

**65<sup>th</sup> STREET  
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Meeting Minutes**



**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:10p.m. by Chairperson J.D. Stack.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Roll call was conducted.

**RAC Members Present:** Mel Billingsley, Chandra Clady, Steven R. Jones, Gary A. Little, Betty Lopez, Marcia Maleske, Maggie O'Mara, Scott Rasmussen, Dave Sikich, Linda Shafer, J.D. Stack, Christopher Wilson

**RAC Members Absent:** Matthew Altier, Taiwo Jaiyeoba

**Staff Present:** Gregory Ptucha and Chris Pahule, SHRA

**III. INTRODUCTIONS**

Chairman J.D. Stack invited RAC members to introduce themselves to the audience, and then asked audience members to introduce themselves and why they are interested in 65<sup>th</sup> Street RAC proceedings. He also reminded those in attendance of the meeting "sign-in" sheet. Last, Mr. Stack pointed out that applications for RAC membership were available near the entryway.

**IV. APPROVAL OF RAC MEETING MINUTES**

The minutes of the November 3, 2005 meeting were unanimously approved upon motion made by David Sikich and seconded by Linda Shafer.

Chandra Clady pointed out a needed spelling correction in the December 1, 2005 meeting minutes. With that correction, the minutes of December 1, 2005 were approved unanimously upon a motion made by Marcia Maleske and seconded by Dave Sikich.

**V. REDEVELOPMENT ITEMS**

**A. Transportation Planning – 65<sup>th</sup> Street Tunnel Feasibility Study**

Mr. Ted Davini, Senior Civil Engineer, Sacramento Department of Transportation (DOT), was introduced. Mr. Davini provided background information about circumstances that resulted in the tunnel feasibility study. Davini described how the preliminary findings of the

2005 Station Block Redevelopment Study by Leland Consulting Group included a recommendation to examine the feasibility of a multi-modal transportation entry into the campus of California State University at Sacramento (CSUS) from 65<sup>th</sup> Street. The objective would be to determine if such an entry could provide a means to divert volumes of traffic that currently approach CSUS from Folsom Boulevard. Doing so might allow Folsom widening plans to be minimized or canceled, so that improvements could be made that are more consistent with the urban design objectives of the adopted 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan. If the results of a tunnel feasibility plan were favorable, this would greatly affect the scope and emphasis of a plan to reexamine the circulation needs for the 65<sup>th</sup>/Folsom area.

Mr. Davini described how SHRA and DOT jointly sponsored the tunnel feasibility project, with DOT overseeing the work of locally-based consultant group Mark Thomas & Company. The Mark Thomas contract was funded with 65<sup>th</sup> Street Tax Increment monies. Davini then introduced Mr. Rob Himes, Principal & Regional Division Manager, Mark Thomas & Company. Mr. Himes supervised the study. Their work has been summarized in a draft report with preliminary findings and conclusions. Mr. Himes showed a PowerPoint presentation. The sequence and topics of slides were as follows:

#### Introduction

1. Purpose of the Project:
  - Determine if there were insurmountable barriers to development of a tunnel, given the circumstances of the favored route.
2. Identify Project Constraints
3. Identify Preliminary Options
4. Develop Preliminary Cost Estimates

#### Existing Constraints Overview

1. City Pump Station
2. Bicycle/pedestrian tunnel connecting CSUS to Elvas Avenue
3. Private, improved property in path of tunnel route
4. CSUS drainage ditch & perimeter road
5. UPRR railroad levee
6. Need for flood protection

#### Proposed Project that was Studied

1. Location of new roadway (site plan and photo)
2. New railroad structure
3. Need to acquire and remove privately-owned building

#### Constraints – Detail

1. Specific facilities within existing pump station
2. Implications of proposed tunnel on 48-inch outfall pipes
3. Other underground facilities: 2-inch SMUD conduit; 2-inch fiber optic; 15-inch storm drain.
4. Flow pattern of CSUS drainage ditch & impacts of proposed tunnel (need for new pumps).

#### Cross-section Options for Tunnel

1. 2-lane option: 57.5-foot overall width (2 vehicle lanes; one bike lane; one sidewalk).
2. 3-lane option: 69-foot width (2-through vehicle lanes; 1 vehicle turning lane; 2 bike lanes; 2 sidewalks).
3. 4-lane option: 88-foot width (4 vehicle lanes; 2 bike lanes; 2 sidewalks).

4. BRT option: 106-foot width (4 auto/truck lanes; 2 bus rapid transit BRT lanes, 2 bike lanes, 2 sidewalks).

#### New Railroad Bridge Section Options

1. “Box Girder” bridge (height ranges from 3.8 feet to 5.8 feet, depending with span).
2. “Through Girder” bridge (2 foot height for any span assumption).
3. 4-lane box girder section assumed for cost estimate.

#### Tunnel Road Profile Options

1. Assumption used: 30 miles per hour (MPH) traffic flow; arterial street designation. Result: 17.5-foot vertical clearance needed. Also: CSUS perimeter road elevation would be 6.5 foot lower than current road.
2. Traffic signal sight distance calculations shown.
3. Pump station outfall pipe conflict shown in section drawing.
4. Road profiles for 35 MPH and 25 MPH options shown (30 MPH currently favored by City of Sacramento Department of Transportation DOT staff).

#### Flood Protection Options

1. UPRR levee is a secondary flood protection device.
2. Elevation at top of RR ties at study site is 50-feet (only 45-feet further north and west on the levee).
3. Existing flood protection at CSUS bicycle/pedestrian tunnel described (“stop-log” structure).
4. Options for tunnel scenarios studied: flood gates favored over stop-log structure.
5. Gates would be at low point in tunnel; height = 24-feet; width would vary according to tunnel width selected.
6. Flood gates with 49 – 50 foot elevation assumed for purposes of cost estimate.

#### CSUS Perimeter Road

1. With flood gates: lower elevation at tunnel road would require approximately 450-foot approach to make current elevation of perimeter road to conform with tunnel road elevation.
2. Impacts of stop log option on the perimeter road design was shown and described as not favored by City Utilities or by CSUS.

#### Construction Impacts on UPRR Operations

1. Cross-over tracks would be constructed to move trains onto “active” tracks during construction.
2. Total of three cross-overs needed, and 2,500 running feet of track would be relocated.

#### Cost Estimate

1. Preliminary estimate in 2005 dollars, using assumptions noted previously = \$24 million to \$25 million.

#### Next Steps

1. Mr. Himes described these as:
  - Update traffic model
  - Determine benefit/cost/funding
  - Prepare environmental document
  - Prepare construction documents

Mr. Himes was thanked for his presentation, and Mr. Davini then asked for questions from RAC members and the audience. A summary of comments and responses:

- a.) Maggie O’Mara pointed to potential conflicts where the existing bicycle/pedestrian tunnel would intersect with the CSUS perimeter road and tunnel road. There was related discussion about traffic signalization, sidewalk locations and the (unlikely) possibility of a traffic circle at Elvas Avenue and the proposed tunnel road. Mr. Davini stated that

“high-end” bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be an objective of any favored project design.

- b.) The comparative virtues of a lower design speed were discussed (20 or 25 MPH versus the 30 MPH used in the study). Davini described how speed limit signs are generally posted at 5 MPH less than the speed for which the road is designed. Davini agreed that, if the project is pursued future, the question of design speeds can be reevaluated.
- c.) Betty Lopez inquired about whether CSUS is sharing with the cost of the analysis, and whether “post-tunnel” traffic volumes on 65<sup>th</sup> were estimated. Chris Pahule replied that 65<sup>th</sup> Street Tax Increment funds are paying for the current study. Estimating traffic volumes after construction was not part of the scope of work for the feasibility study. An application is being prepared for submission to the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) for funding from their Community Design Program to reexamine how best to handle traffic circulation in the area. If funded, traffic volume projections would occur as part of that study.
- d.) Gary Little asked how tunnel construction costs compared to costs to complete the Folsom Boulevard widening. Ted Davini responded that the scope and costs for Folsom widening would presumably change (i.e., be reduced) if a CSUS tunnel were constructed. In any case, the source of federal funds for Folsom work are different than those that could be used for construction of a tunnel. Funds allocated for Folsom work are tied to the previous South East Area Transportation Study (SEATS) that included Folsom widening as a mitigation measure for development outside the Transit Village boundary. Davini said the SEATS-related funds could not be used for the tunnel since those funds are tied to a different scope of work and different project objectives.
- e.) Linda Shafer inquired about how tunnel width options would be affected by different “bus rapid transit” (BRT) scenarios (dedicated BRT lanes versus shared BRT lane options).
- f.) Mel Billingsley inquired about whether the existing bicycle/pedestrian tunnel would remain if a new tunnel were constructed (answer: unclear). Also, whether the existing pump station would remain (answer: yes).
- g.) J.D. Stack asked about the “next steps” for the project once the draft report is finalized. Ted Davini responded by describing how, since the potential construction of a tunnel has been determined to be feasible from a physical design and engineering perspective, a next step would be to include a tunnel option as a component of a new circulation study for the Transit Village area, leading to amendments to the Transit Village Plan (TVP) and issuance of a supplemental environmental impact report (SEIR). Davini said the SEIR and TVP amendments would have to be adopted before officials could make any decision to actually implement construction of a tunnel.
- h.) Mr. Ray Lettini, owner of 6501 Elvas Avenue, expressed concern over the need for his commercial parcel to be acquired if the tunnel project were to proceed. Lettini complained that receiving one week’s written notice of tonight’s meeting was inadequate, and that 30-day written notice would be better in the future. Ted Davini described a likely 5-year timeframe as including 2 – 3 years for a new circulation study, leading to the SEIR and TVP amendments, design and search for funding. Davini said DOT and SHRA are open to meeting with Mr. Lettini and his representatives to discuss the particulars of the tunnel study and the implications for his property if the project were eventually implemented.
- i.) An unidentified audience member speculated that a tunnel would create excessive traffic congestion.
- j.) Audience member Ms. Roxanne Fuentes asked who proposed the tunnel idea. She expressed concern that a tunnel would detract from the pedestrian-friendly and bicycle-

friendly urban environment the TVP was attempting to create. She also suggested that any new opening in the secondary UPRR levee would negatively impact flood risk and flood insurance rates. Ted Davini responded by suggesting that various tunnel options could be consistent with TVP objectives—especially if they allow for achievement of a pedestrian-oriented “main street” in the vicinity of Folsom Boulevard and 65<sup>th</sup> Street. Tunnel options include ones that would be limited to bicycles, pedestrians and BRT vehicles, but any decision needs to appreciate which scenarios might qualify for federal transportation funds.

- k.) There were questions about the previous studies and approved mitigation measures, and whether the Folsom widening plans might be a better option. It was noted that Folsom widening cost estimates were approximately \$50 million, while the tunnel option was estimated at \$25 million. Mel Billingsley urged those in attendance to familiarize themselves with the earlier plans and to regularly participate in the planning meetings for the area.

Mr. Himes and Mr. Davini were thanked for their presentation. As closing comments, various RAC members expressed their concerns about the similar issues as those raised by audience members, but that their perspective is shaped by their regular participation in the RAC. Similar to Mr. Billingsley, they also encouraged audience members and other area residents and property owners to regularly monitor and participate in planning activities. No action was taken.

## **REDEVELOPMENT ITEMS**

### **B. Matching Funds Request for Community Design Planning Grant Application**

Following up on discussion from the December 1, 2005 (no quorum) RAC meeting, Redevelopment Manager Chris Pahule referred RAC members to Attachment 4 in their packet, concerning two applications soon to be submitted to the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) for the 2005-07 Community Design Grant program. Pahule briefly described the projects:

1. Redding Avenue improvements;
2. 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan Circulation Study

He described the estimated project budgets and how a minimum 11.47% local match is required for each grant dollar requested, and how 65<sup>th</sup> Street tax increment monies would be a suggested source for the local match. Marcia Maleske inquired about the internal City of Sacramento review of possible projects, and whether these two projects had been approved. Pahule described how staff evaluated and recommended certain projects, including these, to the City Council, which authorized submitting the applications.

Scott Rasmussen motioned that the RAC approve the staff recommendations described in Attachment 4, including allocation of \$114,700 in tax increment monies for the circulation plan grant application and \$344,100 in tax increment funds for the Redding Avenue improvements grant application. Mel Billingsley seconded the motion. Discussion included Chandra Clady’s concern about issues that need to be examined further in the circulation plan. The RAC then approved Rasmussen’s motion with a unanimous vote.

### **C. FY 2006 Budget – Discussion**

Redevelopment Manager Chris Pahule described how recent 2005 assessment figures from the county assessor’s office show a substantial increase over base year valuations. The figures received do not include the Verge (formerly Jefferson Commons), but they do include the Friedman “F65” project. The increases suggest the need for additional debt to be

incurred by the redevelopment area before June 30, 2006. The SHRA Finance Department is suggesting issuance of \$6 million in tax revenue bond that would be issued in concert with a much larger planned City of Sacramento bond. In anticipation of having the bond proceeds available for projects in the redevelopment area, staff is recommending that the RAC engage in a 3-month process to evaluate possible projects to prioritize how proceeds should be allocated over the next few years.

Marcia Maleske asked to revisit the priority projects that were discussed during the plan adoption process. Chandra Clady asked if the additional police enforcement expenses generated by the Verge development would be deducted from the net tax increment available. There was no action taken.

#### **E. Redevelopment Area Update**

Gregory Ptucha updated the RAC and audience on the following items:

- Detention Basin: the Sacramento Department of Utilities has decided to pursue this project without relying upon tax increment monies to repay the loan requested from the California Infrastructure Bank, which has been submitted. A decision on the loan application may occur this month. Utilities reported that the acquisition process is moving forward with use of eminent domain powers. A “404 permit” is tentatively in-hand pending the City entering a contract for wetland replacement. Mel Billingsley asked why Utilities no longer wanted tax increment funds.
- Water Run-off Patterns: the Department of Utilities will provide access to photocopy their master plan for Basin 31, which includes the redevelopment area.
- Written correspondence has been sent to Target Corporation to encourage presentation of their plans to the RAC and community as early as is practical. Similar letters will be sent to Jackson Properties, University Enterprises and the controlling interests of the 13.5 acre parcel upon which Jefferson Lofts had been proposed
- 65<sup>th</sup> Street / Highway 50 Pedestrian & Bicycle Improvements: Ryan Moore of the City’s Department of Transportation (DOT) was introduced. He distributed a summary fact sheet and graphics of the recent feasibility study that was discussed with Ed Cox at the no-quorum December meeting. Caltrans, Walk Sacramento and bicycle advocacy groups are reviewing the findings and recommendations of the project’s consultant, Mark Thomas and Company. Mr. Moore said the study was “purely technical” and also showed a larger scale aerial with recommended changes to facilitate bicycle and pedestrian movements at this location. Features included “blue lanes” similar to those used in Portland, Oregon. Mel Billingsley asked about the new proposed northbound traffic lane. Ted Davini described how that lane was part of an earlier traffic mitigation measure linked to developments at Power Inn Road and in the SEATS study. There was discussion about traffic conflicts at 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the light rail crossing and service level ratings for urban environments. This included discussion about possible expansion of the study area for the circulation plan component of the 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Plan.
- RAC Member Attendance  
2005 attendance records were compiled and transmitted to the executive

committee in late December, along with excerpts from relevant policies and ordinances.

- RAC Term Expirations and Recruitment  
Six RAC members are serving terms that expire on January 8, 2006 (Lopez, Little, Wilson, Jones, Clady and Sikich). The City Clerk's office will accept applications for these positions beginning tomorrow. Deadline to submit is February 3, 2006 at 5:00pm.
- Projects list  
The scope of information staff would plan to include in a list of newly-completed and planned developments was shown in the agenda memo included in the packet.
- University Garage: Bill Hutcheon of Code Enforcement indicated that the November 22, 2005 citation at 5904 Elvas Avenue citation was accompanied by an \$875 fine. Owner has removed some inoperable automobiles and asked for an extension when the 30-day compliance period expired. He was granted an extension until January 10, 2006. The property owner said he intends to apply for requisite permits to install fencing that will hide inoperable vehicles and auto parts from public view. If there is no compliance by January 10, 2006, additional administrative penalties/fines will be applied.

**III. COMMUNICATION FROM RAC MEMBERS AND PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

Intentionally blank.

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

At 8:25 pm, the meeting adjourned upon unanimous vote on a motion by Linda Shafer and a second by Marcia Maleske.