

MEETING SUMMARY
Sheldon/Wilton Working Group
Meeting #6
August 12, 2009

Sheldon/Wilton Working Group Members

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

Tom Zlotkowski, Executive Director, Capital SouthEast Connector
Gene Endicott, Facilitator (absent)
Michele McCormick, Facilitator
Pam Johns, Resource Consultant (absent)
Sara Eisenberg, Meeting Scribe

Subject Matter Experts

John Long, DKS
Vicki Axiaq, ICF Jones & Stokes
Bob Cermak, Parsons Brinkerhoff
Kathy Wickam, Parsons Brinkerhoff

1) Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was held at the Connector JPA office in Mather. Group members, consultants and experts introduced themselves. Members of the group clarified a few points included in the previous meeting summary. Updates will be made and a revised copy distributed to the group.

2) Review of July 29 Meeting: Bypass Typical Section and Cost Estimate

The list of issues to be addressed in the environmental process, mentioned by Mrs. Washburn in the last meeting, was shared with the group. It was agreed that the list would be covered later in the meeting while addressing the evaluation matrix.

Mr. Cermak provided a recap of the last meeting's discussion of two alignment alternatives for a bypass through the Sheldon-Wilton area. The two alignment alternatives, each with three lanes (one in each direction and a passing lane), begin at the same point and terminate at different places, with lengths of seven and nine miles. Cost estimates for each alternative alignment were shared, and Richard Shepard of the City of Elk Grove (who was unable to attend this meeting) provided feedback, which PB incorporated into some revisions. For cost information, three alternative structure types were studied and the typical cross-sections of these alternatives were provided to the group with technical details of the construction of each.

The group asked whether either construction alternative (with support piers closer together or farther away) would offer measurable performance differences in the

floodplain. There was discussion of whether the same square footage of water storage that would be removed from the floodplain because of the bypass would need to be replaced. The group also raised the question of FEMA guidelines for structures in floodplains and how flood modeling is done to determine how a bypass would affect the area during a flood event. Mr. Cermak noted that any bypass option would need to have those questions included in its evaluation, along with potential impacts on water levels, hydrology and a variety of other elements.

Ms. Axiaq asked if the cross-sections and plans take a drainage system into account, and there was discussion of various options to manage roadway runoff (collecting, storing, treating and releasing runoff) as well as systems available to manage runoff. The group also discussed lighting options, including lighting fixtures that may be incorporated into the railing instead of standard street lighting. Ms. Axiaq reiterated that lighting fixtures can have impacts both on the community and native habitat.

The group also discussed the proposed elevation of a bypass, citing concerns that the height be adequate to accommodate farming vehicles. Mr. Cermak noted nothing has been designed yet, but said allowances could be made in areas to allow access for farm vehicles. Design elements and noise impacts were other discussion points, with questions on signalization, grade separations, barrier height and how to attenuate traffic noise. Mr. Zlotkowski noted there are options to address each of those concerns.

By taking into account the request at the last meeting to narrow the footprint of the bypass and Mr. Shepard's input, the cost estimate for the bypass alternatives was reduced. The group raised the question of where the significant cost of realigning Sheldon is included in estimates. Mr. Cermak and Mr. Zlotkowski noted that much of that cost would be classified under redevelopment or mitigation, not construction, so it was not reflected in these cost estimates.

The group also raised the question of purchasing development rights so the area around the Connector could be treated as a conservation area, with the idea of minimizing negative impacts and preserving/enhancing existing natural resources. Mr. Zlotkowski noted there are funds set aside specifically for preserving and protecting the Cosumnes River floodplain area, with the specifics to be defined by the Connector Board when that stage of the project approaches.

Mr. Zlotkowski suggested the group continue to review the information from PB and provide feedback or questions to Mr. Cermak. He noted that the bypass proposal is more feasible than the tunnel proposal in terms of cost. He asked the group to think of other items they would like more information on and contact him so PB can gather the information before the next meeting.

3) Bradshaw Road Alternative

Mr. Cermak reviewed the highlights of the proposed Bradshaw Road alternative for the Connector. It would be a six-lane improvement with some potential restrictions for intersections and some expressway elements. Mr. Long of DKS Associates reviewed the traffic modeling for this alternative.

Mr. Long noted the challenges involved in roadway work near Highway 99 because there are a variety of Specific Plans that have been approved but not yet built. Those plans include intersections and other roadway elements that would not fit with plans for

the Connector. He reviewed some of the specifics of what would happen on Bradshaw Road with improvements that are currently planned under the General Plan and various Specific Plans, and touched upon the modeling. According to modeling, building the Connector on the Bradshaw Road alternative would make some improvements at each end but not much would change in the middle—the roadway would still be congested, as it is now.

The group asked various questions about this proposed alignment and what effects the modeling shows for Grant Line Road with a Bradshaw Road Connector route. Mr. Long noted that origin destinations are different for travelers on Grant Line Road and Bradshaw Road, and that a Connector route on Bradshaw Road would likely not relieve enough traffic on Grant Line Road to make much of a difference to Sheldon. There was much discussion about the travel models used to predict future volumes, including peak travel times, and Mr. Long noted some sensitivity analysis is included, though it's too speculative to predict future human behavior (telecommuting, etc.).

Mr. Long reiterated that models show there is an ultimate six-lane demand on Grant Line Road near Sheldon, closer to 2045. He felt a four-lane Grant Line Road would satisfy demand for many years, but noted that other roadways would need to follow the modified design presented earlier in the process for the system to work smoothly.

The group agreed that the Bradshaw Road alternative was less likely to be chosen due to a variety of issues, and asked how things like existing driveway access on Grant Line Road would be addressed. Mr. Long said likely solutions would be a closed median so driveway ingress and egress is solely through right turns, with control at multiple signalized intersections.

Mr. Zlotkowski asked the group to keep in mind that an alternative cannot be dismissed without technically validated reasons. It must be evaluated on the same matrix, with the same criteria as the other options. Ms. Axiaq noted there are more environmental considerations with Bradshaw Road than with any other alternative, including more stream crossings, the highest acreage of wetlands, a large cluster of vernal pools, critical habitat for two species and a large number of observed species. The group agreed to not spend additional time on the analysis of the Bradshaw alternative as part of their current scope of work.

4) Development of Matrix Evaluation Criteria for Rating Alternatives

The group began its discussion of the evaluation matrix with a brief discussion of the environmental issues list provided by Mrs. Washburn. Mr. Washburn noted the list contains principle-type issues to address when evaluating alternatives, which members of the group seconded as being helpful to keep in mind. Some specific questions were posed, and Mr. Zlotkowski reminded the group that everything on the list will be evaluated and studied in the environmental review process. He asked Ms. Axiaq to review the list, check in with Mrs. Washburn and report back at the next meeting.

Mr. Cermak reiterated the reason for developing the evaluation matrix: that the intent of the group is to conclude the Working Group process with some recommendations that can be made to the Board for preferred alternatives through Sheldon. He reviewed the proposed matrix and listed each alignment to be evaluated as well as the criteria. The main categories listed were:

- **Environmental Impacts**
- **Community Impacts**
- **Traffic Impacts**
- **Cost**

The group had additions to both the alignments and criteria, which will be reflected in the next iteration of the matrix. Air quality was a big concern, which will be included though both Mr. Long and Ms. Axiaq noted it will be difficult to pin down exact information for the area because air quality is considered a regional issue. There was agreement that the social impact of the Connector should be included; with potential business losses comes loss of meeting space, community interaction and local business support for activities.

There was discussion of including the distributive option, which the group agreed not to do, because it does not meet the projected need even with the improvements included in various General Plans. The group also discussed creating hybrid alignments, combining the best of, for example, two possible alternatives. Mr. Zlotkowski noted that is possible.

The group discussed how their recommendations would be presented to the Board. Some members were concerned about usurping the Board's authority without having full and complete information from the environmental studies, while others were concerned about recommending a proposed alignment while leaving the door open for a wider right-of-way acquisition.

The group wants to be sure a few questions are "top of mind" when looking at the alternatives: Does whatever we're recommending help or hurt Sheldon? Does it have a real, negative impact on this rural residential area where we're trying to preserve our quality of life? Is there a negative impact on the floodplain and environment? Will it force traffic onto Dillard Road and others, eventually turning them into what Grant Line Road is now?

Mr. Zlotkowski reiterated that the group needs to develop a maximum of one primary and one secondary alignment recommendation, each with a defined set of parameters. Mr. Cermak noted the technical experts would gather information relevant to the listed and new criteria for the alignments and bring it back to the group for evaluation. He also recommended creating a relative measure for an evaluation scale.

5) Working Group Report on Community Coverage

Mr. Zlotkowski shared with the group an Elk Grove map of known homeowner's associations and asked them to mark off the areas covered by their efforts to communicate with neighbors and their associations. The JPA wants to be sure to communicate with the entire community but doesn't want to duplicate efforts of Working Group members. The group provided feedback about the geographic areas they represent and are sharing information with.

Representatives from different areas, including both Wilton and Sheldon, shared what they believe to be the prevailing sentiments about the project. The group noted the importance of information sharing and gathering with farmers to be sure their concerns are understood. The Working Group wants to be able to reassure the community that the studies will be fair and comprehensive.

6) Community Workshop

The JPA is planning to host another community meeting when the Working Group meetings are concluded. The JPA expects Working Group members will help drive attendance at and participation in the meeting. The group agreed another community meeting is important and requested some information be given to Working Group members before the meeting that they would be able to distribute to people to encourage them to attend. The group is concerned the community may be tired of meetings about the project because it has been going on for such a long time. The group also recommended the JPA contact the Elk Grove Citizen about what the Working Group has done and when the community meeting will take place.

7) Next Meeting

The next meeting date is being confirmed, but will likely be September 1 from 5:00-7:30 p.m. at the Connector JPA office. Discussion at the next meeting will focus on the evaluation matrix, layout and methodology with more information from the technical experts. Working Group members can expect to receive additional information from the technical expert team in advance of the next meeting to begin evaluation.

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