



**Sacramento  
Housing &  
Redevelopment  
Agency**

65<sup>th</sup> Street  
Redevelopment Advisory Committee (RAC)

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**Wednesday, February 27, 2008**  
*SMUD Customer Service Center*  
*Rubicon Room (ground floor)*  
*6301 S Street, Sacramento, CA 95817*

**Call to Order – 6:00 p.m.**

**Roll Call**

Present: Sikich (chair), Wilson (vice chair), Arnold, Little, Billingsley, Clady, Jones, Maleske, O'Mara, O'Toole, and Garcia

Absent: Lopez, Stevens

**Discussion / Action Reports**

Staff reports include oral presentations and those recommending receive and file.

**1. Approval of Minutes for October 24, 2007**

The minutes of the October 24, 2007 RAC meeting were approved by a unanimous vote on a motion by Mr. Little and seconded by Ms. Maleske.

Vote: 11-0-0-2

**2. 65<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area Study - Update**

Councilmember Cohn introduced the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area Study (Study) and stressed the importance of community input in the process. Sparky Harris from City of Sacramento Department of Transportation introduced the consultant team to present the three transportation alternatives. The consultant team explained the process and schedule. A Notice of Preparation will be released in April, 2008 to start the Environmental process. City Council Approval is anticipated in spring 2009. The RAC first asked a series of questions before opening up to public comments. Mr. O'Toole asked how many homes would be affected by each alternative. Mr. Arnold wanted to know the cost for the Ped/Transit tunnels. Additionally, Mr. Arnold wanted to know why Alternative B only showed a full mode connection into CSUS along 65<sup>th</sup> St. The on/off ramps at 65<sup>th</sup> Street and US 50 need to be addressed in the study. Mr. Billingsley asked if there were improvements planned for pedestrians. One suggestion was the addition of ped actuated/lighted crosswalks. Mr. Billingsley would like to see more prominent gateways and gathering places denoted in the plan. Ms. O'Mara wanted to know the cost comparison between the Automobile/Ped Tunnel vs. the Ped/Transit tunnel. Mr. Wilson would like to study to analyze the connectivity from San Joaquin to the eastern side of the study area. Ms. Clady would like to know the impact that this study will have on the existing established neighborhoods.

Once the RAC's questions were vetted, then the community asked a series of questions. Diane Eid expressed concern over the study's impact on traffic along 59<sup>th</sup>

Street. Bob Rosenberg liked scenario B. Mr. Rosenberg would like quality ped connections from the CSUS campus to the south area of the Study. Elisabeth Cantu expressed concern over the Kroy Pathway connection. Additionally, she expressed concerns over the pedestrian safety. Specifically how pedestrian navigate along 65<sup>th</sup> Street under the freeway up to the F65 commercial center. Roxanne Fuentes expressed concern regarding the new pedestrian tunnel increasing the flood risk in the area. John DeGlow from the College Glen neighborhood wanted to know if the study will be modeled as part of the EIR process. Rob Burness is concerned about the financial feasibility of the study. Trish Peas is concerned about traffic and air quality as it relates to automobile exhaust.

### **Public Comments - Matters Not on the Agenda**

No comments were presented to the RAC from the public.

### **Committee Comments-Ideas, Questions, and Announcements**

Mr. Wilson would like an updated on the Target Subcommittee. Mr. Billingsley requested that staff work to set up a meeting of the Target Subcommittee. The Subcommittee will try and meet in advance of the March 27, 2007 RAC meeting and will report back to the full RAC of the meeting discussion.

### **Adjournment**

Mr. Little motioned to adjourn and RAC member Ms. Maleske seconded; motion passed unanimously.