groups, environmental groups, business and planning professionals, local elected officials (City, County and State), and individuals representing county, local, regional, state and federal agencies.

In addition to mailing meeting notices, a variety of notification methods were used to inform the South Sacramento area of the meetings:

- paid newspaper display ads
- rack cards on the LT and LRT lines
- placards on buses
- a message on the roadside marquee sign at the Samuel J. Pannell Community Center
- flyers/displays at churches, community centers, libraries, and retail shops
- pre-meeting newspaper articles
- individual contact through e-mails and phone calls.

The Study Team also placed individual phone calls to resource agencies, inviting staff to attend scoping meetings, bus tours and stakeholder interviews. Individual phone calls were also placed to community leaders and neighborhood association members to invite them to special community presentations.

Newspaper articles and radio/television reports provided increased public information about the corridor Study as well as notification of scheduled meetings.

III. SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

A. METHODS OF RECEIVING COMMENT

Attendees of the public scoping meetings, agency scoping meeting, community presentations, and the agency bus tour, were encouraged to verbally communicate their concerns and recommendations during the meeting and also to record their personal concerns and suggestions on comment cards. Comment cards were provided with the meeting materials and attendees were asked to deposit the cards into comment boxes provided during each meeting or to mail them directly to RT. Those unable to attend the meeting were given the opportunity to submit their comment by sending RT a voice message, e-mail or written letter. Contact information for submitting comment was provided in all noticing materials and during the rebroadcasts of the public scoping meeting on Cable Access Channel 73.

In addition to the meetings described above, comments from neighborhood and community meetings held prior to May 15 as well as the Agency Bus Tour and Field Review are included in this summary report. In addition to a summary of the comments by issue (see next page), a copy of all written comments are included in this report's Appendices. This summary report will be distributed to the Study Team, and will be available for public to review on the project Web site and at public repositories at the following locations:

- Sacramento Central Library, 828 I Street
- South Sacramento Library Branch - Valley Hi North Laguna Library, 6351 Mack Road
- RT District offices, 1400 29th Street.

B. COMMENTS SUMMARIZED BY ISSUE

The table on Page 10 includes a summary of each comment received throughout the scoping process. Comments were received during public meetings or as written comment. The comments are sorted by project issue. Information about where or how the comments were collected is included to the right of each comment. A copy of all written comments as well as full summaries of each meeting are included in the Appendices section of this report.

Comment/Issues	Date/Meeting
Alignment	
One person suggested continuing the alignment down the corridor on Meadowview instead of cutting over to Auberry. Trains could stop at Laguna Blvd. and Elk Grove Blvd. saving time.	Comment Card - March 25
One person questioned whether the Bruceville Road alternative is an addition to the alignment or whether it replaces the alignment that continued east to Calvine/Auberry intersection.	Agency Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person stated that there is a need to service the medical facilities in close proximity to the college. Suggested a shuttle that could service the stations.	Agency Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person asked if there is sufficient space for the Light rail next to the railroad tracks. This person also questioned the track proximity to the adjacent homes.	Agency Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person stated that it does not make sense for Light rail to go down the Union Pacific track. This person suggested that Phase 2 travel down Meadowview and then Franklin Blvd., missing the wetlands. This would avoid the need to realign the Union Pacific.	Agency Scoping Meeting - April 11
One resident of Hollow Hearst Way asked about soundwalls. The Union House Creek is in her backyard and she said water from the canal carries sound.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person asked why the alignment doesn't continue down the current railroad tracks to Elk Grove, rather than going through existing neighborhoods.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person requested Light rail would go to Bruceville due to safety and crime concerns.	Telephone Information Line
One person asked if light rail will be extended to San Jose or Stockton.	Telephone Information Line
One individual stated that extending light rail to Calvine/Auberry intersection, or Power Inn Road, was not as important or needed as extending it to Laguna/Elk Grove where there is more ridership. He said the station at the college will not attract the riders projected, because students will continue to drive to accommodate their class schedules.	Telephone Information Line
The City of Elk Grove reported that they are developing a new general plan and would like RT to consider their plan.	Written Response to NOP
The Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency preferred the alignment that runs parallel to Bruceville Road with a station on or to the west of Bruceville Road near Cosumnes River College. If the extension crosses Highway 99, they prefer that it does not run through or separate the multifamily property parcels along Cotton Lane from the vacant land to the north.	Written Response to NOP

Comment/Issues	Date/Meeting
The City of Sacramento, Planning and Building Department stated that the promotion of transit oriented development for the College Square area is a key objective. They recommend the alignment does not cut diagonally across the College Square development, which would make development more difficult. Further, they support alignment options that help to foster transit oriented development along other areas of the corridor.	Written Response to NOP
Community	
One resident was concerned about how much, if any, land from private owners will be required along the rail road track starting at Meadowview Road.	Comment Card - March 25
One person asked if RT could host a meeting similar to this to discuss bus service in relation to the Phase 2 extension.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One resident asked where they could find information about the effects of the light rail extension on property values of the surrounding homes.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One resident asked where they could locate the studies of the visual impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One resident of Cosumnes River Blvd. stated that he does not want a train in his back yard. He asked if there could be a different area for a final stop and a shuttle service to Cosumnes River College.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One resident is concerned that immigrants and people of color will not speak up for themselves.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
Several people commented that they do not want the building or running of the train to cause any negative impacts to their quality of life and/or housing prices.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person voiced concerns regarding increased housing density.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person suggested that more residents need to be notified of the public comment period and suggested notices be sent in multiple languages.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One resident suggested that a survey needs to be completed in the area to get the entire neighborhood's input/opinion to include the Asian community that won't attend. To obtain their opinions and needs, a written survey would be best.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person suggested that there are too many people working on the same effort, meetings should be combined in the interests of the attendees' time.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
A concerned property owner interested in the Study requested to remain on the mailing list.	Telephone Information Line
One person questioned the placement of a sub-station at Power Inn Road.	Telephone Information Line



Comment/Issues	Date/Meeting
Several people asked to be placed on the project mailing list.	Telephone Information Line
One person asked if RT could make a presentation to his group.	Telephone Information Line
A member of the SACOG Transportation Roundtable and Board Member for the North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association, encouraged RT to consider BRT alternatives due to land use studies.	Written Response to NOP
North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association has three concerns: privacy, noise, and pedestrian safety.	Written Response to NOP
The Southgate Recreation and Park District is interested in providing a childcare center in this area.	Written Response to NOP
Design	
One person requested that RT replace the chain link fence on the north side of the project (between Franklin and Center Parkway) with a sound wall. It would not interfere with SAFCA floodwall project. Also, replace walls on the south side of project, 10 feet from roadway, with a sound wall.	Comment Card - April 11
One person questioned if RT is considering future technology, and leaving enough room around the station for changes in design.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person stated that sound walls to the north and south sides of the project are important.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person was in support of elevating Franklin Blvd.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person believed that having a flyover at the Franklin Blvd. station would be a good idea.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person expressed concern about the design at the corner across from Cosumnes River College because it is a blank slate.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person suggested RT use the BART example of promoting mixed land use around the station locations.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One resident asked if there would be a sound wall on the west side of Meadowview. There is a sound wall on the east side of Meadowview.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person would like to see an elevated causeway over the buffer lands, which would preclude the potential for flooding along the Union House Creek and the Morrison Creek.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
One resident voiced concern about the effectiveness of the sound wall for visual impacts. This person prefers an at-grade crossing.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
One person asked if there would be a sound wall along Cosumnes River Blvd.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
One person asked if the Union Pacific track is being preserved for the future option of double track and high-speed rail.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25

Comment/Issues	Date/Meeting
One person expressed concern regarding the design consistency of station and surrounding facilities. This person encouraged RT to be sensitive to the architecture of the surrounding community.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person hoped the design is appealing in low-income neighborhoods.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person suggested that RT should consider lighting, shelter from weather, parking availability, security and safety when designing the stations.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person asked how big the stations would be.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person asked if there are design standards.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
The Sacramento Transportation Equity Network (Network) commented that for the cost of this Light rail extension, a much more extensive BRT system can be built to serve this area. The Network would like RT to study connecting this area with Downtown via a BRT line on Power Inn, Franklin and with E/W Bus Rapid Transit on Florin and Calvine/Cosumnes Blvd. with ridership on the Light rail line. There is a need to include shuttle service. Suggests that RT prepare a comparison of capitol costs for the BRT and Light rail.	Written Response to NOP
The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 3 stated that the alternative alignments that cross the SR99 need to be reviewed by Caltrans for conformity with State freeway design standards, aesthetics, landscape, and irrigation. In addition to a separate Old Calvine Road/freeway bridge, a joint use of a southerly Sheldon Road interchange new bridge structure could be studied. However, housing areas served east of the freeway at this location would not be as close to DR99 as the area west of Calvine High School. A Caltrans Encroachment Permit will be required for any work conducted in the State right-of-way.	Written Response to NOP
One individual encouraged sound barriers along Phase 2.	Written Response to NOP
Southgate Recreation and Park District requested RT consider proper exterior lighting at stations, and to explore how it may affect the residents on the north side of Calvine Road. Possible landscaping techniques could also mitigate this concern as well. They support bike locks and bicycling facilities for those riding to a station.	Written Response to NOP
The City of Sacramento, Public Works Department suggested that RT should study the need for sound walls along Cosumnes River Blvd.	Written Response to NOP
Environment	
One person expressed concern about the construction emission thresholds and standard mitigation for this project.	Agency Scoping Meeting - April 11

Comment/Issues	Date/Meeting
One person asked what environmental hazards might be uncovered with the realignment of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person asked if the train would increase air pollution or have any negative impact on the air quality.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person asked what the projected noise level of the train would be.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One resident questioned whether the train construction and operation could cause any illnesses.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person recommended that, since sections of the alignment would be built in a residential neighborhood and not along pre-existing track, RT should mitigate any visual blight in the neighborhood along the route and at the station areas.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person was in favor of RT preserving or providing mitigation for wetland areas.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
Southgate Recreation and Park District encouraged RT to provide additional landscaping and possibly a mini-park to improve the environmental mitigation of automobile emissions to improve aesthetics along the corridor.	Written Response to NOP
Caltrans stated that any planned freeway crossing should mitigate construction activities so that any development would not contribute contaminants (oils, grease, sand, sediment or debris) to storm waters handled by the State. Any increases of discharge into the State drainage system must be mitigated and information should be supplied for Caltrans review. RT should incorporate environmental Best Management Practices.	Written Response to NOP
Air Quality Management District suggested that RT include mitigation measures to reduce emissions during construction of the extension into the Draft SEIR/SEIS. Specifically, reducing Nox emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment and controlling visible emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment.	Written Response to NOP
One individual stated that a local neighborhood is fully developed with an elementary school in the area. If RT has to realign the UPRR tracks, it should mitigate potential environmental hazards faced with disturbing the existing UPRR.	Written Response to NOP
US Fish and Wildlife Services suggested ongoing consultation with RT to evaluate whether any of the project activities are anticipated to impact jurisdictional wetlands and/or endangered species.	Written Response to NOP
The US Environmental Protection Agency recognized that the extension will provide significant air quality benefits by providing alternatives to driving. However, operation and construction has the potential to impact air quality. Issues to coordinate with the EPA include: Air Quality, Water Resources, Cumulative Impacts, Environmental Justice, Sustainability/Design Features, Auxiliary Facilities, Recycling Materials, Materials Reuse and Recycling and Invasive Species.	Written Response to NOP



Comment/Issues	Date/Meeting
Operation	
One resident stated that the fewer the stations included in the alignment, the faster, more convenient the extension will be.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person stated that improved bus service to the Phase 2 extension is important for the handicapped.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person asked if it would be more cost effective to spend money on improving the bus system.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
Several people expressed the need to improve the feeding bus system.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person questioned whether RT is considering Bus Rapid Transit options toward Cosumnes River College.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
One person asked if once Phase 1 was completed, would the regular bus service run the alignment of Phase 2 in the interim.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
One person asked what the estimated running time of Phase 2 to downtown would be.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
Several people said that there should be fewer stations, with more park-n-ride lots, so that the trip time is shorter.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
Several people asked about the access to stations by bus transportation.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person asked how often the train would run.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person asked what the hours of operation would be.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person asked what the cost for a fare would be.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person asked if RT could extend the hours for people to use transfers.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
Parking	
One person asked if there would be enough parking for the Elk Grove sports stadium and the Calvine/Auberry intersection Station.	Agency Scoping Meeting - April 11
Related Projects	
The Sacramento County Regional Sanitation District stated it is modifying its facility and expect to have as many as 300 Double Dump trucks rolling down Cosumnes River Blvd. and Franklin during the summer of 2003. The District had concerns regarding construction delays, especially if construction for light rail is in the area of Cosumnes River Blvd. in 2003.	Comment Card - April 11
One person stated that Southgate Recreation and Parks has a trail head at Power Inn Road. The opportunity for a light rail connection is great.	Agency Scoping Meeting - April 11

Comment/Issues	Date/Meeting
One person asked what the status of Calvine/Auberry intersection station is relative to recent project approvals by the City of Elk Grove which might impact this planned station, especially the park -n-ride lot. Additionally, the speaker voiced a concern that more cohesion is needed so that all plans in the area are compatible with extending light rail as soon as possible.	Agency Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person stated that Regional Sanitation District will have new connectors that could be coming down from Folsom, which could potentially impact the Bruceville Road alignment.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
One person asked if the Amtrak San Joaquin will travel on the Union Pacific or other tracks.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
One person asked if there will be any impact from this project on the East Bay MUD project.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person asked if there will be any impact to the project because of Morrison Creek flooding.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person asked if the plans to go down Bruceville consider the plans to extend Cosumnes River Blvd. and the new marketplace development.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
Freeport Regional Water Authority stated that some of the potential pipeline alignments presently under study by the Authority would follow the future extension of Cosumnes River Blvd. The Authority would suggest close coordination during the planning of the extensions, as there are also other project in the same general vicinity.	Written Response to NOP
The City of Sacramento, Public Works Department suggested that the impacts of other projects in the vicinity be evaluated with their impacts on the light rail extension.	Written Response to NOP
Safety	
One individual asked for a pedestrian over-crossing on Center Parkway at Cosumnes River Blvd., due to high school and middle school foot traffic. Middle school is year-round. There are 1,500 students at each school and about half of them have to cross this high-speed roadway.	Comment Card - April 11
One person asked if there are planned bikeways in the area.	Agency Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person stated that, during construction of Phase 1, construction workers left their equipment, tools etc. laying around, causing drains to plug and other problems for the area.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person asked if pedestrian safety could be increased if the Light rail was on ground level at Center Parkway with a pedestrian overcrossing. There are many kids in this area.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One resident asked what the security provisions would be for the stations and on the trains.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One resident expressed concern about parking and crime issues on residential streets.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1



Comment/Issues	Date/Meeting
Several comments were made about the need to give special care to the safety of children, especially in the areas where tracks are near schools.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person suggested a dedicated pedestrian overpass at Franklin so that pedestrians (especially school children) do not have to cross the tracks or deal with heavy traffic flow on the Boulevard on their way to school.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person stated that there is a need to protect privacy of homes and back yards adjacent to where the trains would run.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person asked if the train will cause any disruption to the roadways, vehicle travel, pedestrian flow, and the ability to walk to school.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person encouraged RT to add a pedestrian overcrossing.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One resident on Marshall Way had a safety incident while walking near the tracks at Freeport & 21st.	Telephone Information Line
Cosumnes River College would like RT to provide appropriate security at the station on Bruceville Road to ensure no negative effect on the campus.	Written Response to NOP
The City of Sacramento, Public Works Department suggests to RT that pedestrian circulation and safety needs to be evaluated for all station locations.	Written Response to NOP
Schedule	
One person was in favor of the Phase 2 extension to Calvine/Auberry intersection, followed by a next phase to Old Town Elk Grove. They also said adding another "leg" going South on Bruceville would be okay as long as the portion East of Highway 99 remains in the picture.	Comment Card - March 25
One person expressed disappointment that Phase 2 will be broken into two phases, increasing the length of the project time line.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
City of Elk Grove supported the Phase 2 extension and would like to see it come faster.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person stated the importance of making the citizens aware of the time frame for providing public comment.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One individual questioned the timing for construction.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person asked for information regarding Study and meeting dates	Telephone Information Line
One person wanted to know the location of the scoping meetings.	Telephone Information Line

Comment/Issues	Date/Meeting
Station Location	
One resident stated that there are a number of medical service facilities just North of the college. The resident encouraged a shuttle service from the College Station to either of the hospitals, or medical offices in the area.	Comment Card - April 11
One resident strongly supported the Phase 2 extension and the College Square Marketplace station location.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person asked if it was possible to modify the stop on the south side of where Detroit and Meadowview meet.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person stated that the Center Parkway station should not be optional because it has the highest pedestrian foot traffic due to density of residential area.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
One person stated that the Calvine/Auberry intersection station is an important facility, with lots of ridership potential.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
The City of Elk Grove said they are working on a General Plan right now and hopes to work with RT and to help light rail come to Elk Grove.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
One person asked if there would be enough space to place the Calvine/Auberry intersection station next to the middle school and high school.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
One person asked where the location of light rail on Cosumnes Blvd. would be.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
Southgate Park & Recreation District would like to speak with RT about the proposed station locations.	Telephone Information Line
One person did not agree with the Cosumnes River College station location because it would cause too much congestion.	Telephone Information Line
Cosumnes River College would prefer that the tracks and station be situated in the median of Bruceville Road.	Written Response to NOP
A staff member for Councilmember Robbie Waters suggested that RT should explore another stop for the south line in the area of Detroit Blvd./Delta Shores, due to the impressive future population numbers expected for this area.	Written Response to NOP
The Board of Valley-Hi Covenant Church, on behalf of its congregation, supported the Phase 2 extension. The church is located on Cosumnes River Blvd. and Center Parkway the Board would support a station being located near Center Parkway.	Written Response to NOP
One individual was interested in a station where the Union Pacific line crosses Morrison Creek.	Written Response to NOP

Comment/Issues	Date/Meeting
One individual, in support of the Light rail alternative, stated that stations at Cosumnes River College, Center Parkway and east of SR99 are very important for ridership. In regard to the Franklin Blvd. station, this individual encouraged RT to minimize any disruption resulting from floodplain control improvements, such as the future levee raising along Morrison Creek.	Written Response to NOP
Traffic	
A four-year resident of Elk Grove, who works in Downtown Sacramento, was concerned about current traffic problems in South Sacramento.	Comment Card - March 25
One person was in support of Sacramento's effort to aid their traffic problems by extending light rail, to Elk Grove. This person stressed that public transportation needs to be accessible, reliable and efficient in order to attract and maintain commuter riders.	Comment Card - March 25
A senior resident of Elk Grove was concerned about driving in traffic. SR99 is literally becoming a parking lot morning and night. It is imperative that accessible and affordable transportation be provided. Cost, pollution, and time are all reasons to have fast, efficient transportation downtown. We need massive rapid transit.	Comment Card - March 25
One person was concerned about the intersections and questioned whether RT was considering an increase in traffic in these studies.	Agency Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person expressed disappointment that the Sheldon road off ramp had not been improved. The interchange is virtually unusable.	Public Scoping Meeting - April 11
One person suggested that RT makes sure the design is not disruptive to existing traffic patterns.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One person asked if studies show that there would be any increase in traffic congestion. This person asked whether the Cosumnes River Blvd. extension, Cosumnes River Blvd. connecting to I-5 and SR99, and the I-5 extension would be enough to relieve future traffic congestion.	Community Leadership Meeting - May 1
One resident, who lives on 34th Avenue, questioned why bus route #81 is often late.	Telephone Information Line - 6/12
Sacramento Public Works Department encouraged RT to use the 2025 traffic volumes for design.	Stakeholder Interview
Cosumnes River College has concerns regarding the aesthetic nature of the flyover to accommodate the traffic issues at the corner of Cosumnes River Blvd. and Bruceville Road.	Written Response to NOP
The City of Sacramento, Public Works Department suggested that the grade crossings should be modeled using a traffic simulation model prior to the completion of the environmental document and for the City to review the model.	Written Response to NOP

Comment/Issues	Date/Meeting
The City of Sacramento, Public Works Department stated that the City's Traffic Division would need to review the Traffic Control Plans.	Written Response to NOP
One individual was concerned with the traffic situation that light rail would cause on Meadowview Road.	Written Response to NOP
Utility Interface	
One person would appreciate contact with the engineering group to discuss under ground telephone facilities existing along Old Calvine Road.	Comment Card - March 25
One person suggested that the PG&E line that runs along Bruceville Road needs to be recognized.	Public Scoping Meeting - March 25
The City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities suggested that if Phase 2 includes park-n-ride facilities, or if it engenders Transit Oriented Development, it could further overstress local drainage systems. They asked that RT work with them to plan and design mitigation measures, and, where necessary, cooperate with them on drainage improvement measures.	Written Response to NOP
The City of Sacramento, Department of Utilities stated that the proposed stations at Franklin and Cosumnes River College/College Square are both adjacent to the detention basins. RT needs to design these stations to avoid any encroachment onto the detention basins and access roadways.	Written Response to NOP
Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) would like RT to acknowledge the two sewer interceptors and the trunk sewer lines that are near portions of the railroad line. Suggests providing a buffer area between the project and the SRCSD and for RT to address the potential impacts to the biological resources of the Bufferlands. SRCSD would like each station to have a separate connection to the public sewer system and 20-30 feet easements for all sanitary sewer facilities.	Written Response to NOP

APPENDICES

