



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

Appendix F – Community Feedback

Overall Project

- I am very supportive of the Green line.
- I hope this project goes through. It would be nice to take light rail to the airport or downtown.
- The plans look great.
- The tentative designs look good.
- I attended tonight representing the Regency Park Neighborhood Association (2 of us attended). I'm thinking the opportunity to ride downtown, to the airport, schools, stadium, and hospital would be a real plus to the community.
- Please build this!
- Not a big fan at the moment.
- Will it be used frequently? Will it reduce traffic?
- I fully support this project. I bought 2 properties within 5 minutes of his proposed line in 2008 and 2010 specifically because I wanted to own property adjacent to this new line.
- I am very much in favor of this project.
- I am very excited about this transit-oriented development (TOD) project.
- When I moved to Sacramento four years ago, I was aghast that a metropolitan city had an international airport and a light rail system that did not connect!
- I think this is great if you can take a train to Folsom and go out to the airport.
- The Green Line is an important and long overdue project, especially for those of us whose driving days may be numbered.
- Green Line is a good idea. It will cut car trips to the airport.
- This project is critical. I am glad to see progress.
- I would love to work with RT.
- Light rail transportation should be a basic utility in a city--like electricity, water, and sewage lines.
- Then why are we expanding light rail here?
- RT leaders/Board need to make Green Line hyped.
- No light rail is needed!
- It will be awesome to have light rail to the airport! It's been long needed.



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

- Yes, we want the light rail to go to the airport. I had a friend who lived in senior housing in North Natomas and it was 1/2 mile from a bus stop.

Schedule / Project Completion

- Excited to get it built. Sacramento needs better public transit to SMF and the plans seem well thought out.
- I want the Green Line to get here soon!
- I'm curious about the phasing of the various segments. If the next segment is just across the American River, I doubt whether it will live long enough to get to the airport. Even reaching Truxel will be an accomplishment.
- Looking forward to following the evolution of this project.
- I don't know when, but it's likely I'll need public transportation during my lifetime. We need it! We are a bustling, busy, alive and active city.
- Since construction is years away, I suggest we try Bus Rapid Transit to test which routes work best. We need this light rail sooner.
- Sounds great! That far in the future though?
- Let's build the bridge and line to Natomas as quickly as possible to improve our mobility and air quality.
- Hopefully the timeline for completion can happen sooner. Our environment and personal health depend on such projects happening sooner than later.
- I support the Green Line Project. This should have happened 20 years ago when light rail came to Sacramento.
- I had no idea that it takes this long to complete. My main concern is construction. How will it impact traffic?
- Once the project is finally complete, I hope people will use it. I also hope the federal government will give the final go ahead. Good luck!
- Why repeat the EIR/EIS schedule when it was done already? I sat on committees since early 2000's before Blue Line talks started. Enough delay!
- Please build the Green Line to the Airport as soon as possible. We in North and South Natomas have been waiting for almost 30 years!
- I bought a home in South Natomas in 1988 because I was told that there would be light rail up Truxel Road within 10 years
- Build it now and then pay for it. I realize that's not how local government works, but I'm frustrated that I'm 63 years old and have little hope of using this line in my lifetime.



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

- Truxel Road is now too congested for the Green Line. Why was this project delayed for 25 years? This should have been completed a while ago. What will be torn up?
- How long will the construction take to complete the project?

Alignment / Route

- South Natomas - It's good that so little private property will be needed.
- Overall, I'm very supportive of this project! I would like to see RT avoid dealing with the Truxel/Gateway Park intersection. I think the elevated structure is a great idea.
- The options through the existing Sleep Train Arena area look good.
- I do not agree with having the Green Line come down Truxel Road. It will impact morning and evening commute. You are removing the right turn lane from several streets in South Natomas (River City Commons Area).
- No transportation from west side or Heritage to the stations. Truxel is already congested. What are you thinking?
- I would like to express my concerns about building a bridge over the American River and bringing light rail up Truxel Road. It would make more sense to come up Northgate (no bridge required) and improve that area by making the low income housing more desirable and increase in value. There are also vacant lots for parking and apartments that could use transportation.
- I like the alternative route through the Sleep Train Arena. Del Paso/ Truxel Road intersection is congested.
- Overall, the Green Line route has many turns. It will result in longer route trip times. I prefer to go west on San Juan and north on Commerce. This is good for West Natomas too.
- I like the shorter route just south of the airport. Also, consider airport terminal expansion plans.
- Please check the capacity of the existing bridge over Highway Interstate 80, whether the bridge is strong enough to take the extra loadings from light rail.
- I question the alignment of street/tracks on Sequoia Pacific in favor of something other than what is on the model available for viewing at the meeting.
- I am concerned about the alignment of the tracks at the northeast corner of Richards and Sequoia Pacific and how tracks relate to the street as they both move north.
- I strongly support the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Why create conflicts?
- I do not want this going by my home. I love Natomas and where I live. This needs to go next to Highway 5.



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

- Please do not go from Garden Highway to San Juan.
- I'm concerned about the proposed removal of left turn lanes along Truxel Road. This would make traffic much worse and more dangerous.
- We do not want this project running through South Natomas on Truxel Road. We want it in another location like along the freeway.
- I cannot object more to your plan to put RT in the middle of Truxel all the way up Truxel. In particular, I object to putting RT on Truxel near Bannon Creek residential area. If you are going to put RT on Truxel, start it at Natomas Marketplace. Bus 11 will take people from the residential areas to the Natomas Marketplace easily and quickly without causing huge congestion issues and more homeless/crime problems. Here are the problems I foresee:

We do not need RT down at the Community Center/Bannon Creek area. We already have buses 86 and 88 to go downtown, and have bus 11 that takes us up Truxel. What I suggest is that you start RT at Natomas Marketplace. Truxel from that point on is commercial. It will not affect homes as much and will serve the purpose you are trying to serve, i.e., to get people an alternative ride to the airport.

If you need to use the Green Light to do this, take it along HWY 5, come down Arena Boulevard, and have Bus 11 drop people off there. That is a much better solution!!!!

- North Natomas is a business area. This project needs to skirt around the residential neighborhood and reconnect north of Natomas High School.
- The current Green Line runs on 7th, and a "no right turn on red" sign causes northbound traffic to back up and spew pollution. Please do not have a similar situation happen in the new construction.
- I like an I-5 alternative as an express but we do somehow need to accommodate the bike riders and pedestrians.
- Has Nino's Parkway been considered as an alternative to Truxel Road? This parkway runs from Garden Hwy to I-80--accessible by multiple neighborhoods and thoroughfares.
- Very concerned about chosen South Natomas alignment on Truxel; it needs to be revisited. That process was a sham plus it's been so long that stakeholders have changed.
- I am very concerned about grade level intersections, especially in high traffic areas such as Truxel and San Juan and Natomas Marketplace.
- Much too close to homes on East commerce and school. Children will be out. Station shouldn't be near school. Children will be in danger.
- The drawings don't show South Natomas at all. We need to be able to visualize it.



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

- And if the Green Line is approved, special attention and rare needs to be given to South Natomas. Thank you.
- To whom it may concern,
Extending the Light Rail along Truxel Road is a horrible plan that will negatively impact the environment and community?
My wife has lived in South Natomas since the mid-80's and is a teacher in the district. When we decided to purchase our home here, it was to raise our family in the same community she was so fond to be brought up in. But, in the years since, the area has deteriorated greatly. Crime has risen, homeless regularly wander our street to dig through our trash and the loitering at the local grocers is a constant nuisance. Because of this, we are wary to shop in the area and are worried about our future in Natomas. The area is already inundated with homeless and delinquents from the numerous apartments and rentals. As a frequent user of Light Rail and several bus lines, I have personally witnessed the type of riders that travel between communities. Now that a station is right at my doorstep, I am horrified to think of the increase in transients and derelicts that will have new access to the area?
I'm sure many have already sent lists of arguments against these plans, so I will leave that to them. Just know, rather than taking measures to improve the existing community, you are adding more reasons for families like my own, to leave.
- Dear RT Board Members,
I am writing to you in regard to the plans to extend the Light Rail from downtown Sacramento through South and North Natomas via Truxel Road. As you can imagine, for many Natomas residents this is a matter of great concern. While we understand the need to provide public transportation options, the current plan to bring the line down Truxel would impact more than 50 homes - some of whose owners were not aware this was a possibility when they purchased and lead to the destruction of more than 100 beautiful and mature trees -- a resource our area is known for.
We have all seen the crime issues that a Light Rail station brings to an area. We are already plagued by property crime and vandalism that goes unaddressed by the Sacramento Police Department. If the police were more responsive to needs in South Natomas, perhaps the residents would not be so fearful of the influx of passengers the line will bring. However, as it stands, calls to police for burglaries in progress go unanswered, drug deals commence daily in Jefferson Park - which is adjacent to a school and has a large children's play area in the park, and issues with an aggressive and sometimes? Dangerous homeless population has also gone unaddressed by police and



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

the city. Already the bike path is a ""freeway"" of sorts for vagrants and criminals targeting our homes. I have been the victim of burglary four times. Each time I beat the police to my home by hours and was forced to clear my own house with nothing more than a baseball bat and the hope that no one lingered inside. You can understand how residents are largely opposed to something that would bring even more of this element to our area.

Please reconsider your plan and find another way to address the extension of the rail. While bringing it to Truxel Road would directly and negatively impact many residential homes, creating parking and safety issues, placing it instead on Northgate (or even another less populated outlying street) would give riders more access to the businesses along that boulevard and perhaps provide those businesses with a much needed boost. I realize this has been bandied about for many years, however a thorough examination of all possible alternatives with conditions as they currently stand would better serve the taxpayers and the members of this community. There has been much change to our area since this was initially conceived in 1991. Thank you.

- The route that uses Truxel Road (South Natomas) was originally designed at least 20 years ago. Needless to say, this road has been developed over time with primarily private residences on it. Also added was a community center with a playground, library and park. To run light rail down Truxel Road as currently designed will eliminate 52 homes, guard rail installations at all major intersections and both off-ramps from I-80. It will also cause the loss of over 100 mature trees. It will increase traffic congestion by eliminating lanes of traffic on Truxel that are already crowded. There are no ridership figures to support a billion dollar cost rail line. I believe Northgate Boulevard (primarily businesses) would be a much better alternative if light rail must be provided. We have enough problems in South Natomas without light rail bringing in undesirables to further reduce property values. I have written my comments to all of the Regional Transit Board Members and only one member, Linda Budge, responded. She lives in a totally different area so has no interest on the hardships that we will face. Here is one of her responses to my comments:

"Personally, as a resident of Rancho Cordova, we are thrilled to have direct access to light rail, and would love to not have to drive to the Airport and spend 1.5 to 2 hours driving to the ARCO. My family will be taking light rail to the new downtown arena. That's one of the reasons that we are working so hard to get the system cleaned up and returned to being the community asset that it was supposed to be." [Linda Budge]



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

I do believe this woman is not well informed. Arco Arena was changed to the Sleep Train Arena some years ago. Her interest in light rail is personal rather than business-related, and apparently she does not care what happens to those of us who live here.

Thank you for listening.

- Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am writing to let you know I do NOT support putting the light rail line down Truxel, as currently proposed. To do so will cause a direct and negative impact to 52 homes along Truxel, guard rail installations at all major intersections and both off ramps from I-80, and also the loss of more than 100 mature trees. It will increase traffic congestion by eliminating lanes of traffic on Truxel that are already crowded.

There are no ridership figures to support a billion dollar cost rail line. Super Shuttle is a much more convenient method to get to and from the airport. Truxel is primarily a residential area with a wonderful community center, park and playground. I believe Northgate Boulevard (primarily businesses) would be a much better alternative if light rail must be provided. We have enough problems in South Natomas without light rail bringing in undesirables to further reduce property values. No mention of light rail on Truxel was provided to me when I purchased my home in South Natomas. If it had been, I would have located elsewhere.

- I would like to focus my comments on the South Natomas (SN) portion of the route from Richards to I-80.

The impacts on the American River Parkway and the residential community of South Natomas will be significant and warrant special attention and mitigation. Please do not just consider us an area between other destinations. If properly designed light rail can be as asset, but that is not a guarantee. Neighbors are concerned about safety and security and other impacts like noise and congestion.

While crossing the American River, care must be given to protect and avoid impacts to the riparian forest and habitat.

In South Natomas the design of each station is critical. I suggest a coffee house at each of the 3 stops in SN. 2 of the stations are already at commercial centers and the 3rd is at the community center/library. Having a well-lit place for coffee etc. at each station will improve safety and discourage loitering. There should be lighting, shades and seating at each stop.

Truxel will need improvements to make it a safe and walkable street to accommodate riders. There is no reason it can't be attractive.



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

-Pedestrian oriented lighting for the sidewalks will be needed in addition to the intersection lighting that currently exists.

-Sidewalks will need improvements in some areas.

-ALL sound walls should be replaced with taller and more solid sound walls, perhaps with art as was done for Land Park. The maintenance of these walls should be transferred to RT. Vines on the walls would reduce graffiti.

-Each cul-de-sac connection should be landscaped and sound walls added.

-ALL trees (planted by the community) should be retained. And more should be planted. We will need shade for the walkers.

-Consider designating streets for riders to use, such as Bannon Creek Drive, Pebblewood, etc and improve pedestrian lighting on these as well.

Homes that face Truxel will face an unsafe situation for using their driveways and should be given the option to sell to RT.

Consider street cars rather than light rail as a less intrusive option.

Add traffic signals at additional streets such as Bannon Creek and others to accommodate interface with LRT and excessive traffic.

Work to "time" the traffic signals on Truxel to reward careful drives and stop those who speed. And figure out a way to eliminate the ""suicide"" land by having dedicated left turn pockets.

Provide mitigation for Azevedo as frustrated drivers are likely to use it rather than Truxel as congestion increases. This would include a road diet such as a landscaped median and additional stop signs.

Thank you for considering my comments. I submitted them at the Dec meeting in South Natomas but wanted to be sure they were in the system.

- Years ago there was a plan to build light rail to connect to Arco Arena, now Sleep Train and the airport. Sleep Train will be closed and a new arena is being built downtown so there is no longer a reason to use Truxel as the main route for the light rail. In addition, the loss of more than 100 mature trees, direct impact to 52 homes along Truxel, guard rail installations at all major intersections AND both off ramps from I-80. No ridership figures to support a BILLION \$. I assure you, there are many valid reasons why this project should be scrubbed or an alternate route used.
- Dear Mike Wiley,
Can I say that you have always been my hero? I admired Bob and Teri, and everyone who served on our first school board (loved all their kids too) But you were my hero. All the work and maneuvering and effort and chutzpa you put into creating NUSD was awe-



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

inspiring. The last meeting when the state board of education tried to negate our elections is my favorite memory. You countered all their arguments perfectly. But at the end it still looked as if we were going down again. That's when you stood up and told them you would tie them up in court until we were finished ... at least that is how I remember it!

Mike, you lived on the east side of Truxel. It is hard for me to believe you advance the current plan for the Green Line. Can you really support a LR laid down the middle of our main street ... one that cuts our neighborhood in half? Fort Natomas is right there! Our Community Center, 50 homes, 100+ trees! Do you remember when the tree foundation proposed a canopy rivaling East Sac?

I've read the studies. They say any benefit starts 1000 feet away and ends at 3 blocks. The only successful lines connect two urban areas. We don't need a Light Rail. The RT handles everything just fine, and can be added as necessary. We won't take it to the airport...it's only 4 miles! The line down Truxel is asking us to bear all of the burden without any benefit. North Natomas was planned with the light rail in mind. Run it beside 1-5, and cut in where they need it. We were never designed for this. What kind of plan is made for Stonecreek and Erin and Mill Oak and Azevedo where traffic will go to find a way around? Don't let them divide us.

I know you will be long gone before this ever comes to be, but please, will you suggest that the board members sit along Truxel for an afternoon to see what they are asking of us.

Stand up for us again.

- We are writing to express our belief that light rail on Truxel in Natomas would be a colossal mistake.

If we want rapid transit between downtown and the airport, bus lines offer flexibility. Light rail requires disruption of a residential neighborhood with permanent structural changes. We have lived in and traveled in many large cities using public transportation. None of them tore up residential communities on residential streets. Northgate is a commercial street and a viable alternative. Along the freeway, disrupts no homes. Truxel is a poor choice! In addition, the poor security on light rail has been well documented of late and introduces crime potential in our community that is unwarranted.

NO LIGHT RAIL ON TRUXEL!!!

- (Submitted multiple times) To Whom It May Concern,



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

I understand that the decision has been made, to bring Light Rail up Truxel Road in South Natomas. We were told that the current comments are only to address any environmental concerns.

It is fairly obvious that building another bridge over the American River Parkway will have an effect on the environment. It will not only disturb the parkway physically, but will add traffic noise directly over the park, where people go to enjoy the peace and quiet that our beautiful park provides us at this time.

The decision to add another bridge over the parkway really makes no sense when we have a clear road that runs down Northgate to the light rail downtown! The effects of having light rail run through South Natomas on Truxel will affect the peace and quiet of the neighborhood as well. We currently have a safe and quite suburb where children can walk to the Library and park in safety. Having light rail run through this neighborhood will bring down the value of the homes in this neighborhood.

If Light Rail were to come up Northgate, it would have the opposite effect. Because the street is lined at both ends with commercial buildings, having light rail come up this road would bring business to a distressed community and improve not only the property values, but would be a benefit to the businesses as well. We have several vacant lots that could be available for parking and the homes that are along Northgate, do not face the street. Having light rail come to that area will increase the value of small older homes, many of which have one or no car garages. Just as these small older homes downtown are extremely expensive because of their location downtown. Those people who work downtown would pay more for these small homes, just to take light rail.

It would be very easy to go up Northgate, past all of the apartments (who will use light rail) and cross over on either, San Juan, North Freeway or del Paso Road.

The homes along Truxel Road have 2-3 car garages and the people who live there will most likely not take light rail, since they have multiple vehicles.

Station Locations

- The Gateway Park Station on the east side of Truxel Road seems like it would attract more riders with the offices and hotel.
- The South Natomas Community Center Station - I like the location and it should improve access to the library and park.
- As a resident of Heritage Park, I immediately looked at the "Activity Centers" on the Green Line handout. Will there be a stop at East Commerce? Also, I would like to see



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

more detailed information regarding the specific streets the Green Line will pass by. The main streets are noted but the map creates confusion regarding the specific route.

- I would like to find out specifically about the San Juan Boulevard light rail station. We currently live near the Mammoth Way entrance on Truxel Boulevard and I'm concerned about foot traffic. How close is the station going to be on that street? Currently there is a vacant lot and I fear the station might be there. How soon is construction beginning and ending? Thank you in advance for your response.
- Why not leave Metro Air Park and Greenbriar closed like Morrison Creek in the Blue Line to cut costs and still make the airport the terminus?
- I like the Town Center stop.
- I like the redesign in the River District/ new station and alignment of Sequoia Pacific.
- You should space the South Natomas stations to only have two for faster trips to the airport.
- Stations in North Natomas near the arena should be combined into one station just north of Arena Boulevard and North Market Drive.
- Consider placement of stations so access is safe and cutting across traffic is minimized. Consider other transit (bus) and correction to stations.

Potential Impacts

- Roads are busier today and it makes the road too narrow for trains.
- Absolutely horrible idea and it is painfully obvious no traffic studies of the area were done. Truxel Road will be a nightmare if reduced to 1 lane bottlenecks.
- I wish the light rail had come in operation before the housing developments. My big concern is the property values of homes decreasing, crime going up with people from other areas hopping on the train for fun and leisure creating concerns in the neighborhoods, noise issues and environmental issues.
- The key need is to minimize route time. Truxel is too busy/ congested and will slow route times.
- I am a bit concerned about construction congestion and noise level.
- People complaining about the environment should remember that all the cars affect the environment too!
- Will the height of rail affect landscape (natural environment)?
- Consider working with SAFCA and COE as part of activation of old growth riparian vegetation.
- Make project GHG Natural or a reduction in GHG commissioned.



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

- Possible conversion of parking at the airport to other uses such as a utility scale solar.
- Additional renewable energy plan route should be considered.
- Consider planned growth and road congestion when analyzing GHG.
- Why is South Natomas shown as a parking location when most parking is reserved for the community center?
- I would also worry about increased noise levels and increased littering by trains and its passengers.
- How do you plan on handling the traffic nightmare?
- Add more traffic signals on Truxel and coordinate timing to keep traffic slow and paced.
- I am very concerned about the impact on the South Natomas area. This is a densely populated area, and not affluent. However, there is a quality of life here; the beautiful tree lined streets, especially Truxel. The Green Line would change that on Truxel.
- Limit vehicles near the rails to zero emission vehicles only. Gas cars are too noisy and would discourage bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Traffic congestion and air quality should suggest more urgency on completion.
- I'm very concerned about the safety of the light rail stations and surrounding neighborhoods. Adding service to this area will lower safety and the quality of the neighborhood.
- My concern is the crime that is rampant on our transit system and areas it serves.
- I am concerned about the traffic impact between W. El Camino to San Juan.
- Also, the wires that go with the Green Line would be unsightly. I am very concerned that the Green Line would disrupt and "ghettoize" South Natomas. Seriously rethink the effect on South Natomas.
- Violent crime will go up as well as thefts. We already have a home theft problem in the Bannon Creek/Truxel area. This will make it much worse because will allow for easy ingress/egress to/from homes nearby.
- Property values will be decimated because light rail brings homeless and people of ill-repute who have nothing else to do but ride the train. People will not want to buy near RT.
- Health Impact Assessments: The nuisance of living next to a station must be overcome through careful planning to shield noise and visual pollution from adjoining land. I am not sure this has been done, since I just learned of the development. The nuisance factor has been found to be a problem mainly in quiet, suburban areas. One electric light rail train produces nearly 99 percent less carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions per mile than one automobile does. A report from the American Public Transit Association



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

(APTA). I believe that this is a good thing overall. Negative consequences are increases in noise levels, loss of wetlands, adverse impacts to historic sites, gentrification and risk of displacement. Has this been addressed through an environmental impact study, if so where has it been published for review? I suggest the other project sites be considered, such as, North Park Drive to Ottumwa Dr. light rail to the center of East Commerce Way or the other side of the vacant land. Please reply. Thank you for your attention.

- Too much traffic already exists from the area between Bannon Creek and Natomas Marketplace Plaza and accidents will occur.
- Noise levels related to RT and increased congestion will increase pollution and noise.
- The community center area is for children. All of these issues will impact those who come to the park!!!
- I think it is very important to include consideration of as much clean renewable energy in the project either as a direct project facility or a mitigation measure. Given the location and alignment this would likely be solar. I believe that PV panels should certainly be included at all stations to the greatest extent possible and along the alignment where space is available. It may be possible to modify the cable support columns to include panels. However ground mounted panels are much more cost effective and easy to maintain if there is room available for them in the right of way. It should be considered that battery storage is becoming more economically viable.
- The proposed route through Discovery Park between Sequoia Pacific Blvd and Truxel Rd. will bisect one of the largest patches of mature riparian forest in the Sacramento area. The Environmental Impact Report should include an analysis of the impact of the permanent fragmentation of this forest on local wildlife including the threatened valley elderberry beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*). Impacts to be analyzed should include light pollution from bright lights installed in what is now a dark area at night as many species of insects are attracted to lights at night where they are at increased risk of predation and other mortality factors.
- I am one among many who believe that we must reach 100 percent renewable as soon as possible if we are going to minimize climate change which has already had a measurable negative impact. This project should be an example of what we can do with some forethought.
- Hello RT light rail assessors,
I have reviewed the proposed path that the new rail is targeting, and I wanted to inject an opinion on this proposal.



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

First of all, I wanted to say that I have been a resident of South Natomas for a good percentage of my 56 years on this earth.

I am a huge proponent of alternative modes of transportation. I walk/ride my bike, and of course take the RT system to get around town.

I am very aware of the daily traffic patterns in/around the South Natomas area.

I have also had the experience of using Light Rail systems in some of the major cities in the US. This includes Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and San Diego. Additionally I have used the Washington DC Light Rail on the East Coast. In Europe I have traveled using the Metro System.

In short I would say I have ridden on many systems.

Now that I have provided a foundation of my experience and background, I wanted to express an opinion on the proposed route.

The corridor that the rail is proposed to take will take it through one of the most congested areas in Sacramento. Truxel road from El Camino (northward to the Natomas Marketplace) is one of the most highly traveled streets. It also contains a large number of residences along the section between El Camino and San Juan. The intersection/entrance to the Natomas Marketplace shopping is one of the most poorly designed intersections. The intermixing of a Light Rail train into that mix would make the situation even worse.

In my opinion the construction of a LR extension through this section will cause numerous issues.

- 1) The rail will impede the already nightmarish flow of traffic on Truxel Road
- 2) The rail will create a hazard for homes located on the East side of Truxel Road
- 3) The rail will cause much dissatisfaction to the residents located on Truxel Road
- 4) The rail will cause property values to drop for the homes located on the LR corridor

If the object is to smoothly shuttle passengers from Downtown Sacramento to the Airport, I think this concept needs to be revisited.

The area where the shuttle is being planned does not represent a very high percentage of the riders (that want to get to the airport).

Ridership will not support the costs involved in creating this path to the airport.

Based on the number of stops involved in the basic design that is on the website, the amount of time it takes to take the LR would be discouraging for many (including myself).

It would be more advantageous to just take the YOLO TRANSIT BUS, or LYFT, or UBER instead. Based on my calculations, the run to the airport using these current methods would be fractional compared to the Light Rail Extension.



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

RECOMMENDATION: The rail should be configured with an offsite parking area/staging location somewhere near the rail yard. The rail path should be reconfigured to follow a path that does not take it through so many congested areas. A possible path would be parallel to El Centro Road. Also, the number of stops should be reduced.

Thank you for considering my suggestions.

Design

- The rails need to be separate from traffic! Better for both to run smoothly.
- The light rail does not have enough room for luggage. Add buses from the train station to the airport now.
- I hope to see light rail integrated with bike and pedestrian access and other public transportation.
- I'd like to see double tracking from Downtown to the airport to facilitate higher train frequency or headways.
- I think Regional Transit (RT) should hire a design firm to make Sacramento transit cohesive, understandable, and well thought out. I want RT to make sense to my mom who is skeptical.
- South Natomas segment should preserve trees and limited right of way acquired.

Amenities & Safety

- At key stations, I would like to see parking structures so North Natomas residents can park and take light rail into downtown.
- I would like to see measures to address safety, especially at night.
- Include bike parking at stations.
- Hopefully the stations will stay clean and safe.
- I am concerned about street lighting; replacement LEDs less than 3000k.
- In addition, I hope the line will be well maintained and that there will be personnel to handle troublemakers.
- I am concerned about not having glaring lights everywhere. There are many new fixtures that address non-glare, full cutoff fixtures, and low, warm-color lamps. No blue lights! Be neighbor friendly.
- Trains carry crime and homeless people as well. It is true here, with BART in the Bay Area, and MARTA in Atlanta, GA. We already cannot get police response in South Natomas.



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

- We already have a homeless population problem and this will make it worse. Drugs are sold on the trains with nothing done to stop it. We do not need and do not want drug dealers in my neighborhood.
- I request all bridges/stations have artistic details and decorative light fixtures.
- Include art at stations to reflect communities or the Sacramento region as a whole.
- For safety, can emergency call stations be added? What about safety on the train? Anti-terror in design?
- Add reader board, two light rail stations for time interval.
- I want to be able to charge my phone and use wifi on the train.
- Bike storage? Bike racks? Include at major destination points.
- Rail cars on the Green Line should accommodate airport travelers who have roller bags. Suitcase storage would be appropriate.
- You told me to my face that the "stops" are safe and clean. History shows not true and I don't want that across from my home.
- Keep RT's promise that Truxel sound walls would be upgraded.
- I am concerned with frequency of stops in relation to pedestrian/rider traffic to limit jaywalkers. Increase the amount of cross walks for neighborhoods to cross streets to the light rail platform.
- Please mitigate with new vine-covered sound walls on Truxel.
- Save all the trees on Truxel.
- Add a cop at all South Natomas stations to add security and safety.
- Add pedestrian lighting on Truxel and streets that connect to LRT.
- The freeway would be convenient for a park and ride and accessible from the highway--like 80 Watt and Long View.
- I am an 11-year resident of South Natomas and a daily transit and bicycle commuter to downtown Sacramento. As such, it was with great interest that I attended the December 3rd Green Line to the Airport workshop held at the South Natomas Community Center. After reviewing the options presented at the workshop and discussions with the staff and consultants present, I would like to submit the following comments.
Construction of "Dutch" style intersection at Truxel - Garden Highway intersection. As a daily bicycle commuter, I am very familiar with the difficulties of bicycling from South Natomas to downtown and midtown Sacramento. As such, I am very happy to see consideration of an additional bridge crossing over the American River at Truxel Road and to see the inclusion of bicycle lanes under consideration for the bridge. While this bridge will make it significantly easier and more convenient to bike from South Natomas to



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

downtown, it will also highlight the deficiencies of the Truxel Road / Garden Highway intersection for bicyclists and pedestrians. Both Truxel Road and Garden Highway are currently posted for at least 40 MPH, and drivers often approach the intersection and execute turns at relatively high speed without taking notice of pedestrians or bicyclists. Given that the addition of this bridge will likely increase both the bicycle and automobile traffic approaching that intersection, special consideration should be taken for pedestrian safety at that intersection. One such possibility would be the incorporation of a "Dutch-style" intersection, such as that recent installed at E. Covell Blvd and J Street in Davis (<http://www.davisenterprise.com/local-news/davis-dutch-intersection-first-ever-in-u-s-unveiled-with-no-drama/>). The additional separation from vehicular traffic provided by the setbacks and pedestrian islands, as well as the additional visibility, would go a long way to accommodating the anticipated increase in automotive traffic at that intersection while mitigating the danger to bicyclists and pedestrians.

Improve bicycle lane separation in the approach to Truxel - Garden Highway intersection. SB Truxel Road's current bicycle lane configuration requires bicyclists to cut across the right turn lane in order to follow the bike route to the intersection. In conjunction with a Dutch intersection configuration, the bike lane configuration on SB Truxel between Millcreek Drive and Garden Highway should be changed, ideally with a curb or pylon separation from the vehicular lane.

Support the elevated RT station concept at Gateway Park / Natomas Marketplace. I like this idea a lot and the inclusion of the pedestrian overpasses over Truxel and Gateway Park help to alleviate the problems at one of the most pedestrian-unfriendly intersections in the city.

Consider possibility of bike / pedestrian lane adjacent to the RT line over the Truxel / I-80 overpass. In many ways, I-80 presents a more formidable barrier between South and North Natomas than that posed by the American River between South Natomas and downtown. The Truxel Road overpass of I-80 is extremely unfriendly to bicyclists and pedestrians due to configuration of the on- and off-ramps. In order to mitigate this problem and to make it easier and safer to traverse I-80, please give consideration to the inclusion of a pedestrian/bicycle lane adjacent to the RT line down the center of the Truxel Road overpass. To reduce the possibility of RT/pedestrian collisions, this lane should be separated from the RT tracks (and possibly also from the vehicle lane) physical barrier.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on this project. I look forward to following the future developments on the Green Line.



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

- I think these issues should be addressed...a better plan for the Green Line to the airport is needed.
- How do we have everyone keep the trains clean so riding on them would be a pleasant experience?

American River Bridge Crossing

- I prefer the City's General Plan option with all modes of transportation - no places to park and ride.
- I am concerned about the impacts on the Parkway.
- I would like to see a minimal footprint of the bridge over the river.
- Will this project be detrimental to the natural habitat located near the American River?
- On the bridge over American River, provision for Discovery Park Exit to get down to the river.
- I would like to see the American River bridge carry bikes, pedestrians, light rail, and automobiles (all modes).
- Minimize impact to the development of a future neighborhood from the landing on the south end of the American River crossing. We need it to be an environment that will encourage TOD and a place where RT riders want to live.
- For American River crossing, minimize the visual impact and sound. Use transparent rails on sides. Minimize speeds for autos if included.
- What are the strengthening of bridge alternatives without affecting the view and the environment in case the bridge is not strong enough?
- Work with the City of Sacramento to analyze auto use of new bridge over American River from Natomas commuters. Also, light rail should not share lanes on the bridge.
- For the bridge crossing options, I would prefer bikes and pedestrians to be separated by striping or a raised barrier with clear signage directing each mode.
- Automotive, bicycle and pedestrian traffic should all be separated over the new American River bridge. Vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians should all have discrete paths over the bridge. The bicycle lane should ideally be separated from vehicular traffic by pylons, a barrier or a curb. A painted bike lane demarcation would be insufficient for safety due to poor visibility in the dark or inclement weather. Similarly, shared pedestrian / bicycle sidewalks, such as that on 7th Street, only serve to deflect the problem of bicycle-auto collisions to bicycle-pedestrian collisions.
- We need to include cars on the American River bridge.



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

- By the way, the bike/pedestrian alternative to the bridge has got to be the way to go (leave cars out!).
- What about the huge bridge? It's got to cost beaucoup bucks.
- I attended the Public Scoping Meeting on December 2, 2015 and submitted written comments on the comment cards provided at that meeting.

The following comments are intended to compliment and clarify those submitted at the meeting. These comments are primarily to focus the proposed crossing of the American River.

1. It is important that any alternative to the proposed alignment to evaluate both respect to cost and environmental impacts with emphasis emissions when automobile traffic is being considered for the bridge crossing.

2. The increases in emission resulting from congestion should be considered. This factor was considered in the CALTRANS environmental study for car pool and bus lanes on Interstate 5 between elk Grove and Sacramento. Full buildout of the Natomas area currently planned development and planned expansion of the International Airport should be considered.

3. Reduction of noise should be major consideration for the proposed bridge. Measures to be considered include

- * Minimizing speed for both trains and automobile on the crossing.
- * Rubberized pavement for auto lanes.
- * Sound dampening cushioned bedding for tracks.
- * Track joint should be minimized and designed to reduce noise such including nonmetallic material in the joint.
- * Auto speed should be minimized by the use of speed limit signage and approach design that will slow traffic.
- * The used of transparent Plexiglas barrier on the side of the bridge should be consisted to minimize sound travel. These should be coated with material that will ease removal of graffiti.

4. The tree removal as required for bridge should be minimized. The used of precast deck section should considered. This will minimize tree removal.

5. The bridge deck depth should be minimized by the use of prestressed girder sections.

6. Bridge width should be minimized by use of joint bike and pedestrian lanes should be considered.

7. A bridge color that blend with background and does not stand out should be use.



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

8. An important part of the project will be design in that minimizes conflict with auto traffic on high volume streets such as Truckee. Information and control technology should be state of the art to help trains be responsive to traffic conditions.

10. Walking and bike access to the line should be carefully designed to make routes as safe and convenient as possible.

11. Neighborhood shuttle to provide access to the line should be included

12. Constraints to parking at international airport should be considered to incentives for use of the light rail.

Thank You for your consideration.

Funding

- We need to support the funding! The traffic is so bad. We need this!
- What is the cost of this project?
- Who is paying for this?
- How many jobs will it create?
- Before you seek public funding, RT must repair the existing system by getting serious about fare evasion, never dispatching a dirty train, installing shade/rain shelters, and clean stations weekly.
- No one will vote for or support filthy trains to the airport.
- Project costs too much, especially in an uncertain economy.
- Try to minimize cost.
- Are there going to be enough riders to justify all the \$\$ for this project? A lot of education/incentives may encourage more riders. Great job and good luck!
- It's irresponsible to continue pursuing light rail expansion at all cost, especially when federal funding tolerance of rail projects is very low.
- This is a great project. Please build it ASAP. I would support a sales tax increase to fund it.

Public Transportation Options

- With the expected growth in North Natomas, we will need more public transportation.
- Will bus service be expanded for lines like 13 and 11 with these changes throughout Natomas?
- How will the Green Line accommodate patrons who use it because of flights that are outside of standard hours of operation for the Blue and Gold lines?



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

- I live in a senior community (Heritage Park) at Elkhorn and Northborough. We are excited about the Green Line but will need bus transportation from our development to the station on East Commerce. What is planned?
- My "dream" is for me to be able to travel from my home in Arden Arcade/Carmichael area to the City and other areas of the county, and never have to get in a car.
- I'd love to see creative solutions for working families. My kid is in school in Carmichael and I work in North Natomas. Like most working parents, public transportation is not an option for me.
- It would be better if there was no transfer needed. Would prefer if the Gold Line and the Blue Line feed directly to the airport.
- Project should include enhanced access to the Green Line for buses, shuttles, pedestrians, and bikes.
- Please ensure that bus lines connect well to the line and run frequently (i.e. line 34 in midtown doesn't run at night or on weekends so it's hard to get downtown to catch another bus or light rail).
- If you wanted rapid transit for Natomas and to the airport, you could have added bus lines 10, 20, or even 30 years ago.
- Get tourists from airport to downtown (hotels and arena) in 20 minutes.
- Consider street car instead of LRT.
- The goals of the current plan could be achieved by busses. Busses are far more flexible than trains. There is currently only one bus line that travels down Truxel and it runs every 1/2 hour at its most frequent. More bus lines and more frequent bus lines should be employed instead of a billion dollar light rail. Light rail has no business being on the only main car and bike throughway within two miles that connects South Natomas and North Natomas. Truxel is already very congested. Truxel could be bikeable if investments were made, but instead we are going to make it impossible to bike by putting in light rail and squeezing in the cars. People who actually live in Natomas would like workable public transport instead of catering to the imaginary people who need to get from the airport to the new arena.
- Add 10 parking lots or provide shuttle.
- Why won't RT expand bus service to North Natomas and airport? North Natomas has huge low income apartment complexes and residents have no transit service. Not enough ridership to justify?
- There should be some "express" alternative to the "local"- two tracks maybe?



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

Community Involvement

- Great to see such early, open talks.

Other

- I have never lived in a city with a light rail before. I am fairly new to the Sacramento area.
- How are you dealing with the homeless?
- Will we have enough funding for water?
- Will you be using solar energy?
- Will you go before Congress to change the law of high taxation for business?
- Environmentally, it would be better to go from the Watt Ave Station to the airport than Downtown.
- Is the pedestrian crossing over westbound 80 safely going to be fixed? From what I recall, several pedestrians have been hit there.
- I prefer that the 7th Street Bridge allows autos as well as bike/ pedestrian travel.
- Please let me know when you are soliciting comments for the Environmental Impact Study and scoping for environmental documents.
- The planned developments right near the airport should be mixed-use since there already seem to be many homes in or near that area.
- Buy houses that face Truxel.
- Please include me in your email list for project disclosure and Green Line Updates.
- Let's talk about what happens to traffic along Folsom Boulevard in Rancho Cordova due to train crossing signals at rush hour. We need to not repeat here!



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

Appendix G – Agency Feedback

Potential Impacts

- Include a complete assessment of existing biological conditions within the project area, including but not limited to the type, quantity, and locations of habitats, flora, and fauna. [CDFW]
- Include a complete and current analysis of threatened, endangered, candidate, and locally unique species. Conduct species surveys using approved protocols. [CDFW]
- Identify and describe all short-term, long-term, permanent, and temporary impacts to biological resources including all direct and foreseeable indirect impacts. [CDFW]
- The project area may be impacted by reducing riparian and terrestrial habitats, including habitats for sensitive species and could result in the direct take of state-listed species. [CDFW]
- Discuss the project's cumulative impacts to natural resources and determine if the project's contribution would result in a significant impact. Include a list of present, past, and probable future projects producing related impacts or include a summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional, or statewide plan. [CDFW]
- Incorporate mitigation performance standards that would ensure that significant impacts are reduced as expected. [CDFW]
- Include all avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. If impacts to state-listed species are expected to occur even with the implementation of these measures, mitigation measures shall be proposed to fully mitigate the impacts. [CDFW]
- Encourages early coordination to determine appropriate measures to offset project impacts and facilitate future permitting processes, and to coordinate with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to coordinate specific measures to federally listed species. [CDFW]
- Disclose all potential activities that may incur a direct or indirect take to nongame nesting birds within the project footprint and close vicinity, and include appropriate avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures to avoid take. [CDFW]
- Identify impacts to traffic operations at state highway system ramps and ramp intersections using a Traffic Impact Study. [Caltrans]
- Prepare a Transportation Management Plan or construction Traffic Impact Study if traffic restrictions or detours are needed on or would affect the state highway system. [Caltrans]



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

- Determine the impacts to the state highway system from placing fill within floodplain areas using a hydraulic model. [Caltrans]
- Do not unduly restrict or impede the navigation and recreational rights of the public. [SLC]
- Prepare a report on the feasibility of providing public access to the American River in association with the proposed bridge crossing. [SLC]
- Include a section describing the potential to affect recreation uses and public access to the American River. [SLC]
- Discuss recreational uses and access points in the project vicinity, whether and to what extent these uses would be facilitated or disrupted by the project, and what if any measures could be implemented to reduce any potential negative impacts. Also identify any safety measures to ensure public safety for recreational activities. [SLC]
- Assess public access needs and include a benefit analysis of public access alternatives. [SLC]
- Describe existing public access points and facilities in the project vicinity, including the existing condition of these resources and entity responsible for maintenance. [SLC]
- Assess existing constraints and hazards that could make onsite public access infeasible. [SLC]
- Assess the feasibility of proposed onsite public access infrastructure such as construction of trails, stairs, parking area, trash cans, and restrooms. [SLC]
- If onsite access is infeasible, provide an assessment on the feasibility (and environmental impacts) of improving existing public access in the project vicinity or creating new public access points that could provide a means to access the American River in the project vicinity. [SLC]
- Evaluate potential impacts on surface and groundwater quality. [CVRWQCB]
- Discuss, quantify, and disclose significant construction-phase emissions of criteria pollutants and precursors of primary concern. Prepare a construction air quality mitigation plan if thresholds are exceeded. [SMAQMD]
- Discuss, quantify, and disclose construction-phase emissions of greenhouse gases, and minimize greenhouse gas emissions during construction. [SMAQMD]
- Discuss, quantify, and disclose significant operations-phase emissions of criteria pollutants and precursors of primary concern. Prepare an operational air quality mitigation plan if thresholds are exceeded. [SMAQMD]
- Discuss, quantify, and disclose operations-phase emissions of greenhouse gases, and discuss consistency with existing greenhouse gas reduction plans such as the



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, the California Air Resources Board Scoping Plan, and the City of Sacramento Climate Action Plan.

[SMAQMD]

- Estimate the acreage of waters of the United States within the project area using jurisdictional determinations, including the classification, functional condition, and geographic extent. [USEPA]
- Identify all protected resources with special designations and all special aquatic sites, and steps taken to avoid and minimize impacts to these areas. [USEPA]
- Provide specific descriptions of proposed in Clean Water Act regulated waters including grading plans and cross sections. [USEPA]
- Discuss wildlife species that could reasonably be expected to use waters or associated habitat, and sensitive plant taxa that are associated with waters or associated habitat. [USEPA]
- Analyze the potential flood flow alteration. [USEPA]
- Analyze the potential water quality impact and potential effect to designated uses. [USEPA]
- Identify specific techniques proposed for minimizing surface water contamination due to increased runoff from additional impervious surfaces. [USEPA]
- Demonstrate that all potential impacts to waters of the United States have been avoided and minimized. If these resources cannot be avoided, demonstrate how cost, logistical, or technological constraints preclude avoidance and minimization of impacts. [USEPA]
- Quantify temporary and permanent impacts to waters of the United States. [USEPA]
- Identify design measures and modifications to avoid and minimize impacts to water resources, and quantify the benefits achieved. [USEPA]
- Include a compensation proposal for unavoidable impacts to regulated waters that complies with regulations for compensatory mitigation. [USEPA]
- Include a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan for fugitive dust and diesel particulate matter, including best available control measures for fugitive dust, mobile and stationary sources, and administrative controls. [USEPA]
- Identify how the proposed alternatives may affect low-income or minority populations in the surrounding areas, and provide appropriate mitigation measures for any anticipated adverse impacts. Include a description of the area of potential impact and provide the source of the demographic information. [USEPA]
- Include outreach to low-income and minority populations in the surrounding areas as part of community involvement activities. [USEPA]



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

Permit Requirements

- If it is determined that the project may have the potential to result in the take of state-listed species, an Incidental Take Permit or consistency determination may be required. [CDFW]
- Identify all areas under CDFW jurisdiction per Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code, including all perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral rivers, streams, and lakes and habitats supported by these features such as wetlands and riparian habitats. Note that CDFW definition of wetlands as well as extent of the jurisdictional areas differs from other agencies such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Regional Water Quality Control Board – identify the different jurisdictional areas under each agency. [CDFW]
- Apply for an Encroachment Permit for any work or traffic control that would encroach onto state right of way. [Caltrans]
- A land use lease application is not required because state sovereign interests in the American River have been granted to the City of Sacramento. [SLC]
- A permit is required for the placement, construction, reconstruction, removal, or abandonment of any landscaping, culvert, bridge, conduit, fence, projection, fill, embankment, building, structure, obstruction, encroachment, excavation, planting or removal of vegetation, and repair or maintenance activity that involves cutting into the levee. [CVFPB]
- Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities. [CVRWQCB]
- Follow local stormwater permittee design concepts for low-impact development and post-construction hydromodification. [CVFPB]
- A U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permit may be needed for discharge of dredged or fill material into navigable waters or wetlands pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. A Water Quality Certification must be obtained prior to initiation of project activities. Waste Discharge Requirements may be needed if the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determines that only non-federal waters are present. [CVRWQCB]
- Construction or groundwater dewatering and discharge to land may be covered under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Risk General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board's Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Risk Waiver) R5-2013-0145. [CVRWQCB]



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

- Construction or groundwater dewatering and discharge to surface water will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit. Dewatering discharges may be covered under the General Order for Dewatering and other Low-Threat Discharges to Surface Waters (Low Threat General Order) or the General Order for Limited-Threat Discharges of Treated/Untreated Groundwater from Cleanup Sites, Wastewater from Superchlorination Projects, or Other Limited-Threat Wastewaters to Surface Water (Limited Threat General Order). [CVRWQCB]
- The American River is considered to be a navigable water of the United States, and a bridge permit is required prior to construction. [USCG]
- Identify sensitive areas or aquatic systems with functions highly susceptible to change. Demonstrate that potential impacts to waters of the United States have been avoided or minimized to the maximum extent practicable consistent with Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act. [USEPA]

Project Description

- Involve Caltrans in the design and traffic operations studies for Interstate 80 and State Route 99 overcrossings. [Caltrans]
- Explore triple tracking in key locations to allow future limited or express service between with Airport and Downtown. [SMAQMD]
- Consider using roundabouts when investigating intersection geometries. [SMAQMD]
- The American River bridge will be required to match or exceed the navigational clearances provided by the downstream Interstate 5 freeway bridge. This will require a minimum of 10 feet of vertical clearance between low steel and the 35-foot high water (floodplain) elevation, with at least 111 feet of horizontal clearance pier face to pier face, normal to the axis of the channel. The proposed in-water piers shall be located so that they do not preclude safe navigation, in good water, through the bridge during high or low water extremes and do not result in unsafe navigation relative to other existing obstructions in the waterway such as adjacent bridges. Bottom contours and a site visit will be required to determine correct pier locations to ensure safe navigation through the proposed bridge. [USCG]
- Commit to facilities that are certified as green buildings per the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design rating system. [USEPA]
- Use green infrastructure in onsite stormwater management features, such as bioretention areas, vegetated swales, porous pavement, and filter strips. [USEPA]



Green Line to the Airport Scoping Meetings

December 1, 2, and 3, 2015

North Natomas, Downtown Sacramento, and South Natomas

- Use recycled materials, or reuse or recycle byproduct materials. Identify how industrial materials recycling can be incorporated into project design. [USEPA]

Alternatives Analysis

- In addition to having the American River bridge crossing being a rail and pedestrian bridge, consider an alternative that includes general purpose vehicle lanes. Addition of a vehicle crossing may be more consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and reduce vehicle trip lengths. [SMAQMD]
- Include a summary in the discussion of alternatives that discusses the other modes and alignments that were considered but not carried forward in previous analyses so that the public and other agencies who were not involved in those processes have an understanding of how the proposed locally preferred alternative was selected. [USEPA]