



**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**Sheldon/Wilton Working Group**  
**Meeting #1**  
**May 27, 2009**

**Sheldon/Wilton Working Group Members**

Richard Bisnett	Shirley Peters (absent)
June Coats	Russ Shields (absent)
Tom Franzoia (absent)	Tom Shine
Bill Kutzer	Barbara Washburn
Bill Myers (absent)	

Tom Zlotkowski, Executive Director, Capital SouthEast Connector  
Gene Endicott, Facilitator  
Michele McCormick, Facilitator (absent)  
Pam Johns, City of Elk Grove

**1) Welcome and Meeting Guidelines**

The meeting was held at the Connector office in Mather. The meeting was intended as a kick-off meeting to define and agree upon the group's role; clarify the process; and confirm the meeting schedule and topics the group would like covered. There was discussion about the agenda not being what members expected. Mr. Zlotkowski explained the need to put a framework and process in place to ensure the desired information is discussed and an outcome is reached by the group. This was a kick-off meeting; subject matter experts will participate in future meetings.

There was also discussion about confusion surrounding the meeting dates and locations for the group. Mr. Zlotkowski apologized for the confusion and confirmed that group members will receive meeting confirmations the Friday before each Wednesday meeting. The group requested an email list be shared, which will be compiled and distributed to the group within one week.

**2) Participant Agreement**

Mr. Zlotkowski provided each group member with a personalized copy of the participant agreement, including the dates of upcoming meetings. Members in attendance will pass along the agreement to members who were not able to attend the meeting. There were questions about one element of the agreement, and the group discussed the meaning of that element. It was decided that that element, number 7 on the agreement, would be rewritten and the agreement would be re-distributed to the group.

**3) Review and Approve Mission Statement**

A draft mission statement was shared with the group. It is intended to help define the group's role and anticipated output. There was discussion amongst the group about adding a section addressing the Connector Project's Purpose & Need Statement. The group is interested in learning more about the studies and modeling, specific to

population counts, land use and traffic, that were used in developing the proposed Connector Project. Mr. Zlotkowski noted that the broader review process will evaluate those studies in terms of the need for the project, and that the working group was envisioned as more of a solution-based process that uses community values to help determine alternative alignments to be assessed in the broader review process. Working group members and the greater community will have opportunities to participate in the environmental review process as it moves forward.

It was agreed that subject matter experts would help put the Purpose & Need Statement into context with the various alignments the group is interested in reviewing in greater detail. The group also recognized the need to evaluate information in the broader context of the region and different jurisdictions that likely have their own plans.

#### **4) Background Review**

Mr. Zlotkowski noted that members of the group are pretty familiar with the project and process it has gone through to this point. He reiterated that the group will act as a “litmus test” on issues for which more information needs to be gathered and shared with the greater community. He also noted that the group is a conduit to share information with the community.

The group asked why the Joint Powers Authority (JPA) that is leading the Connector Project was formed and why SACOG did not continue the development process. Mr. Zlotkowski explained that the JPA Board is acting in the same capacity the SACOG Board did, but in a more streamlined fashion. It didn't make sense, and was in fact inappropriate, for all participants in the regional SACOG organization to be making decisions on something that affected and was being funded by only five jurisdictions.

JPA staff, including Mr. Zlotkowski, and participants like the meeting group are further exploring and working to understand the project and issues. There has not yet been a decision on the best configuration for the Connector that will best fit community needs in the future, which is one of the things being evaluated. All of the information gathered through the process will be presented to the JPA Board, comprised of members from each of the five jurisdictions, that is the ultimate decision-making authority on the project.

#### **5) Review Community Values**

Two presentation boards listed all of the Community Values that were shared at the April 20 community meeting, and those that were selected as most important at the May 18 meeting. Mr. Zlotkowski suggested a matrix be developed to determine what issues go along with each community value and determine what subject matter expert the group would like to hear from on that issue/value. The chart would also help the group evaluate the alternative alignments they will discuss, to show visually what alignment(s) are preferable based on the top-ranked community values.

The group noted that a similar effort was used with the City of Elk Grove's Rural Roads policy development process, where that group was able to see what would happen if different options were implemented.

The group is most interested in learning more and hearing from subject matter experts about traffic, population predictions and land use. The group brainstormed possible speakers for future meetings to help plan the meeting series.

#### **6) Define the Nature of “Alternatives”**

The group was asked to select six alternative alignments to consider in greater depth and hear about from experts. There was much discussion about the various alternatives that have been developed through the process thus far, and which to focus the group's attention on. The six selected alternatives were:

1. Grant Line Road
2. “Baby Bypass”
3. Bradshaw Road
4. Distributive Alternative (pushing traffic to existing roads such as Bradshaw, Calvine, etc.)
5. Floodplain “edge”
6. Floodplain “big” (green/white routes on Sheldon alternatives map)

In future meetings, the group will perform qualitative analysis on the alternatives based on the top-ranked community values and information gathered from the subject matter experts.

#### **7) Design the Plan for the Meeting Series**

The proposed meeting schedule was agreed to by the group: meeting every other Wednesday until the end of August, with a break around the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. The group decided to change the meeting time to 5:00-7:00 p.m. to allow more group members to participate, and to continue holding the meetings at the Connector office.

The group requested the next meeting focus on population projections, traffic modeling and land use.

*\*This is an annotated version of the notes transcribed during the meeting. More detailed notes are available upon request.*