



**SR 12/Rio Vista Bridge Preliminary Study
Public Information Workshop No. 2
DRAFT Meeting Recap – 6:30-8:30 p.m., Feb. 25, 2010
White Elementary School, Rio Vista**

Project Team Representatives

Janet Adams, Solano Transportation Authority

Eric Cordoba, Cordoba Consulting

Steve Mislinski, AECOM

Bob Fish, AECOM

Keen Poong, AECOM

Bill Mayer, LSA

Lucy Eidam, LucyCo Communications

Summary

On February 25, 2010, approximately 70 community members attended a public information workshop for the State Route 12/Rio Vista Bridge Preliminary Study at White Elementary School in Rio Vista. Lucy Eidam from LucyCo Communications opened the session by welcoming attendees and stating the meeting purpose as an opportunity to hear a project update about project alternatives and navigational constraints and let participants know the meeting was not being held to select an alternative. She then introduced Councilmember Jack Krebs.

Councilmember Krebs welcomed the meeting participants, provided a brief project background and stated that the City of Rio Vista requested the study to be undertaken. He then introduced Janet Adams, Deputy Executive Director/Director of Projects at Solano Transportation Authority, who provided an overview of the State Route 12/Rio Vista Bridge Preliminary Study and an overview of the State Route 12 Major Investment Study that will be underway in the next month to study the route from I-80 to I-5.

Before the meeting was turned over to Project Manager Steve Mislinski of AECOM, Lucy Eidam stated that everyone would be asked to complete comment cards for any comments they would like recorded in the meeting recap. Steve Mislinski presented a detailed overview of the project history, purpose, goals, objectives and alternatives (see PowerPoint presentation that is available for download in PDF format along with simulations of potential routes at www.riovistabridge.com). In addition, he highlighted the public outreach conducted as part of the project:

- Summer 2008 Stakeholder Interviews
- September 24, 2008 Special Meeting of the Rio Vista City Council
- May 21, 2009 Public Workshop
- August 26, 2009 Special Meeting of the Rio Vista City Council
- May 2009 Public Workshop

A question-and-answer and comment session followed and the project team stayed after the Q&A to answer questions one-on-one after the formal presentation was complete.



Summary of Question and Answer Session Themes

Specific comments were provided on the comment cards as indicated in the following section of the recap; however, during the question and answer session, topics mentioned more than once included impact of a toll fee, impact on private property and landowners and impact of truck traffic on the local community.

Concerns about tolls were the most frequently mentioned by the participants. Comments ranged from how the toll would negatively impact businesses (several indicated that businesses would go out of business if a toll were put into place) to how detrimentally residents would be impacted, especially those who frequently travel across the bridge several times each day. One person indicated that a toll would be all right in their mind for truck traffic.

One person stated that landowners who would potentially be affected just outside Rio Vista should be included as stakeholders. Another stated that jurisdictions on the other side of the river should be involved in the study.

Comments Submitted On Comment Cards

Eighteen comments were formally submitted in writing at the meeting as indicated below.

- Working people cannot afford the tolls.
- I absolutely do not support or agree with putting a toll on the new bridge. I am also questioning the accuracy of your traffic flow projections.
- Try to impact as few residents as possible. Thinking long term, hold down noise and hold down traffic within city. Hold down long term costs. Build a tunnel or bridge where the maintenance costs can be kept to a minimum. No tolls. Build a bridge/tunnel with very low impact, then no tolls.
- I prefer to see the southern crossing, which seems to have the least impact on existing homes. I would not be in favor of putting a general toll on the existing bridge, but I would support a toll on the big rigs crossing the existing bridge.
- The effect of a toll will be devastating to local businesses that depend on going to Lodi and Stockton for supplies. To put a toll on the Rio Vista Bridge is an anti-business action.
- I live in Isleton. The project is going to kill shopping at Lira's. Once a week, I attend classes at the senior center for \$3. A toll would be detrimental to all this.
- I am very, very disappointed in this study as a property owner that would be greatly impacted by this bridge relocation. As a property owner, we have NO communication with either the city or any official that is assigned to this study. I believe the decision has been made and I believe that this puts my family and me at a disadvantage if our property is going to be condemned. This is not our first experience with these types of projects. CalTrans, DWR and Fish and Game. We have been dealing with these types of issues (land use). I expect a meeting ASAP.
- Regarding the southern alternative, the land that will be used for the bridge is under a conservation easement funded by the California State Department of Conservation. There are numerous endangered and threatened species on that property. Environmentalists would object to this route.



- The Seeno development is non-viable and that land should be used for the bridge. It is very unlikely given the current and future economy that housing development will take place. The development agreement should be changed and a new (i.e. bridge) use found for that land.
- The Canright Road alignment goes through wetlands and would also wipe out a future gas well drilling location that has been designated for future drilling. The future drilling location is the southwest corner of the northern one-fourth section of Brann Ranch.
- The general plan update ten years ago explicitly considered the four alternatives that you present now. We purposely decided on Airport Rd for the following reasons: to protect the Montezuma Hills and agriculture there, to reinforce the idea of an industrial area, to protect the DP2 and to keep from isolating Rio Vista. This decision expressed the views of the community. It is wrong to violate our current general plan.
- The primary problem on Highway 12 is trucks. If trucks are prohibited from Highway 12, then traffic is no longer a problem.
- If you increase Highway 12 to four lanes and the bridge to four lanes, the traffic will only increase. If it remains a route that slows people down, people won't choose to take it.
- This was an excellent presentation of the alternatives. It was explained well.
- Hooray for Jeannie McCormick. Take her comments to heart. In spite of all the meetings, it sounds to me that you are planning without really listening! (This is my first meeting)! Joe Awender's land would be split in half. What kind of planning is that? Imminent domain? Maybe we need a tunnel from the city limit on Highway 12 all the way across the river! (I'm only kidding!)
- I do not like to be held hostage by developers who may or may not ever contribute to our community. Their entitlements should be invalidated. Proceed with the Airport Road alternative only. It has the most advantages and fewest disadvantages. Get the trucks off our local roads-have them use I-80 and I-5.
- Twenty years from now? The town will be gone! Studies have been going on since 1999!

Several participants included their name on the comment cards, which were provided to the Solano Transportation Authority; for privacy reasons, they are not included in the recap.