

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRANSCRIPTION OF THE PUBLIC COMMENTS MADE
AT THE PUBLIC MEETING REGARDING
THE ELK GROVE INTERMODAL RAIL STATION PROJECT

---o0o---

ELK GROVE, CALIFORNIA
JULY 10, 2008

Reported by:
STEPHANIE D. PLASKETT
CSR No. 9799
Job No. 60207

□

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Thursday, July 10,
2 2008, commencing at the hour of 6:00 p.m., at the
3 CITY OF ELK GROVE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 8400 Laguna
4 Palms Way, Elk Grove, California, the Public Meeting to
5 hear public comments on the proposed Elk Grove
6 Intermodal Rail Station Project was reported by me,
7 STEPHANIE E. PLASKETT, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in
8 the State of California; and the following are the
9 comments made by members of the public:

10 MELISSA LOGUE: So at this point, I'd like to
11 open the floor to public comments. Before we start --

12 SARAH JOHNSON: well, I do have one question.
13 How long do you anticipate the construction
14 period to be?

15 GARY GRUNWALD: I think they can do it in one
16 season. It's probably seven months. I just -- I want
17 to look at the bridge details. That's the only -- we're
18 looking at possibly a precast bridge or a cast in place.
19 Either way, I really think they can get it done in one
20 season.

21 I think we have Giant Garter Snake concerns.
22 So that's May to October.

23 MELISSA LOGUE: we do have limitations on when
24 we can construct for Giant Garter Snakes.

25 GARY GRUNWALD: Yeah. So that may -- it may go

2

□

1 into a second season. That's part of what the
2 consultant is gonna tell us.

3 SARAH JOHNSON: well, is it -- I was mainly

4 interested in, you know, what the neighbors around there
5 could anticipate in terms of time frame. Mostly, I know
6 that you've received comments from the Laguna Creek
7 watershed Council and from the Trails Committee, and I'm
8 sure that there -- they cover everything that I would
9 say about those things, but we are concerned about the
10 creek and about the trail connection. And that's a very
11 important component of this whole thing.

12 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay. Well, tell you what, why
13 don't we -- why don't we have you stand up and provide
14 comments, or if you want to write them down for us, if
15 you're not comfortable standing up tonight --

16 MR. GRUNWALD: I think that was it. Right? Is
17 that your only comment, Sarah, or you got -- go ahead,
18 Melissa. I'm sorry.

19 MELISSA LOGUE: Yeah. And maybe you could
20 elaborate what you mean by concerned by the creek and
21 the bridge. So we'll -- I'll ask you to hold that for
22 comments.

23 So for the comments, Stephanie is here
24 recording everything we say. So she will get everything
25 accurately recorded of what your comments are. So rest

3

□

1 assured that we're hearing every word.

2 If you wish to speak tonight, I will ask that
3 you fill out a speaker card for us. I know it's a
4 little formal for this small of a group, but what it
5 gives us is your name and your contact information so we

6 know how to spell everything when we put it into the
7 public record. And then we also know how to contact you
8 when the final document is prepared.

9 I will send you a notice letting you know that
10 that's available to you, and you could see how we
11 addressed your comments in the final document.

12 But if you give us your address or your contact
13 information, we're not gonna sell it to anyone; it's
14 just for me to be able to contact you.

15 GARY GRUNWALD: Does that conclude your
16 questions or --

17 MELISSA LOGUE: We -- are your questions on
18 design of the project or --

19 STEVE DETRICK: I have a question that would be
20 tied in with Public Works.

21 When you show the sidewalk terminating on the
22 south end of the project, is there any plans to tie that
23 in to the -- basically the entrance of Canyon Passage?

24 GARY GRUNWALD: A good question. Yeah, I think
25 we have to. I think we've got to get that across the

□

1 railroad tracks.

2 STEVE DETRICK: I think it's a must.

3 GARY GRUNWALD: Yeah, yeah. I -- I --

4 STEVE DETRICK: It doesn't show it on your
5 plans --

6 GARY GRUNWALD: No, it doesn't.

7 STEVE DETRICK: -- but I know this is probably
8 a draft plan.

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08

9 GARY GRUNWALD: It's a conceptual -- yeah,
10 that's a very good question. We've got to make -- we've
11 got to complete that to the south end, pedestrian
12 access, because if we don't do it, there's not gonna be
13 a small, little development project that's gonna finish
14 it up. That's why I look -- good question. Yeah, we
15 will tie that in. We have to.

16 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay. So it says on here every
17 speaker is gonna be given three minutes. I'm scrubbing
18 that because we do have a small enough group. There's
19 no need to limit to give everyone a chance to speak.
20 So, you know, you do have an opportunity to say your
21 piece. Although, I will encourage folks to make it
22 brief so we can get home and have dinner eventually. So
23 three, four, five minutes would be great to focus your
24 comments.

25 Everyone who wishes to speak has the

5

□

1 opportunity. So I welcome anybody to stand up if you're
2 brave enough tonight.

3 If you're not brave enough tonight, we will
4 accept written comments until July 25th. I have comment
5 cards in the back. If you would like to jot something
6 down tonight, you could give them to me at the end of
7 the meeting or you could mail them in later or you could
8 send me a letter that you wrote on your computer.
9 whatever works for you, give me your comments written,
10 and I'll take them in all forms.

11 And, again, all of our comments will be
12 responded to in the final MND.

13 So I'll -- I'll open it up to whoever would
14 like to provide comments on the MND at this time.

15 TOM RUSSELL: I have a question -- two
16 questions on this.

17 The trail crossing and -- you're gonna go
18 underneath the tracks?

19 GARY GRUNWALD: Yeah.

20 TOM RUSSELL: Well, that's only for a partial
21 year.

22 GARY GRUNWALD: Right.

23 TOM RUSSELL: But other than that, it's
24 flooded.

25 GARY GRUNWALD: Right.

□

1 TOM RUSSELL: So will there be a track level or
2 a ground level crossing also for bicycles during the wet
3 period?

4 GARY GRUNWALD: I don't know right now. We can
5 run that by UP, but the goal is, when we -- when we put
6 that trail underneath, that we put some sort of wall in
7 there, a waterproof wall, so that it will be usable for
8 most of the year; maybe some years, all of the year
9 depending on the winter.

10 How high does Whitehouse Creek get up there?
11 Does it -- I imagine sometimes it gets all the way --

12 TOM RUSSELL: It can get -- you know, depending
13 on the rain that comes in.

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08

14 GARY GRUNWALD: Right.

15 TOM RUSSELL: If we get a real downpour, it
16 will get pretty full. Other than that, it's basically
17 half full --

18 GARY GRUNWALD: Is it?

19 TOM RUSSELL: -- during the mid-winter.

20 GARY GRUNWALD: See, I think we could design
21 around that. I really think we could put a wall around
22 there.

23 To answer, I don't know yet. The goal is to
24 make it all weather, definitely all weather; not like
25 some other places where they use a bike trail maybe as

7

□

1 a -- it's a detention basin half the year. But that's
2 the goal, to make it all year round.

3 Of course, in a hundred year flood or something
4 like that, there's no way.

5 STEVE DETRICK: It depends on the beavers, too.

6 GARY GRUNWALD: Do you have beaver activity
7 down there as well?

8 TOM RUSSELL: Oh, yeah.

9 SARAH JOHNSON: Yeah.

10 TOM RUSSELL: Don't tell the City.

11 GARY GRUNWALD: So it backs up -- is it right
12 in Camden there so it -- I mean, because it's pretty dry
13 right now.

14 SARAH JOHNSON: Everything's dry right now.

15 GARY GRUNWALD: Right, right.

16 TOM RUSSELL: Whitehouse Creek does dry up in
17 the summertime.

18 GARY GRUNWALD: Okay.

19 TOM RUSSELL: But it flows in the wintertime.

20 GARY GRUNWALD: Okay. So that is the goal.

21 And I don't -- I just flat don't know, as far as grade
22 crossing, just -- my guess would be -- it would be
23 really tough to get a new grade crossing.

24 TOM RUSSELL: For safety reasons, I could see
25 why.

8

□

1 GARY GRUNWALD: Right.

2 TOM RUSSELL: But those times of -- when people
3 are trying to get there and they can't, you know --

4 GARY GRUNWALD: Right.

5 TOM RUSSELL: -- you've got something that goes
6 down and it's filled up with water, now you got to drive
7 two miles --

8 GARY GRUNWALD: Right.

9 TOM RUSSELL: -- around to get to the station.

10 GARY GRUNWALD: Exactly.

11 How quickly does it go down?

12 MELISSA LOGUE: Actually, Gary, I might
13 suggest --

14 GARY GRUNWALD: Yeah. I'm sorry.

15 MELISSA LOGUE: -- that this is exactly the
16 kind of design detail information that would be great to
17 have a focused conversation with Gary from now on maybe
18 after we've taken your comments on the MND.

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08

19 So if we could maybe focus on -- your comments
20 on the MND, get us through the CEQA process --

21 GARY GRUNWALD: Thanks, Melissa.

22 MELISSA LOGUE: -- and if you want to have
23 design detail discussions, we could kind of do that
24 offline. You know?

25 SHIRLEY PETERS: I have some questions.

9

□

1 First of all, you said a minimum of 100 parking
2 spaces.

3 GARY GRUNWALD: Right.

4 SHIRLEY PETERS: And what -- what do you expect
5 when it's built out? How many parking spaces?

6 MELISSA LOGUE: I'm sorry, ma'am. What's your
7 name?

8 SHIRLEY PETER: Shirley Peters. Here you are.

9 MELISSA LOGUE: Oh, okay. Thank you.

10 GARY GRUNWALD: We don't -- to be honest, all
11 our funding was predicated on starting with a minimum of
12 100 parking spaces. We didn't do any models or anything
13 like that to see where we might end up in the future.
14 We really have no way of knowing how many trains will go
15 through, how busy it's gonna be. Yeah.

16 SHIRLEY PETERS: Okay.

17 GARY GRUNWALD: And that's a good question.
18 You know, we could -- we could -- we'll answer that
19 better in the environmental document.

20 SHIRLEY PETERS: Now, I have a copy of this

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08
21 thanks to you. And in this, they have the mitigation
22 only for construction. I don't see mitigations for
23 anything else. Is that because everything is -- is all
24 right?

25 MELISSA LOGUE: If you review the document,

10

□

1 you'll see --

2 SHIRLEY PETERS: Which I did.

3 MELISSA LOGUE: Yeah.

4 -- you'll see that for every impact that we've
5 identified as potentially significant, then we provide
6 mitigation for it to reduce that -- that significant
7 impact.

8 SHIRLEY PETERS: Have you written that in here?
9 I hadn't seen --

10 MELISSA LOGUE: Yes, ma'am. Yeah, you should
11 see it at the beginning of each checklist --

12 SHIRLEY PETERS: Okay.

13 MELISSA LOGUE: -- question, each discussion.
14 There will be a statement that says, "If an impact is
15 considered potentially significant, less than
16 significant with mitigation incorporated, less than
17 significant or no impact."

18 For any of the impacts where we've -- yeah,
19 where it starts out as already determined to be less
20 than significant or no impact, we've not proposed
21 mitigation, because if it's already less than
22 significant or no impact, you know, it follows logically
23 that there wouldn't be a need to --

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08

24 SHIRLEY PETERS: My question --

25 MELISSA LOGUE: -- provide mitigation.

11

□

1 SHIRLEY PETERS: Thank you.

2 My question is this: If you don't know how
3 many cars will be there, you really don't know how the
4 air will be affected, as far as the ultimate build out.
5 You also don't really know how much the noise will be.
6 Because I'm sure, when this grows, there's gonna be
7 problems with that. And there's no plans for future
8 mitigation for those; is that correct?

9 MELISSA LOGUE: If -- if that's how you're
10 reading the document --

11 SHIRLEY PETERS: Uh-huh.

12 MELISSA LOGUE: Yeah. And that's --

13 SHIRLEY PETERS: Because he said "minimum
14 parking."

15 MELISSA LOGUE: Yeah. This is exactly the kind
16 of comment I'm looking for on the environmental
17 document. If you feel that, you know, we've not
18 addressed impacts for -- you know, haven't discussed
19 potential impacts in the future and therefore haven't
20 provided sufficient mitigation, then -- then that's the
21 kind of statement that I'm looking for.

22 SHIRLEY PETERS: Also, on page 49, in Part 3,
23 it says, "No impact. The City does not at present have
24 an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community
25 Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or

□

1 state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, there would
2 be no impact."

3 Is that how some of these things are
4 determined?

5 MELISSA LOGUE: Yes. If you -- and how the
6 environmental document works is -- is you'll see that
7 there is a series of kind of questions that we ask
8 ourselves. And in that particular case, the question is
9 posed, would the project conflict with an adopted
10 habitat conservation plan, and then we provide a
11 response to that particular question.

12 SHIRLEY PETERS: And since I don't have one --

13 MELISSA LOGUE: Since we don't have one, we
14 can't conflict with it, therefore there's no impact.

15 SHIRLEY PETERS. Okay. This won't go through
16 the commission again, will it, the Planning Commission?

17 MELISSA LOGUE: Actually, yeah, the
18 environmental document doesn't go through the Planning
19 Commission. It will go through City Council.

20 SHIRLEY PETERS: So it will bypass the
21 commission?

22 MELISSA LOGUE: Correct, yeah.

23 SHIRLEY PETERS: Because it's already a done
24 deal in that respect?

25 MELISSA LOGUE: No, not -- no, not necessarily.

□

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08

1 It's just -- because it's a Public works project,
2 it's -- the channels for approval go through the City
3 Council rather than the Planning Commission. So they're
4 the approving body.

5 If the City Council either, you know, feels
6 that the environmental document was not adequate or, for
7 whatever other reason, doesn't wish to approve the
8 project, then that's their -- their determination to
9 make.

10 SHIRLEY PETERS: Also, in this, it describes
11 what is built around this property, the potential.
12 We're on ag/res, and we're not too far away. So there's
13 been no consideration or not even reference to ag/res.
14 And I know and you know that ag/res should have buffers.
15 It should have less gradation of fewer density -- less
16 density. And it seems as though this is just plopped
17 right in here. Whereas, we're not too far away from
18 that.

19 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay.

20 SHIRLEY PETERS: Now, is this a thousand feet
21 you're supposed to look at, or what's going on with
22 that? Because our ag/res is -- it's very delicate. We
23 raise animals and things like that. And the noise and
24 the air, even though you say there's no impact, it can
25 require -- it could cause a lot of problem with animals

14

□

1 and people.

2 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay. Very good. I appreciate

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08

3 that comment.

4 SHIRLEY PETERS: Okay. So you won't answer it?

5 MELISSA LOGUE: Yeah. I'm here to take your
6 comments. I can respond to questions. I won't be able
7 to respond to comments tonight, but I will respond to
8 them in the final environmental document.

9 SHIRLEY PETERS: So we just came here to hear,
10 listen?

11 MELISSA LOGUE: Yeah. You're here to give us
12 your thoughts and your critique of the environmental
13 document.

14 SHIRLEY PETERS: But my questions should be
15 answered before I give my thoughts.

16 I'll talk to you, Gary.

17 Okay. That's about it.

18 MELISSA LOGUE: Very good.

19 And we have --

20 SHIRLEY PETERS: Oh, one more thing. We don't
21 agree that it should be in that place. Although it is.
22 We feel it should be closer to the middle of the town.
23 The village concept in the '80s was created in that
24 people would start with the high density, and then as
25 you gradually go further, it becomes lighter densities

15

□

1 and so on.

2 And the -- the transit for people to go
3 downtown and everywhere should be in the center so
4 people can go there, rather than out here on

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08
5 Elk Grove Florin Road, closer to the shopping center;
6 which, to me, makes more sense.

7 So I just want to put that in writing.

8 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay.

9 SHIRLEY PETERS: Also, the -- the plans for the
10 new shopping center had started. And that would be a
11 perfect time to say, "Okay, within these plans, there's
12 going to be a railroad station." So that the people who
13 may live around there -- because I know there's going to
14 be development for residential there -- will know it's
15 there. Rather than having the people who live in one
16 place, and then all of this is starting to crowd them
17 out.

18 GARY GRUNWALD: Just for clarification --

19 SHIRLEY PETERS: And that is called good
20 planning.

21 GARY GRUNWALD: What shopping center?

22 SHIRLEY PETERS: The new one that's coming up.
23 (Overlapping voices.)

24 MELISSA LOGUE: Oh, Promenade? The Promenade
25 Mall?

16

□

1 SHIRLEY PETERS: Right.

2 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay. Very good. Well --

3 SHIRLEY PETERS: So that is -- that is just
4 starting, and would you find -- you could create
5 something really good there that isn't crowded or
6 anything. And it would -- it would be more fair --
7 fairer to people who would look to say, "Oh, well, I

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08

8 might live there. And this depot is gonna be close by.
9 well, that's all right," or, "I might live there, and I
10 don't want to live close to a depot, so I'm gonna look
11 elsewhere." And that's what I'm saying.

12 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay.

13 SHIRLEY PETERS: One more question.

14 Is this a commuter train, or what is it?

15 MELISSA LOGUE: Gary, could you speak to that?
16 It's the Amtrak San Joaquin line.

17 GARY GRUNWALD: Currently, I would call it an
18 inner city -- the schedule is more of an inner city.
19 There's two trains -- there's two trains in the morning,
20 I believe, and two in the afternoon -- or, I'm sorry,
21 yeah, two -- one in each direction in the morning and
22 one in each direction in the afternoon.

23 SHIRLEY PETERS: So if I wanted to go to Old
24 Town, would I be able to?

25 GARY GRUNWALD: Old Town Sacramento?

17

□

1 SHIRLEY PETERS: Old Town Elk Grove.

2 GARY GRUNWALD: Old Town Elk Grove?

3 SHIRLEY PETERS: Would I be able to take short
4 trips within my own community?

5 GARY GRUNWALD: Not on -- not on this line,
6 not -- no, you wouldn't.

7 SHIRLEY PETERS: Okay. If I wanted to go to
8 Galt, would that happen?

9 GARY GRUNWALD: Currently, Galt does not have a

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08
10 station that I am aware of. Now, Lodi does have a
11 station.

12 SHIRLEY PETERS: Lodi does?

13 GARY GRUNWALD: Yeah.

14 SHIRLEY PETERS: Because the neighbors have
15 written e-mails and are asking me these kind of
16 questions.

17 GARY GRUNWALD: I got it.

18 SHIRLEY PETERS: So if I'm going to Sacramento,
19 where can I go with this train?

20 GARY GRUNWALD: well, if you are going -- oh,
21 from Sacramento?

22 MELISSA LOGUE: No, from here to Sacramento.

23 GARY GRUNWALD: To Sacramento. Right --
24 currently, if there was a stop here, your next stop
25 would be Sacramento to the north, and currently --

18

□

1 SHIRLEY PETERS: In the depot there?

2 GARY GRUNWALD: Yeah, to the depot there.

3 And then your next stop to the south would be
4 in Lodi.

5 SHIRLEY PETERS: Uh-huh. Okay. So it isn't
6 something for an inner city -- like going into
7 Elk Grove --

8 GARY GRUNWALD: You mean like -- more like a
9 transit type thing?

10 SHIRLEY PETERS: Yeah. If I wanted to go
11 shopping to this new mall or something.

12 GARY GRUNWALD: Yeah. It -- it -- no, I don't

13 think it would ever be used for that.

14 SHIRLEY PETERS: And what kind of security are
15 they looking there? I got an e-mail from another --

16 GARY GRUNWALD: Yeah.

17 SHIRLEY PETERS: -- neighbor, and they said
18 that they used to go to somewhere. I don't remember
19 where she mentioned. And when she got back, several of
20 the cars had just this skeleton standing there.

21 GARY GRUNWALD: Stockton was notorious for
22 that. We have to get with law enforcement. Again,
23 that's a detail, whether or not we'd have a staff there
24 or surveillance cameras. But it's got to be safe and --

25 SHIRLEY PETERS: That must be considered, yeah.

19

□

1 GARY GRUNWALD: Yeah.

2 Actually, part of the design -- well, I'm
3 getting into more detail than I need to, but --

4 SHIRLEY PETERS: Yeah.

5 GARY GRUNWALD: -- the design is really --
6 we've changed that design somewhat to make it safer.
7 There was a leg going off to the north, but it was --
8 there was concern that it would be hidden too much.

9 So safety is always on our mind, as you know
10 from maybe too much, but it is. Safety is always a big
11 concern and --

12 SHIRLEY PETERS: And then our neighbors are
13 very concerned with what this -- it's a magnet for
14 certain kind of people who are vagrants, and they're

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08
15 concerned with that also.

16 GARY GRUNWALD: I don't know how to respond to
17 that other than, you know, a vagrant can go anywhere.

18 SHIRLEY PETERS: Oh, well.

19 GARY GRUNWALD: No, no. I think we -- that's
20 an enforcement issue and maybe a design issue. That's
21 something that we're gonna have to address. And point
22 well taken.

23 SHIRLEY PETERS: All right. Thank you.

24 MELISSA LOGUE: Well, thank you for your
25 comments, Ms. Peters. I appreciate that.

20

□

1 I also have a speaker from Steve. And have you
2 already provided your comments?

3 STEVE DETRICK: Yeah. I thought you wanted one
4 filled out.

5 MELISSA: Okay. Very good.

6 STEVE DETRICK: So I wanted to do that, make it
7 official.

8 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay. Very good. Thank you
9 for doing that.

10 SARAH JOHNSON: I may be able to help Shirley a
11 little bit with her concerns.

12 The idea of transit through the center of town
13 that would take you to the mall, for example, or take
14 you to the north, that is light rail or bus rapid
15 transit. And light rail is planned to go down through
16 the center and to the mall.

17 GARY GRUNWALD: And there's always regular bus

18 service.

19 SARAH JOHNSON: And there's always regular bus
20 service.

21 GARY GRUNWALD: Yeah.

22 SARAH JOHNSON: This is heavy rail.

23 SHIRLEY PETERS: Right.

24 SARAH JOHNSON: This is AMTRAK, and it's the
25 San Joaquin line. And there's really just two round

21

□

1 trips a day, and they're not at a time that would
2 normally be useful for commuters. There's -- I mean,
3 like, there's a train that comes to -- goes north about
4 noon, and there's one that comes back around five. But,
5 you know, that's not gonna work for -- for most
6 commuters.

7 SHIRLEY PETERS: So will light rail be using
8 the same tracks?

9 SARAH JOHNSON: No.

10 GARY GRUNWALD: Not -- go ahead.

11 SARAH JOHNSON: No. And that's the reason it
12 has to be where it is, because that's where the track
13 is.

14 SHIRLEY PETERS: Right. So --

15 SARAH JOHNSON: No, light rail is gonna plan to
16 come down Big Horn to the mall --

17 SHIRLEY PETERS: Yeah, I read that.

18 SARAH JOHNSON: -- which is more in the center
19 of town. So that may help you with that.

20 I'd like to suggest that you could help with
21 air quality with the -- the trees that you select for
22 the site. Redwoods are very good for scrubbing air.
23 And there's a couple of other types of trees, but
24 redwoods are the most fast growing that work for that.
25 And I would hope that you would consider using those

22

□

1 types -- I mean, I know that's more into the design
2 thing, but it's talking really to the air -- air quality
3 issue.

4 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay.

5 SARAH JOHNSON: And as far as the creek's
6 concerned, the concern for the creek is the creek
7 itself, obviously, and the habitat that's there, but
8 also the downstream drainage and the up- -- and the --
9 whatever is planned upstream, which we just got rid of
10 the Ventura Park project, but, you know, sooner or
11 later, something's gonna go there.

12 And so that needs to be taken -- some kind of
13 thought needs to be given to how -- how a project on
14 that land and a project on that Campbell Road land is
15 gonna impact the drainage downstream.

16 I mean, obviously, you can't solve the whole
17 problem, but you just need to give it some thought and
18 take that into consideration.

19 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay. So just to reiterate
20 your concern, is that the project provide adequate
21 drainage that would account for additional flows coming
22 from upstream with the development and also be able to

23 convey those flows --

24 SARAH JOHNSON: Right.

25 MELISSA LOGUE: -- downstream adequately?

23

□

1 SARAH JOHNSON: Right.

2 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay. All right.

3 TOM RUSSELL. Yes, I haven't kept up with the
4 sewer drainage pipe, that connector, that we've been
5 talking about for the last ten years.

6 MELISSA LOGUE: The big sewer interceptor?

7 Mr. Russell, could you speak up. Stephanie is
8 having trouble hearing you.

9 TOM RUSSELL: Is that still planned for
10 Whitehouse Creek or going down Sheldon, or are they
11 still open?

12 MELISSA LOGUE: The interceptor project?

13 TOM RUSSELL: Yes.

14 MELISSA LOGUE: You know, we -- we've -- I just
15 got a letter from the sanitation district today
16 indicating that they have plans in the area for a sewer
17 interceptor. And I believe that it's scheduled some
18 time between 2016 and 2020. That's all the information
19 that I know, unless, Gary, you know anything additional.

20 GARY GRUNWALD: Before the meeting started,
21 Melissa told me about this. I said, "I wanna see it,"
22 because I want to call them. I don't know right now, to
23 be honest with you, but it's going to be of great
24 interest, obviously.

25 STEVE DETRICK: That was one of the things they

24

1 had, was the Whitehouse Creek area. The last time, it
2 was moved to Sheldon Road, because one of the issues
3 they wanted to --

4 (Interruption by the reporter.)

5 MELISSA LOGUE: Could you speak up.

6 STEVE DETRICK: That's where Whitehouse Creek
7 made a 90-degree turn to the north before it headed up
8 Sheldon. And they were gonna bore underneath the lake,
9 and they decided that wasn't the right thing to do. And
10 the last move is to Sheldon Road, which is kind of sad
11 with all the improvements we're getting done right now.

12 SHIRLEY PETERS: They said Sheldon Road, and
13 then later, they said it would go south down into where
14 Ventura is and over and across. And that if it went on
15 Sheldon, they would need power stations, because there's
16 some risers.

17 STEVE DETRICK: And then there was one proposal
18 to take it through Underwood Park.

19 SHIRLEY PETERS: I didn't know about that.

20 STEVE DETRICK: So I don't know if anything's
21 ever been finalized about that.

22 GARY GRUNWALD: I don't know either.

23 TOM RUSSELL: How about with the environmental
24 thing that -- with the station here, whether they --
25 your planning of this area right here --

25

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08

1 GARY GRUNWALD: It's something we need to know
2 about.

3 TOM RUSSELL: Yes. Yes.

4 GARY GRUNWALD: I'm very anxious to give them a
5 call and find out.

6 MELISSA LOGUE: Mr. Russell, did you have any
7 other comments on environmental issues or the document?

8 TOM RUSSELL: (Shakes head.)

9 MELISSA LOGUE: All right. well, we've run out
10 of our speaker cards. So is there anybody else who
11 wants to make a comment at this point?

12 DANIEL LOVEGREEN: I have a written.

13 MELISSA LOGUE: You have a written comment,
14 okay.

15 No verbal comments, though?

16 DANIEL LOVEGREEN: (Shakes head.)

17 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay.

18 HAL LOVELL: My name is Hal Lovell, and I do
19 have a written.

20 MELISSA LOGUE: Very good. Thank you, sir.

21 HAL LOVELL: But more or less, the only thing,
22 my house is real close to the -- where the railroad
23 tracks and the bridge. And my only statement with
24 regards to the environmental is that it seemed
25 opened-ended about the garter snake, whether or not a

26

□

1 one-mile radius would be impacted.

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08

2 And I have lots of garter snakes that are in my
3 yard. So clearly, close to the project, because I'm
4 probably the closest neighbor to at least the northern
5 part of the project. There are garter snakes.

6 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay. And we can provide
7 clarification in the -- in our response to comments for
8 you on that. But just to provide a little bit right
9 now, the species we're concerned about is called the
10 Giant Garter Snake --

11 HAL LOVELL: Okay.

12 MELISSA LOGUE: -- which is very specific and
13 differs from the common garter snake that you may see in
14 your yard.

15 HAL LOVELL: Okay.

16 MELISSA LOGUE: So I don't doubt that they're
17 there, but we're concerned about a particular species.

18 HAL LOVELL: Kind.

19 MELISSA LOGUE: Yeah.

20 HAL LOVELL: And then with regard to the
21 project itself, it seems like -- I mean, I read the
22 whole package, and it seems pretty clear that you're
23 mitigating (sic), or however the words are for it, but it
24 seems open-ended with regards to the scope of the
25 project, because it seems like there's a lot of openness

27

□

1 with regards to expansion.

2 MELISSA LOGUE: Uh-huh.

3 HAL LOVELL: But I'm not really understanding

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08
4 the expansion that we would expect to see if what we're
5 talking about right now is the San Joaquin rail line,
6 which is two stops per day that basically takes you down
7 to Stockton, maybe LA or Stockton, hang a right and go
8 into the Bay Area. I'm not getting with the plan you're
9 presenting, why there's a need for this huge buffer
10 expansion for future growth, when I thought I heard
11 other people say that light rail can't go down this
12 particular line. It's gonna go down more as a
13 central -- the other line or wherever it is in
14 Elk Grove.

15 It -- it just seems like there's a -- and even
16 reading this, the policy, C126 on page 21, it's
17 open-ended that it's to tie into the existing Amtrak
18 and/or other rail service providers.

19 So the policy of Elk Grove kind of indicates
20 that light rail might have been intended to go down this
21 line. It seems to me that the plan is kind of leaving
22 that open in case that becomes an alternative.

23 GARY GRUNWALD: I think the only other rail
24 right now that could be on the horizon that I could
25 think of is -- would be the ACE line.

28

□

1 HAL LOVELL: The what?

2 GARY GRUNWALD: The -- there's a rail line that
3 goes from Stockton in -- over the Altamont Pass to the
4 Bay Area. And that could possibly -- I don't think
5 they've been talking for quite a while, but turn the
6 corner and head north and go all the way into Stockton.

7 I mean, go all the way to Sacramento.

8 The point that we were trying to do --
9 actually, we got our funding from the state. Caltrans
10 has just had a lot of experiences where they shoehorn
11 the -- they start out with a small station, and
12 development came in all around, and it was very
13 difficult to expand.

14 So one of the conditions of the funding was to
15 make sure that we did have room to expand within the
16 station. When that's gonna happen, you know, I don't
17 know. But we had to have that as a project feature.

18 HAL LOVELL: Which I understand, but then it
19 seems like everything is built upon it being a much
20 smaller scope and the volume of traffic and all that.
21 So...

22 GARY GRUNWALD: Well, I guess -- so if we do --
23 are you concerned that if we do expand, where's the
24 checks? I think if we could expand, we would have to
25 have another environmental document. Right?

29

□

1 MELISSA LOGUE: Potentially.

2 GARY GRUNWALD: Yeah, it would depend. I guess
3 I don't see --

4 MELISSA LOGUE: So let me try to --

5 GARY GRUNWALD: Go ahead.

6 MELISSA LOGUE: -- kind of say it back to you
7 to see if we're understanding.

8 So your concern is that the project description

9 offers a fairly large-size station, and it appears that
10 current services aren't enough to justify such a large
11 facility. So what -- what's -- what are the -- you'd
12 like further detail on plans for expansion in the future
13 to --

14 HAL LOVELL: Or to clarify why in -- and you --
15 I understand the state funding. I work for the state
16 government, so I understand that there's different
17 vehicles to get funding and all that. I understand that
18 part of it.

19 But from the perspective of, you have people
20 here commenting on the plans and whether or not you have
21 concerns, it seems opened-ended that if everyone
22 supports it or is not opposing it, and then down the
23 line, suddenly, the green light -- because I did hear
24 that this is a starting point and you want to get
25 everything lined up, so...

30

□

1 GARY GRUNWALD: Yeah.

2 HAL LOVELL: And it sounds like funding isn't
3 even a done deal yet to this whole thing. It's just the
4 starting point.

5 well, okay, two or three similar to the sewer
6 line. I remember being very active with regard to that
7 because, obviously, I'm right next to Whitehouse Creek.
8 Having the sewer line going down my backyard wasn't what
9 I wanted.

10 You kind of forget about it and lose track of
11 it because it's not on your focal point. But I guess my

12 point is, this document seems okay. And what you're
13 calling out, you know, I have some concerns, but
14 environmentally, it seems okay for the scope of it, but
15 it has an element that's very open to me; meaning that
16 there's a lot of room for growth, or the okay is given,
17 and then suddenly it grows.

18 GARY GRUNWALD: well, the plan is, any growth
19 that would take place would be within that footprint.
20 Are you concerned about going outside this footprint? I
21 mean --

22 HAL LOVELL: No, not necessarily.

23 GARY GRUNWALD: what you're saying is correct.
24 If things go -- if it becomes more popular, we would
25 build more parking internally to the footprint and we

31

□

1 would put a station out there. But as far as expanding
2 that footprint that's in the document, you know, I don't
3 think we could do that without coming back to public
4 again. So...

5 SHIRLEY PETERS: I think one of the questions
6 is: Do you have the footprint? And right now, you're
7 talking about where it's at, the plans are, the minimum
8 100 parking and so on.

9 what I'm concerned about, and I think you may
10 be, too, is what's gonna happen when this footprint,
11 which is here, is starting to get more and more and
12 more?

13 GARY GRUNWALD: Into it, yeah.

14 SHIRLEY PETERS: And then that will impact the
15 air and the infrastructure.

16 MELISSA LOGUE: So then is your comment that
17 the -- if -- are you asking if the -- if the
18 environmental document is fully analyzing all of the
19 impacts from potential future expansion --

20 HAL LOVELL: Yes.

21 MELISSA LOGUE: -- of use of the project site?

22 HAL LOVELL: I would say.

23 MELISSA LOGUE: All right.

24 HAL LOVELL: I could live with that. That
25 sounds great to me.

32

□

1 MELISSA LOGUE: All right. Great. And we can
2 respond to that in the final.

3 HAL LOVELL: That's --

4 MELISSA LOGUE: But I think we know what you're
5 getting at there. Thank you very much.

6 So anything else from anybody in the audience?
7 Comments?

8 (No response.)

9 MELISSA LOGUE: Okay. well, I'll close the
10 comment period then.

11 We are -- Gary and I remain available for
12 design detail questions. If you need, you know,
13 clarification on how -- how tall or how wide something
14 is gonna be or if you need me to provide any -- you
15 know, point out in the environmental document where we
16 discussed a particular item, I can offer that as well

Letter 5 - Public Meeting Transcript - 7-10-08

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

□

34