

**TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC HEARING
FOR THE FOUR COUNTIES (Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba)
MINUTES**

**October 22, 2024 – 6:00 P.M.
HEARING HELD VIA ZOOM**

The hearing was conducted by Jesse Loren representing the SACOG Board of Directors, with Barbara VaughanBechtold of SACOG staff, Jennipher Marquez representing South County Transit Link (SCT/Link), Matt Mauk representing Yuba-Sutter Transit, and Sarah Poe representing the Sacramento Regional Transit District. All transit operator representatives also represent the Sacramento County, Yolo County, and Joint Yuba and Sutter Counties Social Service Transportation Advisory Councils.

Ms. Loren introduced members of the hearing panel and explained that SACOG is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides funds for transportation purposes throughout the SACOG 4-county area.

Ms. VaughanBechtold gave a brief overview of the Unmet Transit Needs Process. The operators in attendance briefly described their agency's services.

Two participants testified at the hearing, and 8 items of correspondence were received. All Unmet Transit Needs comments are listed below.

Director Loren opened the hearing to public comment.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY

1. Glenn Mandelkern, Citrus Heights, CA

Mr. Mandelkern asked about the Unmet Transit Needs (UTN) Process and if commenters can comment only on existing services, or if they can comment on new services.

SACOG staff responded that participants in UTN hearings or events can comment on any transit service needs including existing and new services.

He also asked about comments related to existing services that do allow a rider to complete a trip but take a long time/multiple transfers.

SACOG staff responded that participants could make those comments, but per the unmet transit needs definitions those wouldn't be unmet needs since a traveler can make the trip even if it may not be convenient.

Mr. Mandelkern asked about "operational comments" and what those are versus service comments.

SACOG staff responded that “operational comments” are those that are mainly capital focused related to improvements to vehicles, bus stops, though they can also include things like frequency of service as well.

2. Lucas van Houtryve, Sacramento, CA

Lucas lives in the Tahoe Park neighborhood in Sacramento and goes to school in Carmichael in unincorporated Sacramento County and cannot get to Jesuit High School. It currently takes two hours and up to three transfers in addition to two plus miles walking or biking to make this trip. He has proposed new routes to school to James Drake at SacRT.

SacRT responded – SacRT has an upcoming Comprehensive Operational Analysis will be looking at things like this and doing this analysis to see if there’s ways to improve situations like Lucas’s.

CORRESPONDENCE

1. Vanessa Nino, Sacramento, CA

Hi, I live within walking distance of Franklin Light Rail Station. I am very upset that presently there is no bus that goes directly from the Franklin Station to Delta Shores. There used to be such a bus pre-pandemic. Please bring this bus route back so that there is transport directly from the Franklin Station to Delta Shores and back. Also, please install benches at the Delta Shores bus stop. Years ago, we had to sit on the concrete floor to wait for the bus. A shaded bench is needed. Thank you.

2. Ben Bodenmiller, Folsom, CA

It is nearly impossible to use transit to get from the Folsom Parkway neighborhood to light rail except for one trip a day. This makes it unusable.

3. Jenna Rodriguez, Elk Grove, CA

Hello,

As i am very thankful for the bus and the commute to downtown Sacramento. I would love for you to bring the afternoon route back. It helps so much for the commute instead of needing to ride an Uber or Lyft when I’m in office for half days. Thank you.

4. Gayle Jamerson, Elk Grove, CA

Governor Newsom mandates state workers to return to the office 2x a week. Some staff go in more. Many busses are still operating pre-COVID routes and many last commuter busses pick up around 6:30 a.m. This is early and adding one more bus to popular routes that picked up around 7:00 a.m. would make it easier. My bus route (#10 E-Tran/Sac RT) had five commuter routes before COVID and now there are two. One picks up around 5:30 a.m. and the last around 6:30 a.m.

5. James Cook, Sacramento, CA

I think there should be spots for USB/Outlet in buses and light rails. Many people at the end of the day have a low battery and need to plug in, so this would help for those people. Also, I would like to suggest on-board WiFi, it could be metered for (example) around \$5 per trip, or a day pass for people connecting to a different bus.

6. Ross Parish, Sacramento, CA

LRT Gold Line at Sac Valley Station - 30-minute headways outside of peak hours is unacceptably infrequent for a mass transit service connecting a city to its main rail hub. Capitol Corridor is already fantastic in isolation, but more people will not step up and choose Capitol Corridor over the freeway unless they are confident, they can get to the station in time, or to their final destination safely, at all times of day.

7. Lucas van Houtryve, Sacramento, CA

Dear SACOG,

I attended the meeting today, 10/22/24, for the unmet transit needs and here are a few things that I thought of after the meeting ended that may or may not qualify.

Firstly, I know zero emissions buses were mentioned by SacRT, and I feel like trolleybuses should definitely be considered instead of just hydrogen and battery electric.

Secondly, I feel like there needs to be more services in the inner-city grid of Sacramento going north/south. There is currently nothing between 30th and 65th streets to travel north/south and there are lots of residents/businesses in between there.

Thirdly, what's up with the streetcar? If there is only a plan now to get it across the bridge as a slow tourist streetcar, we should reconsider the project and try to make it a tram line instead of just a streetcar and separate it from the cars in all ways possible. Or connect the current proposed alignment to the green line in its current form, but still separate it from cars.

Fourthly, with the current proposal for the green line not moving along very fast, I feel like other routings should be considered for a shorter timeline. Firstly, with all the land seemingly cleared for the light rail alignment, and the biggest obstacle being a bridge across the river because someone thought cars should be added, it should be considered to use existing blue line bridges and a new on-land alignment in north Sacramento/South Natomas. Although this might work, an express heavy rail line should be considered as well for a nonstop route to the airport that could probably be achieved in 10-15mins with a fully electrified, freight separated line. I have spoken with directors at the airport, and they are so skeptical of the current project that some of them feel they will retire before trains make it to the airport.

Fifthly, the 138 Causeway Connection is the best way for me to visit my grandparents in Davis as someone from Tahoe Park in Sacramento, but I can't take it on weekends, so it doesn't work for the school year. This service is not very well advertised, and the ridership reflects it, but it is

truly a great service for many people. Also, I miss the 1900s Proterra buses, the BEBs run so much smoother, but the dots on the windows are annoying.

Sixthly, if made at the right scale, or advertised properly to the public and then delivered properly, more rail projects should be prioritized over bus or “BRT” projects even though they seem to be less costly. For example, riders were much more excited about the new Siemens S700 trains than they were for the new Gillig 2200 buses. This is not only because the light rail project was much more advertised, but also because people like trains more. Trains have a higher quality representation in most people’s minds, and they bring more ridership, not only because of capacity but also because of preference.

Seventhly, as a cyclist, there is so much potential for Sacramento to be a great cycling city with the weather and geography, but the road conditions and transit connections don’t reflect this. The new S700 light rail cars do not have any designated bicycle storage, but there are always so many bicycles onboard. I have taken notes every time I ride the light rail about how the train is, and there are always bikes. I have also been hit a couple times before due to poor design in the road, and there are always road signs, leaf piles, trucks, cars, etc blocking the bike paths.

Eighthly, the 51 currently has a lot of good aspects with its higher frequencies and seemingly higher ridership, but this doesn’t mean it should still be a bus. Although the route 51 corridor definitely needs higher capacity services, BRT might not be the way to go. If we are able to secure funding for a metro, light rail, or light metro system such as the REM or SkyTrain systems in Montreal and Vancouver Canada respectively, more ridership would be attracted to the service because it would actually be something better instead of just a bus with a fancy rap around it. Elevated right of ways are also often much easier to attain than underground and are good for grade separation.

Ninthly, there is too much light rail ridership for the current service patterns. There have been multiple evenings when I take light rail and there is barely any space onboard. The new S700 cars are very popular and have encouraged a lot of ridership, but more than they can sustain. (Can’t say the same about the introduction of 2200 series buses) Either 3+ car trains need to be added to the service (CAF, U2A, or S700), or greater than 30 min headways need to be implemented for the evening rush. 6:00 is too early to reduce frequencies.

Tenthly, light rail services are seemingly most congested in the downtown cores when on street. These services should be considered for transit only lanes and eventually a downtown tunnel. I have also seen people make designs that show the light rail in a tunnel and then downtown streetcars still on the street with lower speeds.

Lastly, there is a need for greater connection between different agencies. This past month I was taking public transportation to the Bay Area for a Caltrain event and to visit some family friends, but we missed our Amtrak train. At 8th & K station, our light rail operators had a crew change on an already very late train. Instead of trying to keep schedule adherence, they chit chatted about non-work related topics for a good 3+ minutes. If they had not been wasting time we would have made our connection to Amtrak. Also, if there is such an easy connection between SacRT light rail and Amtrak services, why is there not a “hold train” policy like there is with BART?

I hope these can be directed to the right people and I know that some of them aren't relevant to this particular meeting, but this is the first step I can find to address these issues with the agencies.

Thanks,
Lucas van Houtryve

8. Michael Barnbaum, Sacramento, CA

Mr. Barnbaum's comments were submitted in hardcopy format so a scan of them has been included below.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Michael Andrew Barnbaum, Transit Ambassador
Sacramento Regional Transit District

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Christopher Flores <CFlores@sacrt.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 14, 2024 5:57:51 AM
To: Mike Barnbaum <mbarnbaum@sacrt.com>
Subject: Re: Submittal of new Calendar Year 2025 route proposal - Sacramento Ballpark Shuttle

Thanks mike.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Mike Barnbaum <mbarnbaum@sacrt.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 13, 2024 12:49:28 PM
To: James Drake <JDrake@sacrt.com>; Sarah Poe <SPoe@sacrt.com>
Cc: Christopher Flores <CFlores@sacrt.com>; Adam Green <AGreen@sacrt.com>
Subject: Submittal of new Calendar Year 2025 route proposal - Sacramento Ballpark Shuttle

With the 2024 service modifications approved back on March 11th and work ongoing to complete gold line platform modifications and the passing track in Folsom to get to weekday 15-minute light rail frequency to and from Folsom stations, it is now time to leapfrog to the 2025 service modifications and what more of a role public transportation can play throughout 2025. This electronic communication will solely focus on one new route in wake of breaking news that occurred back on April 4, 2024. Other 2025 proposed service modifications will definitely be submitted, but under separate electronic communications.

Background

On Thursday, April 4, 2024, the Athletics Investment Group, LLC, made a formal announcement that they were moving their franchise from Oakland to Sutter Health Park in West Sacramento for the 2025, 2026, and 2027 seasons, with an option to play a fourth season in 2028. The owner, John Fisher, and team President of Business Operations, Dave Kaval, made the announcement after negotiations with the City of Oakland broke down due to terms set forth by the City of Oakland were unacceptable to Athletics Investment Group, LLC. The next three and possibly four years were made possible by Sacramento Basketball Holdings LLC Chief Executive Officer Vivek Ranadive. The principle owner of the Sacramento Kings Basketball franchise had in previous years purchased the Sacramento RiverCats from Susan and Jeff Savage. The news on April 4th with the involvement of Ranadive, a good friend of John Fisher, made terms that Athletics Investment Group, LLC couldn't pass up, including free rent and no guarantee and/or assurances that Sacramento would gain an MLB expansion franchise. Prior to the start of the 2025 Major League Baseball Season, Sutter Health Park will undergo renovations and upgrades to be major league ready. Most of the upcoming changes to the ballpark will occur during the upcoming 2024-2025 offseason and throughout much of the upcoming 2024-2025 NBA Season. Both the Athletics and the RiverCats will call Sutter Health Park as home for the next three, and

possibly four seasons. The 2025 Major League Baseball Regular Season schedule will be released sometime in either July or August 2024. There would then be a combination of 156 baseball games at Sutter Health Park in the 2025, 2026, and 2027 seasons, and perhaps even the 2028 season as well.

Existing Oakland Conditions

The Athletics have called Oakland and the Oakland Coliseum home since 1968. The 2024 calendar year will mark the 56th and final season in Oakland, leading up to their move to Sutter Health Park in West Sacramento for the 2025, 2026, and 2027 seasons, with an option to play at Sutter Health Park in the 2028 season. During the majority of their 56 seasons in East Oakland, fans and ballpark staff had great ballpark access via public transportation that was served mainly through the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District or BART for short. In the final season at Oakland Coliseum, three BART lines (Blue, Green, and Orange) serve the Coliseum with service approximately every five to ten minutes due to the Coliseum BART Station being served by three different line alignments. The blue line serves Coliseum Station riders from Pleasanton and Daly City. The Green Line serves Coliseum riders from Daly City and Berryessa. The Orange Line serves riders from Berryessa and Richmond. Coliseum riders from stations like Walnut Creek, Antioch, and Concord would be required to transfer from a BART Gold Line train to an Orange Line Train at the MacArthur Station in Oakland in order to get to the Oakland Coliseum in East Oakland.

Route Proposal and Service Timeline

In order for baseball fans and staff to enjoy the frequency and service quality that they received over the last 56 years in Oakland, it is imperative that a ballpark shuttle service be implemented at Sutter Health Park, starting with the 2025 season, and that the ballpark shuttle operate service once every ten minutes between March 16th and October 15th - a service timeframe that is seven months in length. In addition, the route would alternate trips operated between Sacramento Regional Transit District and Yolo Transportation District - similar to the existing Causeway Connection - Route 138, and be referred to as Route 140. Doing so would allow each transit operator to operate their individual trips once every ten minutes, for a combined frequency of once every five minutes. The route alignment, though a bit complicated would serve and connect with four light rail stations as follows:

Begin Route: Sacramento Valley Station and exit via Eastbound on H Street, and then...

R: 9th Street

R: Capitol Mall, continuing over the Tower Bridge and onto the Tower Bridge Gateway

R: Grand Street, which winds to the left and becomes westbound West Capitol Avenue

L: Merkley Avenue southbound, which winds to the right and is Merkley Avenue westbound

R: Jefferson Boulevard

R: Eastbound West Capitol Avenue

Layover: W. Capitol Avenue (Eastbound) west of Merkley Avenue (West Sac. Transit Center)

Begin Route: Eastbound West Capitol Avenue at West Sacramento Transit Center

R: Grand Street

L: Tower Bridge Gateway, continuing onto Capitol Mall via the Tower Bridge

L: 8th Street

L: I (Eye) Street

R: 5th Street

L: H Street at the Sacramento Valley Station entry and exit roadway for transit buses only

Layover: Sacramento Valley Station facing westbound (Similar to Route 30 and Route 38)

For game days, the ballpark shuttle would operate up to three hours before first pitch, and up to three hours after the conclusion of the ballgame. In one written example of this submission of proposal of a

new ballpark shuttle route, assuming a game is three hours in length, Route 140 would operate for nine hours with a one hour operator meal break at the 4-hour mark of the operating day. In the case of a game starting at 1300, (1pm) Route 140 would operate from 1000 (10am) to 1900 (7pm) with the 1-hour operator meal break being from 1400 (2pm) to 1500 (3pm) which would be ideal as that would be occurring during the middle of the game and not during times of peak passenger loads before and after the game.

Financing of the Route 140 Sutter Health Park Ballpark Shuttle

Unlike the Bay Area Region, which receives well over a penny of sales tax for public transportation services, Sacramento Regional Transit only receives 1/6 of one cent for public transportation through Measure A, and has to compete heavily for transit service against its peer California transit agencies, putting itself in an unfair disadvantage in successfully adding new service. In a separate work project, the Sacramento Regional Transit District is undergoing a post-pandemic (COVID-19) comprehensive operational analysis, which is slated to be completed by the end of calendar year 2025. When scheduled to be finished, the first season of Major League Baseball will have been completed as well, yet the submission of the Sutter Health Park Shuttle service needs to be completed well prior to the Summer 2024 schedule release of the 2025 Major League Baseball regular season schedule. With the existing financial situation that is currently in place and facing a monumental challenge to make this proposed new route a success, it is imperative that this route be financed through a cost sharing agreement with multiple partners and stakeholders involved to ensure it is a success. To that end, it is recommended that the River City Stadium Financing Authority reconvene and discuss a multitude of financing matters, including but not limited to the proposed Sutter Health Park Ballpark Shuttle. The financial support to initially operate the ballpark shuttle and make sure of its success would include, but not be limited to both the Cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento, both the Counties of Sacramento and Yolo, along with the franchise principal owners and their teams of Athletics Investment Group LLC, and Sacramento Basketball Holdings Incorporated. In addition, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Greater Sacramento Economic Council, and the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce might also want to have a seat at the table and heavily participate in the discussions and actions of the financing of the ballpark shuttle. The River City Stadium Financing Authority was created in the construction days of what was then Raley Field. The founding members of this body included, but were not limited to former West Sacramento Mayor Christopher Cabaldon and former Sacramento County District 1 Supervisor Roger Dickinson. Roger went on to serve in the California State Assembly and worked at the nonprofit organization Transportation California. Roger ran a successful primary election campaign in March 2024 for the district two seat on the Sacramento City Council, and will face Steven Walton for a runoff in the November 2024 General Election. If victorious in November 2024, Roger would become the District Two Sacramento City Councilmember on Tuesday, December 10th.

Future of the Athletics Franchise

The Athletics will play the 2025, 2026, and 2027 seasons at Sutter Health Park in West Sacramento, with an option to play the 2028 season at Sutter Health Park, all while their permanent stadium is being built in Las Vegas, Nevada, on "The Strip" where the Tropicana Hotel was once located. The Tropicana will be torn down in Fall 2024 to make way for their new stadium. While all this is going on, there is a huge amount of uncertainty as to even if their new Las Vegas stadium will even be built. The Nevada Citizens Group "Schools Over Stadiums" has been formed and is currently putting together arguments before the Nevada Supreme Court over the argument that public financing of John Fisher's billionaire stadium is being financed by taxpayer dollars all while Nevada is 48th in the United States on per pupil spending. Citing this in arguments through the Nevada Supreme Court, "Schools Over Stadiums" objective is to place a referendum on the November 2024 General Election ballot

throughout Nevada on allowing voters the say of whether taxpayer dollars should go toward the financing of a ballpark or should be redirected to Nevada public schools. In a recent poll on this very topic, at least 52% of Nevada voters and residents believe that the Las Vegas stadium should not receive public funding and that billionaires like John Fisher should pay for their own stadium. In addition, Nevada residents are more excited to be a Major League Baseball expansion city and not be a city that gets the A's. This ongoing debate could put a move of the Athletics into Nevada into jeopardy and perhaps force them to call West Sacramento their forever home. As this is an ongoing developing story, there is currently a state of uncertainty as to what will become the future of the Athletics franchise in both the near term and in the long term.

Next Steps prior to March 16, 2025: Meetings, Meetings, and yes, more Meetings

With the breaking news that occurred back on Thursday, April 4th that the Athletics are going to make Sutter Health Park home for the next three and perhaps four seasons, and play in the same stadium as the Sacramento RiverCats will, all calls for a whole lot of meetings on changes that will be necessary at Sutter Health Park including but not limited to the successful implementation of a Sutter Health Park ballpark shuttle. March 16th is approximately eleven months away at the time of writing and electronically submitting this ballpark shuttle proposal. Not only will the Sacramento Regional Transit District and the Yolo Transportation District need to be spearheading meetings on this submission of proposal of the Sutter Health Park Shuttle, but the many organizations listed in the financing section of this submission of Sutter Health Park Ballpark Shuttle will need to come to the table to ensure the success of service implementation in a timely manner.

Sutter Health Park Ballpark Shuttle Respectfully Submitted By:

Michael Andrew Barnbaum, Transit Ambassador
Sacramento Regional Transit District

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Re: Submittal of new Calendar Year 2025 route proposal - Sacramento Ballpark Shuttle

Christopher Flores <CFlores@sacrt.com>

Mon 4/15/2024 12:12 PM

To: Mike Barnbaum <mbarnbaum@sacrt.com>

Thanks.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Mike Barnbaum <mbarnbaum@sacrt.com>

Sent: Sunday, April 14, 2024 9:11:41 PM

To: James Drake <JDrake@sacrt.com>; Sarah Poe <SPoe@sacrt.com>

Cc: Christopher Flores <CFlores@sacrt.com>; Adam Green <AGreen@sacrt.com>

Subject: Re: Submittal of new Calendar Year 2025 route proposal - Sacramento Ballpark Shuttle

There is one critical element I overlooked with regards to the submission of proposal for new route 140 - Sacramento Ballpark Shuttle, and that is on the topic of fares for the "cost sharing" service agreement.

Proposed Sacramento Ballpark Shuttle SubTopic - Fares

While both Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT) and Yolo Transportation District (YoloTD) have their respective fare structures and transfer/pass agreements, folks have asked with the original submission of proposal for Sacramento Ballpark Shuttle as to what it would cost the rider, given the relatively short distance of a service that would only operate over a span of just nine hours a day between Sacramento Valley Station and the West Sacramento Transit Center, and only on days in which either the RiverCats or the Athletics are playing a scheduled home game?

Good question, at the very least. For a service like this, the service should be complimentary (free) for the rider, all while both a \$1 ticket fee be included in all ticket types sold for home games at Sutter Health Park for transit operations along with preventative maintenance activities at Sutter Health Park, which, in terms of preventative maintenance, is currently the case for all tickets sold to events at Golden 1 Center in downtown Sacramento. By including the \$1 transit operations fee in every ticket type sold at Sutter Health Park would correlate to the primary users (baseball fans) as their way of paying their share of fares towards the operating cost of the service. While ballpark staff at all staff levels would use the service to get to and from the ballpark for the purposes of work and gainful employment, buyers of ticketed events, whether as single game tickets, season tickets (full or partial) or ticket plans, i.e. the weekend ticket plan would always be assessed \$1 per ticket in their total ticket allotment. This, along with financial considerations, support, and agreed upon terms between Athletics Investment Group LLC, Sacramento Basketball Holdings Incorporated, the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, City of West Sacramento, Greater Sacramento Economic Council, Downtown Sacramento Partnership, Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments will all come together for a successful cost sharing agreement that even directly includes the ticket buyers for events so as to ensure the Sacramento Ballpark Shuttle is a fare free service, will have financial support and contributions from all identifiable stakeholders and partner agencies involved for continuous operations every baseball season, and that both SacRT and YoloTD are completely held harmless with regards to operating costs of the proposed service.

This major topic would be extremely valuable in front of the River City Stadium Financing Authority.

**TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC HEARING
IN SACRAMENTO COUNTY
MINUTES**

**October 23, 2024 – 1:00 P.M.
City of Galt Council Chambers**

The hearing was conducted by Rich Lozano representing the SACOG Board of Directors, with Barbara VaughanBechtold of SACOG staff, and Jennipher Marquez representing South County Transit Link (SCT/Link), also representing the Sacramento County Social Services Transportation Advisory Council.

Mr. Lozano introduced members of the hearing panel and explained that SACOG is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides funds for transportation purposes throughout the SACOG 4-county area.

Ms. VaughanBechtold gave a brief overview of the Unmet Transit Needs Process. Ms. Marquez described the existing SCT/Link transit services.

Three attendees not on the hearing panel attended the Unmet Transit Needs hearing. Four people testified at the hearing, and one item of correspondence was received (shown in the correspondence section of the minutes for the 4-County Remote Hearing). All Unmet Transit Needs comments are listed below.

Director Lozano opened the hearing to public comment.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY

1. Virginia Wieneke, Sacramento, CA

Ms. Wieneke is the transportation manager for ACC Senior Services Rides program. She stated that ACC Rides regularly receives requests for services from Galt residents, seniors that are wheelchair users. These requests are for door-to-door transport to medical/healthcare services outside of Galt.

2. Zackery Rodriguez, Galt, CA

Mr. Rodriguez a student at Cosumnes River College (CRC), specifically the CRC satellite campus in Elk Grove. He would like the Highway 99 Express to stop at the CRC Elk Grove satellite campus. Mr. Rodriguez receives a student transit pass as part of his tuition, but currently he cannot use that pass on SCT/Link services. Is there a way to get SCT/Link fully integrated into the Los Rios Community College District and/or SacRT so that the student transit pass would work on the system? Also, he would like to know if the Highway 99 Express could stop at the Twin Cities park and ride. Last, he wanted to know if the Highway 99 Express could stop at Kaiser or Dignity Health in south Sacramento since there are pharmacy services available there.

3. Bonnie Rodriguez, Galt, CA

There needs to be a permanent route, not dial-a-ride, between the east and west shopping areas in Galt since Highway 99 is large barrier that is difficult to cross without a personal vehicle. Ms. Rodriguez also commented that there needs to be a connection from Galt to Delta College in San Joaquin County.

Paratransit, Inc. staff responded – that Paratransit, Inc. offers regional travel training and their staff would connect with the commenter to assist.

4. Rich Lozano, Galt, CA

Mr. Lozano commented that accessing medical services in downtown Sacramento can be difficult due to the wait involved to travel back to Galt afterward.

CORRESPONDENCE

1. None

**TRANSIT NEEDS COMMUNITY OUTREACH EVENT IN
FOLSOM/SACRAMENTO COUNTY, INCLUDING THE CITIES OF CITRUS HEIGHTS,
ELK GROVE, FOLSOM, RANCHO CORDOVA, SACRAMENTO, AND
THE SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT
MINUTES**

October 26, 2024 – 8:00 A.M.

Community Outreach Event – Historic Folsom Farmer’s Market

The Community Outreach Event at the Historic Folsom Farmer’s Market was held by Barbara VaughanBechtold, SACOG staff.

There attendees provided comments at the event. All other items of correspondence received are shown in the correspondence section of the minutes for the 4-County Remote Hearing.

SACOG staff arrived at the Historic Folsom Farmer’s Market at 8 AM and spoke to interested members of the public until 12 PM.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY

1. Nancy Payne, Folsom, CA

Ms. Payne shared that she had a son on the autism spectrum and he cannot wait safely alone at a bus stop. He has been told that he does not qualify for SacRT Go paratransit service though he has a disability that prevents him from using fixed route services safely.

2. Glenn Mandelkern, Citrus Heights, CA

Mr. Mandelkern provided three comments:

- More direct service from Citrus Heights to Folsom would be useful and appreciated. This service can run along Greenback Lane across the bridge and into Historic Folsom.
- The Delta Shores shopping center needs transit service. This is a large shopping center, with many stores, and transit service to this location would serve both shoppers and workers there.
- With SacRT SmART Ride ending service to the general public it will be very difficult to get around in Orangevale.

5. Kate Reid, Folsom, CA

Ms. Reid is looking for a direct way to get to the Sacramento International Airport from Folsom that does not involve multiple transfers. She stated she would pay between \$10-15 for a one-way and one-seat trip to the airport.

CORRESPONDENCE

1. See other comments regarding SacRT transit services in the correspondence section of the minutes for the 4-County Remote Hearing.