Stakeholder Representative Group Meeting #2 Summary

The project team members present at the second Whitelock Parkway SR 99 Interchange Project Stakeholder Meeting included:

- Alan Glen, Quincy Engineering
- Brent Lemon, Quincy Engineering
- Jason Jurrens, Quincy Engineering
- Carl Gibson, Quincy Engineering
- Gary Grunwald, City of Elk Grove
- Rick Carter, City of Elk Grove
- Gladys Cornell, AIM Consulting
- Ashley Ballinger, AIM Consulting

Representatives from the highlighted community-based organizations below attended the Whitelock Parkway SR 99 Interchange Project Stakeholder Meeting included:

- City of Elk Grove Trails Committee
- Cosumnes Community Service District (CSD)
- Elk Grove Dog Park
- Elk Grove Historical Society & Hotel
- Elk Grove Youth Sports Association
- Girls Fast Pitch Softball League
- Glenbrooke Neighborhood Association
- Sacramento Area Bike Advocates
- Walk Sacramento
- Disability Advisory Committee
- Elk Grove Bike Park
- Elk Grove Chamber of Commerce

Eight stakeholder representatives attended the second SRG meeting for the Whitelock Parkway SR 99 Interchange Project. Below is a discussion summary.

**The meeting objectives included:**

- Provide an update from the City on schedule and funding
• Review and provide response to the community feedback heard from the first Stakeholder Representative Group meeting and the first community meeting
• Present traffic study findings
• Review the concept alternatives including operations and impacts
• Discuss the revised project schedule and next steps

Project Overview
The City of Elk Grove, in coordination with State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), is planning for a new interchange at Whitelock Parkway and State Route 99 (SR 99) to reduce traffic congestion on Elk Grove Boulevard, traffic impacts on SR 99, and future congestion on Grant Line Road from planned growth in the area. The planned interchange will provide vehicular access to and from the west side of SR 99 only, and will include a pedestrian and bicycle crossing over SR 99 into Elk Grove Regional Park.

Project Goals
• Reduce current traffic congestion at Elk Grove Boulevard interchange, and future congestion at Grant Line Road interchange, consistent with the City’s General Plan
• Minimize impacts to Elk Grove Park
• Provide a pedestrian and bicycle crossing over SR 99, consistent with the Trails Master Plan

Introductions
The meeting began with Gladys Cornell, of AIM Consulting, welcoming the stakeholder representatives to the second of three SRG meetings for the Whitelock Parkway SR 99 Interchange Project. The stakeholders were introduced to the new project manager, Brent Lemon, from Quincy Engineering who will continue to manage the Project Study Report phase. Roles and responsibilities of the Stakeholder Representative Group were reviewed. The SRG is not a decision making body but intended to provide input into the PSR. Responsibilities include:
• representing their organization at the meetings;
• sharing information obtained from the meetings to their members;
• informing the PSR to fit the project within the context of the community.

The stakeholders were given an opportunity to introduce themselves, the organization they represent, and their group’s interest in the project.
Gladys Cornell reviewed the materials that each stakeholder was provided (see appendix), including an agenda, a comment card, a community feedback matrix, a short bio for Brent Lemon, and the FAQs listed on the project webpage.

The community members in attendance were welcomed. The agenda, community feedback matrix, Brent Lemon’s bio, website FAQs, and a public comment card were available to them as well. Gladys encouraged public members to visit the project webpage where they can sign up to receive email notifications about the project and find meeting summaries.

**Update from the City**
Rick Carter, the City of Elk Grove’s Capital Program Manager, reviewed the current status and funding for the Whitelock Parkway SR 99 Interchange Project. The project team is working to complete a Project Study Report (PSR) by the end of 2015 for Caltrans approval. The City does not currently have funding allocated for additional phases, however funding is proposed in the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) for an environmental document for 2016. If funding is approved, the City can move into environmental analysis for the project. Funding for design is scheduled for 2018/19. Funding for construction is not in the five year CIP plan.

**Review of Community Feedback**
Gladys Cornell and Alan Glen, the outgoing project manager from Quincy Engineering, reviewed the most prominent feedback received from the stakeholders and the community at the last two meetings.

**Impacts to the Park**
The project team has received comments regarding avoiding and/or minimizing impacts to the Elk Grove Regional Park. The project team developed two sets of alternatives for each interchange concept. Each concept has an “A” alternative that realigns SR 99 to the west in order to hold the alignment of East Stockton Boulevard and not encroach into the park. The “B” alternative would expand upon the existing lanes of SR 99 and realign East Stockton Boulevard slightly into the park to make way for the northbound on and off ramps. The new alignment of East Stockton Boulevard is set to minimize encroachment on the Elk Grove Historic Society’s Hotel; if a “B” alternative was selected, the project would include relocating the iron fence surrounding the Historic Hotel.

The alternatives at their present location do not impact the Kloss Softball Complex, located at the southern end of the Elk Grove Regional Park. The project team does not anticipate any portion of this project impacting the softball complex. All impacts to the park will need to be mitigated including reconstructing or modifying park features, and planting additional trees.
The interchange itself will not present direct noise impacts to the Glenbrooke neighborhoods that are a mile and a half away.

- Comment: The City required open rail fencing on houses fronting Whitelock Parkway. We are concerned that increased traffic from the interchange will create noise impacts.

**Southern Alternative**
The interchange at its proposed location was adopted to the City’s General Plan. A southern alignment would not connect to the planned east and west roadway corridors established through planned development and would not adequately address the traffic impacts created by the build-out of the General Plan. The west side of SR 99 has gone through extensive planning, review, and approval by City Council. A southern alignment would significantly impact planned and existing commercial facilities, adjacent neighborhoods, and the south end of the Elk Grove Regional Park that are not contemplated in the General Plan.

**Bike and Pedestrian Movement**
The Whitelock Parkway SR 99 Interchange Project is seeking to provide a physical separation between cyclists/pedestrians and cars. The proposed project now includes an optional feature for the extension of the Toby Johnson Trail into Elk Grove Regional Park that can be incorporated into any design variation if funding can be secured. The option would provide a grade separated crossing of Whitelock Parkway to connect with the bicycle and pedestrian path on the south side of the interchange designs.

**Diverging Diamond**
The Diverging Diamond concept alternative is similar to a Tight Diamond interchange, with diagonal on and off ramps. The key difference is that drivers cross traffic over to the opposite side of the road, making for a “free” turn onto the freeway, eliminating the need for a traffic signal. Diverging Diamond interchanges are better operationally and safer. The interchange itself is wider due to the necessary angles to make the curved turns. This concept was developed five to seven years ago and there are several across the nation, but none in California currently. To view a video demonstration of the concept alternative, please click here.

The pedestrian/bike path is in the middle of the interchange and protected from the car lanes by barriers. Once pedestrians and cyclists cross to the east side, they will have a clear, unobstructed path into the park. There is only one crossing on the west side of the interchange.
Question: Do cyclists and pedestrians share the same path?
   - We anticipate less experienced cyclists would share the sidewalk with pedestrians. More experienced cyclists can choose to follow the car path and travel on the right side, rejoining the path into the park on the other side of the interchange. The video demonstration does not include a wider shoulder for cyclists, but the project team could include one in their designs.

Traffic Study Findings
Alan Glen discussed the results of the preliminary traffic study performed by Kittelson & Associates. The project team is developing interchange designs based on traffic evaluations for ten to twenty years past construction to accommodate reasonable growth and land use decisions that have been made by the community and City Council. The project team used the initial traffic forecast to modify the alternatives and include diagrams of specific travel lanes.

The project team expected heavy movement from eastbound to northbound and from southbound to westbound. Significant traffic numbers were generated at the Whitelock Parkway intersection. However, the traffic forecasting also showed a heavy traffic movement from westbound, turning south on Lotz Parkway. This would mean that in all of the alternatives, a triple left turn would be needed to acceptable operations up to twenty years after construction.

Once the project team has further developed the concepts and alternatives, Kittleson & Associates will finalize the traffic findings report. The report will be submitted to Caltrans for review and concurrence.

Question: Does the traffic model take into account the Kammerer Road interchange to the south?
   - Yes, the traffic model includes data for the Grant Line Road/Kammerer Road interchange, as well as the Elk Grove Boulevard interchange.

Alternatives Discussion
Alan Glen began by explaining that the project team is working with Caltrans to fulfill their long range forecast and planning needs for State Route 99, which includes the possibility of a build-out to eight lanes, four in each direction (Each direction would have 1 HOV lane in the median). The traffic volumes suggest eight lanes will not be necessary in the next twenty years, therefore the project team is anticipating three lanes in each direction and have designed the interchanges to be able to accommodate four lanes each direction when needed.
Question: Does the three lanes include one HOV lane?
   o For three lanes each direction, there would be one HOV lane and two regular, mixed flow lanes.

The “A” alternatives are reconstructing a large portion of SR 99 to push the alignment 50 to 100 feet to the west to avoid realigning East Stockton Boulevard. The freeway would need to be realigned for almost one mile in order to provide an adequate transition for motorists traveling higher freeway speeds. The “B” alternatives would realign East Stockton Boulevard and encroach on the Elk Grove Regional Park up to 40 feet, but will still avoid relocation of the major sewer line that runs north and south along the park railing.

Question: How far would the “B” alternatives encroach on the Historical Society property and fence line?
   o The current fence is approximately 20 feet from the southern corner of the Historic Hotel’s porch. The “B” alternatives would involve moving the fence to approximately ten feet from the porch and taper north to provide more space. On the outer side of the fence, there would be an additional six foot sidewalk to connect from the nearby neighborhoods to the park, plus a six foot wide shoulder on East Stockton Boulevard. Traffic and motorists would not be closer than 10’ to the hotel. The project team is evaluating options to use as little of the Historic Society’s property as possible.

Question: Is the City still pursuing the sidewalk extensions currently as planned?
   o Yes, the City is currently working to extend the sidewalk from surrounding neighborhoods north of the park before this project is built.

Alan then provided an overview of the three interchange design concepts.

1A/1B Tight Diamond
A Tight Diamond interchange is a fairly common, compact interchange design and a lower cost alternative. This design has two lanes in each direction, making for a wider bridge. It also features a tight radius curb at the northbound off-ramp and southbound on-ramp, designed to slow traffic and shorten pedestrian crossings. Pedestrians would need to cross two signalized intersections with this design.

Question: What is the anticipated speed of traffic traveling from the west to the northbound on ramp?
Along the roads to the interchange, cars would be traveling around 35 to 40 mph. When they approach the intersection, motorists need to make a 15 mph turn, which is also true of a Diverging Diamond interchange.

2A/2B Diverging Diamond
In a Diverging Diamond interchange, traffic approaches the interchange area and then crosses over to the opposite side of the road through one signalized intersection. After the intersection, motorists have free movement onto the freeway. A car approaching the interchange from the freeway would proceed onto the overcrossing bridge over Highway 99 without interference, and would cross over to the other side of the road at the same intersection on the western side of the interchange. This type of interchange can provide a higher vehicle capacity and only requires one intersection. A Diverging Diamond interchange features a bicycle and pedestrian path in the middle of the interchange, protected by barriers from cars on both sides. Pedestrians and cyclists would only need to cross traffic once at the intersection and then would have an uninterrupted pathway into the park.

- **Question:** Would it be possible to raise the bike and pedestrian crossing to connect into the center separate area so that pedestrians and cyclists do not have to go through any intersections?
  - This type of connection may be possible with the Diverging Diamond concept, but it would include a very high up, third-story level crossing.

3A/3B Tight Diamond with Roundabouts
The Tight Diamond with Roundabouts interchange concept is similar to the Tight Diamond interchange, but features roundabouts instead of a conventional intersection with signals. Vehicles would travel on and off SR 99 without a formal intersection. The roundabout on the eastern side would be elevated, with East Stockton Boulevard proceeding underneath. Pedestrians would cross a single lane of traffic at the western onramp and then cross again at the off ramp on the eastern side. A roundabout would slow motorists to 15 or 20 mph to accommodate pedestrian traffic. This alternative would encroach into the park an additional 20’ than Alternatives 1 & 2.

Toby Johnson Trail and Bike/Pedestrian Connections
All of the alternatives anticipate connecting to the Toby Johnson Class I trail on the western side of SR 99, with pedestrians crossing Whitelock Parkway at Lotz Parkway (via the north and east intersection legs) to be on the southern side of the interchange. This was done to minimize pedestrian/bicycle conflicts with the highest volume ramps of the interchange. This is known as Bike Trail Sub-alternative #1 and is shown on Alternatives 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, & 3b.
Since the highest volume at the Whitelock/Lotz intersection is the westbound to southbound triple left, two additional bike trail sub-alternatives were presented which eliminates the need for bikes to cross the east leg of this intersection. Each sub-alternative can be applied to any of the 6 base alternatives.

**Bicycle Trail Sub-Alternative #2** – Bikes travel on the north side of Whitelock Parkway and cross under it 400’ east of Lotz Parkway before looping to join the sidewalk on the south side. This requires at-grade crossings of both the southbound on-ramp and westbound traffic on the bridge.

**Bicycle Trail Sub-Alternative #3** – Bikes travel on the north side of Whitelock Parkway and cross under the southbound off-ramp and overcrossing bridge of Highway 99 before looping to join the sidewalk on the south side. This requires an at-grade crossing of only the westbound traffic on the bridge.

- **Comment:** This is similar to US 50 and Watt Avenue with the grade separated bike and pedestrian bike path.

- **Question:** Is there an opportunity for pedestrians, cyclists, families to cross sooner than Lotz Parkway?
  - Yes, the project team will evaluate options for connecting the trail to the interchange pedestrian and bike crossings at other locations.

Connecting to the Toby Johnson Class 1 Trail is an addition to the project. The City has not identified funding for the base project or this added feature. Connecting to the trail provides an opportunity for additional grant money.

- **Question:** Why would the Toby Johnson trail and bike and pedestrian path remaining on the northern side cause a breakdown of operations at the intersections?
  - The automobile movement is much heavier on the northern side of the interchange because of the high demand of vehicles travelling towards and from Sacramento as opposed to Stockton. Additional signalized intersections for pedestrians would slow the flow of traffic and would worsen operational movements leading to additional delays through the intersection.

- **Comment:** I would like to see an alternative that features bikes and pedestrians on the north side.
We can evaluate how additional pedestrian crossings and path locations affects operations.

- **Comment:** Instead of the circular path into the park, I think it would be better to make a left turn and connect down to the road where cyclists can proceed without entering into the park.
  - The team will evaluate modifying the pedestrian access as described.

- **Question:** Would it be possible to connect the bike and pedestrian path to East Stockton Boulevard instead?
  - The City is envisioning a Class II Bike Path along East Stockton Boulevard as part of the City’s Bicycle Master Plan. The project could include a path to connect to East Stockton Boulevard.

- **Comment:** For the pedestrian and bike connection into the park, I am concerned about slope and cyclist speeds with pedestrians, families, dogs on leashes, etc.
  - Any newly designed and constructed bike or pedestrian path must meet ADA requirements. Cross slopes cannot exceed 2% and longitudinal slopes cannot exceed 5% without landings. The design could be straightened out, but that may encourage high speeds on the ramps for bicyclists, which can create a dangerous situation with a speed differential between bicyclists and pedestrians. Keeping the design tight with many curves will slow bikes down.

- **Comment:** As a runner, the pedestrian connection from the Toby Johnson Trail into the Elk Grove Regional Park would be fantastic, especially avoiding traffic.

- **Comment:** I want to avoid three way crossings for bikes and pedestrians. The connection on the Diverging Diamond is a nicer, simpler version of the Watt/US 50 interchange solution.

- **Question:** Would the additional connections for bikes and pedestrians be easy to promote to Caltrans with the success they’ve had on Watt Avenue?
  - Caltrans is mostly concerned with the safety and operational thresholds of the interchange. As long as the interchange designs meet their standards, they would likely accept it.

- **Question:** How far west along Whitelock Parkway is the project responsible for? Crossing Whitelock earlier than the Lotz intersection may help operational issues.
The project area is not fully defined due to the uncertainty of the Lotz intersection’s build out. If the project team identified that it needed another half or quarter mile for the crossing, it could be folded into the project area.

Additional Questions and Comments

- **Question: Of the “B” alternatives, are the changes to East Stockton Boulevard different across the three interchange designs?**
  - No, the realigning of East Stockton Boulevard does not vary based on interchange design. Each design would feature two lane on and off ramps, which requires the same amount of space for each design in the “B” alternatives.

- **Question: What are the cost differences between the “A” and “B” alternatives?**
  - The project team is currently still evaluating the costs between the different concepts and alternatives and will have more defined cost analysis for the stakeholders at the third stakeholder meeting. Realigning the freeway would add approximately 15 to 20 million to the interchange cost. However, realigning East Stockton Boulevard would add additional costs to the interchange as well.

- **Comment: I do not want East Stockton Boulevard realigned and impeding on the Historical Society’s property.**

- **Question: When deciding on a concept and alternative, does City Council have the final decision or does Caltrans have a say too, especially regarding cost?**
  - This project is a locally funded project. Caltrans does not weigh in on the cost of the interchange, but they do weigh in on design. As the owners of SR 99, they are responsible for potential liabilities, safety, operations and maintainability.

- **Question: Which design do you rank higher from an engineer’s perspective?**
  - As an engineer (Alan Glen), the Diverging Diamond is preferred for its enhanced operations, safer bike and pedestrian connections, and easy use. However, we still have to perform more evaluation of all the alternatives.

**Process Moving Forward**

Brent Lemon, the new project manager from Quincy Engineering, reviewed the project schedule and next steps. The project team is developing a Project Study Report (PSR), which intends to define the scope, cost, and schedule for this project. The PSR does not make any final decisions on the interchange.
design, but rather refines the alternatives to meet the purpose and need for the project while presenting the least environmental impacts and being cost effective. The project team currently has three concepts, six alternatives, which may be carried into the environmental document phase. The City may want to proceed with all six alternatives or narrow down further before pursuing an environmental document for this project in two to three years’ time.

Currently, the project team is finalizing the draft traffic report which will help identify Level of Service (LOS) calculations. These calculations assist the project team in measuring the operational benefit of each intersection and interchange designs. The project team will submit final traffic documents, alternatives, and meeting summaries to Caltrans for review and revisions. The project team will then revise the alternatives based on Caltrans’ feedback prior to the third stakeholder meeting. The next stakeholder meeting will include updated concepts and alternatives with actual cost analysis.

The PSR will be finalized and approved and adopted by Caltrans at the end of 2015. The project team will identify in the PSR a range of alternatives that would meet the purpose and need of the project and achieve the traffic operational requirements of Caltrans and the City. Alternatives that do not meet the purpose and need, are unacceptable to the community or Caltrans, or do not function operationally could be dismissed.

Stakeholder and Community Feedback
Stakeholder had the opportunity to provide written feedback on a comment card about the topics discussed as well.

Impacts to the park
- Sad to see any concept alternatives that impact the Historical Society - fear that the alternatives that do not impact the Historical Society will cost too much and we will lose ground.
- I appreciate the clear attempt to minimize the impact to the park in the various alternatives.
- I think the small realignment of East Stockton is the better alternative.

Bike and Pedestrian Movement Considerations
- With the separate pedestrian trail, would a stairway connector directly into the median trail for those that can use it work?

Traffic Considerations
- Not keen on the huge Lotz/Whitelock intersection in general. If a crossover of Whitelock is needed, can we do it to the west before the intersection?
**Whitelock Parkway SR 99 Interchange Project**
**Stakeholder Representative Group Meeting #2**
**April 30, 2015 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.**
**Elk Grove Council Chambers**

**1A/1B Tight Diamond**
- 1A is best for EGHS - regardless of cost. 1B is not acceptable.
- No

**2A/2B Diverging Diamond**
- 2A - Yes for EGHS view. 2B - No for EGHS view.
- 2A Diverging Diamond - Love this!
- Yes, with grade separated tight turn trail. Explore bringing the trail up into the center median trail.

**3A/3B Tight Diamond with Roundabouts**
- Although this design may flow into traffic faster, the impact to the park is not acceptable to members of the EGHS.
- No

The public members who attended the meeting also had the opportunity to provide feedback on comment cards.

- Choose one of the "A" alternatives. The "B" alternatives have too much negative impact on the park.
- My preferences in order are 2A, then 1A, then 3A.
- None of the "B" alternatives please!
- Please try to save the trees as the pedestrian entrance comes into the park. It looks like it would take out a lot of trees.
- Since funding the construction is not in the CIP funds, will the city consider a sales tax or new road fee to get residents to fund?
- What are the total numbers of cars that can efficiently move through diamond cross overs?
- Have there been safety studies done with this fairly new concept?
- Where will the meters be for the freeway? Lotz?
- The new alternative for the bikes (the add ons) is a new concept wave of the future; with this project 10 years out, should this not be seriously considered?
- Thank you for the video clip; informative meeting.
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### Community Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Feedback</th>
<th>Addressing the Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimize the Impacts to Elk Grove Park.</td>
<td>The proposed project provides A and B variations for each design concept. The “A” alternatives hold the alignment of East Stockton Boulevard to eliminate the direct impacts to Elk Grove Park except for the new bicycle and pedestrian bridge across East Stockton Boulevard that requires a small impact for the access ramp and connection to existing park pedestrian trails and roads. Indirect impacts, such as visual changes, would still occur. These alternatives do require an expensive realignment of State Route 99. The “B” alternatives would utilize the existing lanes of State Route 99 by realigning East Stockton Boulevard slightly into the Park to make way for the northbound on and off ramps. Every effort is being made to reduce the park impacts by constructing retaining walls between the ramps and East Stockton Boulevard as well as the State Route 99 lanes. The alignment of East Stockton Boulevard will conform as quickly as possible with the existing location resulting in a reduction in posted speed that will also benefit the park. The embankment for the interchange will create a barrier that should reduce noise levels in the park. All impacts to the Park will be need to be mitigated including reconstructing or modifying park features, and planting additional trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid encroachment on the Elk Grove Historical Society Hotel.</td>
<td>For the options that realign East Stockton Boulevard, the two lane on-ramp does present impacts to the Historical Society Property within Elk Grove Park. The proposed alignments of East Stockton Boulevard will maintain a minimum of 11 feet from the edge of the raised porch to the back of sidewalk that will allow for relocation of the wrought iron fence and needed circulation around the Hotel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid impacts to the Kloss Complex (softball fields at south end of park).</td>
<td>The alternatives that are being considered at this time will have no impact to this softball complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid noise impacts to the Glenbrooke/Del Webb neighborhood.</td>
<td>The Glenbrook neighborhood is approximately 1.5 miles west of the proposed interchange at State Route 99 and Whitelock Parkway. Whitelock Parkway has been designated as a major east west collector roadway in the City’s General Plan; and as such the planned interchange project does not add traffic beyond what has already been adopted by the City Council prior to the construction of this community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider an interchange at the southern edge of the park, near Elk Grove Florin Road.</td>
<td>A southern alignment would not connect to the planned east and west roadway corridors established through planned development in the City’s General Plan and would not adequately address the traffic impacts created by the build-out of the General Plan. Relocation of the interchange to the south would have significant impacts within four master planned areas, the south end of the Elk Grove Park, the adjacent neighborhoods, and would conflict with several projects that are in or nearing construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide physical separation between bikes and cars.</td>
<td>The proposed project has added an optional additive feature for the extension of the Toby Johnson Trail into Elk Grove Park that can be incorporated into any design variation if funding can be secured. This optional feature would provide a grade separated crossing of Whitelock Parkway to connect with the bicycle and trail crossing on the south side of the interchange.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brent Lemon, Principal Engineer at Quincy Engineering, Inc.

Brent has 29 years of experience in planning, design and construction of transportation improvement projects. Brent began his career with Caltrans in Fresno. After working six years in Fresno, Brent, his wife Teresa, and their five children moved to Elk Grove where they have made their home for the past 21 years. Brent has stayed involved in the community youth baseball league as a coach and in the scouting program where all of his four sons earned the rank of Eagle Scout.

During his 18 years with Caltrans, Brent spent six years in Fresno serving in positions within design, construction, traffic operations, traffic safety and consultant oversight. Upon moving to Elk Grove Brent spent the next three years as a Design Branch Chief doing projects statewide in San Diego, Orange County, San Bernardino County, Los Angeles, the Bay Area and other areas within northern California. Prior to joining Quincy Engineering, Brent spent the last eight years as a design manager for Caltrans District 3 overseeing capital projects within the greater Sacramento area.

One of Brent’s unique assignments while at Caltrans was serving as a Headquarters Geometric Reviewer covering projects in the Central Valley, Central Coast and Bay Area. In this assignment, Brent worked with design teams across five Caltrans Districts reviewing numerous interchange/highway improvement projects, making recommendations on complex design issues and approving exceptions to design standards.

Brent was involved with several significant projects during his Caltrans career including:

- Cypress Freeway Reconstruction, Oakland CA – Contracts A, B, C, F and G totaling over $500 Million.
- Interstate 80 Corridor Improvements, Placer and Nevada Counties CA – Over 20 individual projects totaling over $1 Billion.
- Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program, El Dorado and Placer Counties CA – Highway and Water Quality improvement projects over $1 Billion.
- State Route 70 Freeway Conversion Projects, Sutter County CA – Converted of 2-lane conventional highway to 4-lane divided freeway from SR 99 to south of Olivehurst, over 11 miles totaling over $100 million.
- Caldecott Tunnel 4th Bore Project, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties CA – Consultant oversight of 4th Bore over $420 Million.

For the past 10-years with Quincy Engineering, Brent has been involved in freeway and interchange improvements, local roadway widenings, roundabouts and numerous bridge replacement projects.

Some of his notable projects include:

- State Route 4 Balfour Road Interchange, Brentwood CA.
- US 50 HOV Lane Improvement Project, El Dorado County CA.
- US 50/El Dorado Hills Interchange Improvement Project, El Dorado County CA.
- Old Davis Road Roundabout Improvement Project, University California Davis CA.
- State Route 20/Western Parkway Intersection Improvement Project, Yuba City CA.
- State Route 44/Hilltop Drive Interchange Improvement Project, Redding CA.
- State Route 246/Alamo Pintado Road Roundabout Project Study Report, Roundabout Improvements, Solvang CA.
- State Route 99, Austin/Olive Interchange Feasibility Study, Manteca CA.
- Interstate 205/Chrisman Road Interchange Feasibility Study, Tracy CA.
Whitelock Interchange FAQs

Why is the State Route 99 Whitelock Parkway Interchange needed?

The City determined that the transportation corridors of Elk Grove Boulevard and Grant Line Road would operate at unacceptable levels at the build-out of the City. In an effort to reduce future congestion and accommodate development the City has designated a future interchange at Whitelock Parkway and SR 99. The project is needed to help relieve current and future congestion in central and southern Elk Grove.

How will the proposed project impact Elk Grove Regional Park?

While it is still very early in the planning and design process to assess potential impacts, one of the City’s major project goals is to minimize impacts to Elk Grove Regional Park. To that end, the City has decided to collaborate with a Stakeholder Representative Group (SRG) which is comprised of the Cosumnes Community Services District (CSD) and representatives from other community and regional organizations that can assist in providing important community and study area information as well as help to evaluate design considerations to fit the interchange within the context of the community. A variety of concepts will be developed (including a concept that will keep the roadway out of the park) and evaluated to determine the preferred option.

How is the project funded, how much will it cost, and when will the project be completed?

The project is fully funded by the Elk Grove Roadway Fee at about $41.5 million. This fee is paid by developers to mitigate the traffic impacts of new development. These fees will be paid over many years as new development in the area occurs. Current revenues only allow for the preliminary
design and environmental work at this time. The funds needed to construct the project are not currently available and may not be for many years. The City will seek State and Federal Grants that would allow for the construction to occur sooner. It is possible the project could be completed within 5 to 10 years if funding for construction becomes available.

If you do not have funds to construct the project now, why are you starting the project now?

Development is now occurring on the west side of the project site. It can take more than 5 years to design and secure the needed approvals for a new interchange. The City needs to determine the size and shape of the interchange now to preserve the needed land, more precisely determine the costs, and plan for the interchange construction. Additionally, the City will be more successful in obtaining grant funds for construction if the project is further developed.

When will there be a public meeting where we can view alternatives and make comments?

A recently held public meeting occurred on Wednesday, October 29, 2014.

Please click to view meeting summary.

Future public meetings will be advertised here once they are scheduled.

Who can we contact at the City regarding this project?

The Project Manager for the City is Gary Grunwald. He can be reached via email at ggrunwald@elkgrovecity.org or by phone at (916) 478-2236. All questions and concerns are welcome.

When will a final design be selected and approved by the City?

The project is currently in the “pre-environmental review” phase which identifies potential alternatives; and develops a scope and schedule to deliver the environmental document. Several design alternatives will need to be included as part of the environmental review process. Once the environmental review and documentation phase is complete, then the City will approve the design.

Will pedestrians and bicycles have to cross traffic?

The bicycle and pedestrians will cross the on and off ramps at signalized intersections with crosswalks, and then they will cross over East Stockton Boulevard on the bridge directly into the park.

What are the typical grades through the interchange?
The freeway grade is the same as the park; therefore, the crossing needs to climb to an elevation of 20-25 feet above the freeway to provide standard vertical clearances under the proposed bridge. The Whitelock Parkway grade through the interchange will be 5% or less to meet the Americans with Disabilities Act requirements for pedestrian facilities. The Ramp grades approaching the intersection will be between 5 and 7% to conform to the elevated intersections.

**Will the dog park be impacted?**

We are currently studying the options. Based upon our initial evaluation we anticipate a portion of the dog park may need to be moved and reconfigured.

**Does traffic stop on eastbound Whitelock Parkway to southbound SR99 when the bicycles and pedestrians need to cross?**

We still need to perform traffic analysis for these concepts. However, generally speaking, if the traffic analysis presents low volume of automobiles at this intersection, then bicycles and pedestrians could cross without a signal. If traffic volumes were so large that pedestrians would have a difficult time crossing this ramp there would be a pedestrian push button and a signal added to the project.

**Will the City engage the community throughout planning and design phase of the project?**

Yes, the City will engage the public during the planning and design phases of the project.

**How can members of the public provide their input?**

The City will hold two community meetings during this phase of the project. In addition, the public may provide comments throughout the project’s process by sending emails to grunwald@elkgrovecity.org. All public comments will be considered by the project team and documented and provided to the City Council as part of the formal project summaries. Lastly, members of the public will be notified for all formal presentations to the City’s Planning Commission and City Council.

**Who are the Stakeholder Representative Group (SRG) members?**

SRG members for the Whitelock Parkway Interchange project include a primary and alternate representative from Elk Grove-based organizations including: Elk Grove Historical Society, City of Elk Grove Trails Committee, Elk Grove Regional Parks, City of Elk Grove Disability Advisory Committee, Elk Grove Bike Park, Cosumnes Community Services District, Elk Grove Youth Sports Association, EGYSA Girls Fast Pitch Softball League, Elk Grove Chamber of Commerce, and Glenbrooke Neighborhood Association. In addition, the SRG includes representatives from
interest-based regional organizations including: Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates and Walk Sacramento. Each member represents an organization that may be affected by the project’s outcome and/or can provide expertise to help create a community context sensitive project.

**What is the role of the SRG?**

The role of the SRG member is to attend and actively engage in small group work for three meetings over the next year to assist the project team in identifying community issues, concerns, needs and values. In addition, SRG will assist in evaluating current and future transportation amenity needs and prioritization of proposed solutions. Each SRG is responsible for representing his/her organization’s perspective and serving as the communication conduit between the project team and his/her organization.

**Can the public attend the Stakeholder Representative Group meetings?**

SRG meetings are open to the public and members of the public may attend and observe. Meeting summaries will be provided on the project website.

**Will there be ongoing communication with the City Council?**

Yes, City staff will provide updates to City Council as necessary.

**Does the interchange connect State Route 99 to east and west Elk Grove?**

No, the interchange will not provide access for cars on the east side of State Route 99 to the west side of town or a connection with State Route 99 from the east side. The interchange will only provide access to State Route 99 for west side travelers. Bicyclists and pedestrians will be able to cross SR 99 and directly access Elk Grove Regional Park.

**Why is the City not looking at a full interchange at the south end of Elk Grove Park?**

The City identified the future interchange at State Route 99 and Whitelock Parkway in the adopted General Plan after much planning work and environmental review. A southern location would not connect to the planned east west roadway corridors established through planned development in the General Plan and would not adequately address the traffic impacts created by the build-out of the General Plan. Additionally, Caltrans requires interchanges to be spaced at least 1 mile apart. Placing a full service interchange one mile north of Grant Line Road Interchange would have a severe impact to the south end of Elk Grove Park and the adjacent residential neighborhood.

Further, the City (and Sacramento County before incorporation) has made a number of land use decisions and approved various projects in and around the future Whitelock Parkway Interchange.
These projects were designed with the future interchange in mind at the planned location. Relocation of the interchange to the south would have significant implications within four master planned areas and would conflict with several projects that are in or nearing construction.

Why is an eastern connection to Elk Grove-Florin Road or East Stockton Blvd. not being considered?

To make a connection to the east side of State Route 99 for vehicles would create a severe impact to Elk Grove Park. Additionally, neither Elk Grove Florin Road nor East Stockton Blvd. were designed to accommodate the additional travel demand that would be generated with such a connection.
## Project Schedule-SR 99/ Whitelock Parkway Interchange Project Study Report

*Purpose of PSR: Establish Scope, Schedule Cost of Project; Identify Alternatives for Environmental Studies*

### Overall Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiate project</strong></td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop base maps, traffic forecasts, environmental constraints</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder (SRG) Meeting #1/Public Meeting #1 - Project Scoping</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop traffic analysis and conceptual interchange layouts</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRG Meeting #2 - Review interchange concepts</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine interchange alternatives, develop typical sections, develop cost estimates</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRG Meeting #3 - Review refined interchange alternatives</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting #2 - Present interchange alternatives</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize Alternatives and Costs</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Draft Project Study Report</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Draft PSR</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize PSR and submit to Caltrans for approval</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans approves PSR</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oppotunities for Public Input @

**Overall Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Study Report</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire Right of Way</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Construction</td>
<td>![Progress Bar]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note the overall schedule may be delayed if funding is not available for each phase at the duration shown*