

Summary of Work on Sheldon/Wilton Community Work Group (CWG)

June Coats, Sheldon Community Association
Barbara Washburn, Wilton Action Group

Overview of Work

- ❑ Guiding Set of Values
- ❑ Review of Traffic Data and Other Analysis
- ❑ Review of Environmental Issues
- ❑ Selection of a limited number of alternatives
- ❑ Recommendations for Future Steps

Purpose of the CWG

- ❑ Explore the values and factors that the community considers of primary importance to its future
- ❑ Examine prospective Connector routes
- ❑ Select a limited number of Sheldon-area alternatives for further examination and review in the EIR/EIS process
- ❑ Our primary goal was to represent communities' interest.

Consideration of Community Values and Ideas

- Based on 2 previous community meetings the following 5 values were ranked at the top of the list:
 - Preserve rural and historic character of Sheldon
 - Preserve area's riparian ecosystem
 - Preserve open space, wildlife habitat and ag uses
 - Protect the floodplain
 - Control growth in the project area

- Other suggestions or ideas??

Review of Traffic Data

- JPA staff/consultants presented data on traffic projects on which the need for the Connector are based
 - Residential/commercial land uses currently identified in the general plan of regional communities served as basis for need
 - Project jobs & housing data from SACOG also used, projected out to 2045
 - Projections suggest traffic would double along Grantline in the Sheldon area by 2035.

Uncertainty regarding Traffic Projections

- ❑ Changes in working patterns (telecommuting)
- ❑ Changes in commuting patterns (public transportation & GPS)
- ❑ Changes in population projections, in light of economic reset caused by recession
- ❑ **Great uncertainty involved in projecting needs to 2045**

- ❑ More analysis needed
- ❑ CWG favors a 'phased implementation' of Connector, based on shorter time-frames where greater certainty in the need is better known

Environmental Issues

- Discussions with consultants
 - Focused on processes issues primarily
 - Raised idea of least environmentally damaging practical alternative (LEDPA)
- Issues identified – special concern regarding proximity to Cosumnes River/Deer Creek
 - Sensitive species – salmon, hawk, oak woodlands, many “listed” species
 - Contaminants
 - Invasive species carried on trucks
 - Noise
 - Lighting
 - Hydrological alterations

Developing Alternatives

- ❑ Discussed alternatives at general membership meetings and community meetings.
- ❑ Had discussions with business owners in Sheldon
- ❑ Developed conceptual alternatives

Preferred Approach

- Community-based No Build (preferred by all community organizations)
 - Keep Grantline as an Elk Grove road, not part of the Connector project.
 - If/when expansion necessary, should be based on Rural Roads Policy of Elk Grove
 - Based on traffic “triggers”
 - Intersection expansion and/or signalization occurs first
 - Road widening follows when need is demonstrated

Alternatives 1 & 2

- Alternatives we thought would minimize economic, social, and environmental damages
 - Bypass
 - 4 Lane Grantline with Community Preservation Measures

Alternative #1

- 4 Lane Grantline with Community Preservation (proposed by WAG)
 - Expand Grantline to 4 lanes, preserving the right of way for 6 lanes should they become necessary in the future. Reduce access to G.L.
 - Develop a system of alternative roads to service residences and businesses with goal of maintaining commercial viability. Develop it as a destination place. Embark on a 'redevelopment project' for Sheldon businesses.

Alternative #2

- Bypass through the Floodplain (Proposed by SCA & GSREHA)
 - Wide swing around Sheldon running between Cosumnes & Deer Creek
 - No ingress/egress once on bypass
 - Elevated above floodplain depth to permit wildlife passage and farming
 - Would require advanced stormwater management measures

Need for Scoping

- 2 alternatives are primarily conceptual at this point
- Need for more details from community and technical consultants
 - Discussions with business owners, landowners, and farmers to examine and explore various options
- These alternatives and the Community-based No Build should be evaluated in the EIR.

- Recommend an experienced consultant be hired who would work with the community for about 6 months to explore all relevant issues.

Conclusions

- ❑ CWG sought to understand need for project - questions remain
- ❑ Suggested alternatives that would minimize social, economic, and/or environmental damage of project
- ❑ Strongly recommend an in-depth scoping process to 'put some meat on the bones' of the 3 alternatives.
- ❑ Appreciate the opportunity provided by JPA to offer our suggestions and provide input.