

**NORTH COUNTY CORRIDOR  
TRANSPORTATION EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY**

**ITEM: 3a**

**SUBJECT:**

Correspondence

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Acknowledge receipt

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None

**DISCUSSION:**

Acknowledge receipt of correspondence (copies attached) received since the November 5, 2014 NCC Board meeting.

<u>Date of NCC Correspondence</u>	<u>Name(s) of Sender</u>
10-31-14	David O. Romano, P.E., AICP
5-27-15	Jill Anderson, Riverbank City Manager
6-1-15	J. D. Godkin email
6-8-15	Scott Smith email
6-10-15	J. D. Godkin email
6-11-15	Scott Smith email
6-11-15	Scott Smith

# NEWMAN~ROMANO

A California Limited Liability Company

NOV 3 2014 4:30 PM

1034 12<sup>th</sup> Street  
Modesto, California 95354  
Phone: (209) 521-9521  
Fax: (209) 521-4968

October 31, 2014

Matt Machado, Authority Manager  
North County Corridor Transportation Expressway Authority  
C/o Stanislaus County Public Works Department  
1716 Morgan Road  
Modesto, Ca 95358

Via U.S. Mail

Re: North County Corridor Layouts

Dear Matt:

As you are aware, I have been monitoring the North County Corridor (NCC) alignment since the beginning of the process as it relates to the Martin Family Holdings, LLC ("Martin") property (APNs 083-002-001 & 016) located at the southeast corner of Oakdale Road and Claribel Avenue. We have provided numerous comment letters on the NCC alignment and have participated regularly in the process. We have made clear throughout this process if an alignment was chosen approximately a quarter mile south of Claribel Avenue, that it should be centered on the southern property line of the Martin property. This is a location which has the least amount of impact on adjacent properties and maintains their developability. A recent version in the project appears to have the NCC located north of the property line in question. We must request that the NCC alignment honor the property line and be centered on it.

This letter is being written to reconfirm our consistent position since the beginning of this process, and we believe it is an easily accommodated request. Please consider this as you move forward on the NCC project.

Very truly yours,

  
David O. Romano, P.E., AICP

DOR:bmb  
Enclosures

cc: Martin Family Holdings, LLC  
Brent Sinclair, City of Modesto  
Colt Esenwein, County Public Works

Real Estate and Development Consultants



## **City of Riverbank**

**6707 Third Street • Riverbank, CA 95367-2305  
Phone: (209) 869-7101 • Fax: (209) 869-7100**

**May 27, 2015**

**Mr. Matt Machado  
Director of Public Works  
County of Stanislaus  
1716 Morgan Road  
Modesto, CA 95358**

**Subject: North County Corridor – Eleanor Avenue Crossing**

**Dear Matt,**

**I am following up on the conversations that we have had regarding the City's intent to pursue annexation to the east of Claus Road past Eleanor Avenue to the boundaries of the Riverbank General Planning Area, which includes the North County Corridor Crossing at Eleanor Avenue. This has been approved by the City Council as a strategic priority and is incorporated into the City's work plan for FY 2015-2016.**

**As a result of this planning effort, the City asks that the County add plans for an urban intersection or interchange at Eleanor Avenue where it will meet the North County Corridor. In the event that you need additional information regarding the City's plans, please contact John Anderson, the City's Contract Community Development Director at 209-599-8377.**

**The assistance that you and Colt Esenwein have provided in identifying potential solutions to the concerns that the City has raised is appreciated. I believe that the opportunity to incorporate the intersection at Eleanor Avenue, consistent with the City's General Plan, will also serve to enhance the North County Corridor Project. We look forward to working with you on this project as it moves forward.**

**Sincerely,**

**Jill Anderson  
City Manager**

**Keimi Espinoza - NCC / Airport route?!**

---

**From:** "J D GODKIN" <jdgodkin71@sbcglobal.net>  
**To:** "J D GODKIN" <jdgodkin71@sbcglobal.net>  
**Date:** 6/2/2015 5:02 PM  
**Subject:** NCC / Airport route?!

---

June 1, 2015

Ms. Gail Miller  
Senior Environmental Planner  
CAL-TRANS  
855 M Street Suite 200  
Fresno, CA 93721

Dear Ms. Miller . . .

Greetings!

In reviewing the many comments regarding the NCC, I notice nobody has asked about the 'elephant in the living room'. That would be, in my opinion, the Oakdale Municipal Airport. Why is a NCC route NOT being considered through this city and county owned property? It's a slam dunk for savings!

When I ask longtime Oakdale residents about if a route through the airport has ever been discussed, they just shrug their shoulders with the blind look of 'I have no idea'. Then, that is followed with a beaming 'it does make sense'. It sure does to me. On the other hand, city officials are more obscure, saying 'it's not feasible'. Really? Why not? Give us some specifics and hardcore reasoning this time. Don't just 'shine us on'. We have too much at stake to be placated with double talk.

How does Cal-Trans, et al account for this 'oversight' by not—at the minimum—considering an airport route? Or, if you have, give me the specifics and a hardcore rational argument that proves avoiding the airport is to the clear betterment of the general public. Otherwise, please account for ignoring what appears to be an obvious, and more prudent, alternative to the devastation being caused by your current routes. At least going through the airport property makes more sense for we common taxpayer and our families. For the well-to-do aircraft owner . . . maybe not so much. Simply put: which group is more important to you?

Take a peek at how many Oakdale residents actually use this municipal airport. I suspect you will find most use comes from 'out-of-towners' who do not want to experience the cost and inconvenience of the better planned Modesto airport. Something is out of whack here!

Compare the cost and number of households (lives!) and businesses you are disturbing with any of your current NCC routes against protecting the whims of a few pilots and their playthings. The disparity is glaringly offensive. Maybe you could consider a public survey. Maybe put the matter up for a public vote?

If failing [or refusing] to hold the feet of some government bureaucracy—federal or not—to the fire for the benefit of a few airplane owners is not worth the lives and devastation you are about to cause citizens currently, the shame you have brought to your duties is pathetic, unprofessional, and clearly unacceptable.

Asked if the airport has some specific benefit to Oakdale residents—other than those select few who can afford

to play on this very expensive 'playground'—the overall response from dozens of citizens was 'nothing, as far as I know'. All private toys and no known or real public benefit? That doesn't bode well for the spirit of the NCC . . . nor those managing it.

Moving or eliminating the airport improves the environment, safety, health and well-being of the people living near it now and in the future. Houses are already being planned directly in the airport's flight paths. Take a look at Oakdale's SPSP. Hundreds of more families are going to be impacted.

Gail, is there something the public should know regarding the protecting of this annoying—and apparently very limited use—airport? Is there something taboo about considering this area for the NCC? If so, what is it? Just please do not tell me it is because you are 'afraid of' or are 'intentionally avoiding' the FAA. Just try! Protecting the pleasures of a some wealthy aircraft owners is utterly offensive to those of us facing evacuation of our homes and well-being.

Seems to me that looking at the airport route for your NCC would be a win-win deal. It will stave off a bevy of public costs, ease the fear and frustration of ordinary tax paying Oakdale citizens who will be losing their current way of life, including many of our homes and livelihood. And you would show the citizenry that you—our government officials— honestly have 'the small guy's back' in the NCC project. We truly need your help.

On a personal note: By taking over 30% of our property under Plan 1A or 2A and installing an expressway in our backyard, do you really understand—much less care—how much you will be contributing to our mental, physical and emotional angst? Not only will your current routes have a polluting effect on the environment, you are literally shattering my dream to retire to the tranquility of Oakdale.

Are we just going to be a by-product of another 'tough luck—oh, well' pat on the head, or will our leadership step-up and help find a better way by adding some much needed empathy. I pray it is the latter.

Finally, Gail, I respectfully ask that you please provide a breakdown of how many citizens [property owners, et al] will be affected by each route [1A, 2A, 1B and 2B].

Your time, consideration and patience in this matter are greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Regards,

J D Godkin

P.S. For the record, my family and other potential 'victims' are adamantly opposed to your routes 1A and 2A. If you cannot see fit to consider a route through the airport, please help us by choosing either Route 1B or 2B. Thanks!

837 Townhill Avenue  
Oakdale, CA 05361  
510/638-0343

**From:** Smith, Scott S@DOT [<mailto:scott.smith@dot.ca.gov>]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 08, 2015 11:48 AM  
**To:** [jdgodkin71@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jdgodkin71@sbcglobal.net)  
**Cc:** Colt Esenwein; [machadom@stancounty.com](mailto:machadom@stancounty.com); Pinne, Joy E@DOT; Torres, Juan@DOT  
**Subject:** North County Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Godkin,

Thank you for your interest in this project. As you can imagine with a project of this scale there have been many discussions about where the most efficient and sensible location for a roadway might be. As you mention, the Oakdale Municipal Airport exists in the general area where the new State Route 108 will be located. The airport has mandated setbacks which require us to locate our roadway certain distances away from runways, etc. As the airport is an existing facility and is in the approved city and county plans, Caltrans is required to make every effort to comply with those plans which includes avoiding the airport and those areas that have been identified for future development in relation to the airport.

I hope this information helps you understand some of the reasoning which has gone into the locations of the proposed alternatives and I look forward to your input on which alternative you feel is best suited to address the purpose and need of the project when the draft environmental document is circulated for public input.

If you have any other questions or concerns please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

Scott  
Scott Smith  
Senior Environmental Planner  
Central Sierra Environmental Analysis Branch  
Central Region  
[559-445-6172](tel:559-445-6172)  
[scott.smith@dot.ca.gov](mailto:scott.smith@dot.ca.gov)

**From:** J D GODKIN [<mailto:jdgodkin71@sbcglobal.net>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 10, 2015 3:37 PM  
**To:** Smith, Scott S@DOT  
**Cc:** 'Colt Esenwein'; [machadom@stancounty.com](mailto:machadom@stancounty.com); Pinne, Joy E@DOT; Torres, Juan@DOT  
**Subject:** RE: North County Corridor Project

June 10, 2015

Scott . . .

Thank you for your kind response.

You bet my family is interested in your NCC! Scores of other property owners—are interested, too. If your life was going to be altered, if not destroyed, I trust you would be too. Making matters worse, it appears the head government agency is shrugging off your family's well-being in favor of some benign 'playground'?

Lest we be reminded of Caltrans' reputation and failure rate in Oakdale [i.e. 35-year Bypass, buying and then underselling property, et al]? Today, have an opportunity to show Oakdale citizenry that Caltrans has their best interests in mind. Let's avoid past wrongs with a full and diligent investigation of all possibilities.

Having received numerous supportive responses from a lot of scared people also questioning Caltrans' apparent CHOICE to sheepishly bow to some biased, highly questionable—and unsubstantiated—government decisions, I noticed a common thread: How does maintaining the Oakdale Airport do any more than allow a few aircraft owners to pleasure themselves? How does keeping the airport help Oakdale—even Stanislaus County—more than the current routes harm Oakdale's citizenry?

Your term 'existing facility' and seemingly convenient refusal to 'find a way' to save millions of dollars and hundreds of families is offensive and unacceptable.

Yes, like many in Oakdale, my family suffers in the flight path of the airport and are at the whims and competence of aircraft operators. This is stressful enough on our health, much less our property values. But, if you choose Route 1A or 2A, which I pray you DO NOT, our family loses over 30% of our property—in addition to having a noisy, smog laden expressway with an overpass in our backyard! Doesn't this also fall under the purview of addressing ENVIRONMENTAL concerns, too?

We see first-hand pilots in UNMARKED planes flying quite low over our homes and schools. With Oakdale's new Sierra Pointe Specific Plan [SPSP], hundreds more families will soon be subject to these harrowing airport risks. Is this really what Caltrans wants to ignore and ultimately support? How does this help our environment? It doesn't. It harms every aspect of a good, healthful environment!



Many of us are frustrated and fearful victims of your 'easy way out'—of even asking Oakdale and Stanislaus County to account for the airport. Honestly, did you really spend comparable time reviewing/analyzing the cost and benefit of an airport route as you have with your other more contentious routes? If not, why not? Please, direct your staff to make an official inquiry in a concerted, honest and forthright manner to address all of OUR environmental needs.

We need your help. Would you please provide us with the details on why and when the City of Oakdale and Stanislaus County, respectively, decided that this 'existing facility'—a virtual playground for many non-residents [city and county] was more important and better justified than the existing Oakdale family farms, ranches, homes and business you are about to destroy? Who do we need to speak with, if not you?

Scott, you mentioned '*. . . and those areas that have been identified for future development in relation to the airport.*' Would you please be specific about those areas you are 'protecting'? The gravity of their importance over our family's health and safety is most interesting to us.

Finally, please ask Gail Miller to re-read my initial letter and kindly answer all my original questions. For example, how many citizens/families are affected by each route?

Your time, understanding and patience are greatly appreciated.

Jim Godkin  
510/638-0343

**From:** "Smith, Scott S@DOT" <[scott.smith@dot.ca.gov](mailto:scott.smith@dot.ca.gov)>  
**Date:** June 11, 2015 at 2:27:22 PM PDT  
**To:** "J D GODKIN" <[jdgodkin71@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jdgodkin71@sbcglobal.net)>  
**Cc:** "Colt Esenwein" <[ESENWEINC@stancounty.com](mailto:ESENWEINC@stancounty.com)>, "Matt Machado" <[machadom@stancounty.com](mailto:machadom@stancounty.com)>, "Joy E@DOT Pinne" <[joy.pinne@dot.ca.gov](mailto:joy.pinne@dot.ca.gov)>, "Juan@DOT Torres" <[juan.torres@dot.ca.gov](mailto:juan.torres@dot.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: North County Corridor Project

Mr. Godkin,

Again, thank you for taking the time to express your concerns and allowing me the ability to try to address them.

The questions related to the viability, safety, and reasonableness of the Oakdale Airport are all questions that fall outside the scope of the North County Corridor project. You asked who you should contact to discuss your concerns and I recommend you talk with your city and/or county representatives.

Your local elected representatives voted to adopt both the Stanislaus County General Plan and the 2030 Oakdale General Plan which included the Oakdale Airport and the area to the east of the existing airport identified as "Future Sphere of Influence", "2030 Planning Area", and "Airport". Both of these documents were publicly circulated and the public was given a chance to comment on them before they were adopted by the respective elected bodies. These were not planning documents prepared by Caltrans but must be considered by this agency when planning a new facility such as the North County Corridor.

I can speak to how the impacts of the North County Corridor will be addressed in the environmental document. Your specific concerns over issues such as noise, air quality and visual impacts will be analyzed and compared across each of the alternatives. You will be able to see how the proposed project will affect you. This is also the time when we will be able to publish the data you are requesting with regards to specific numbers of households impacted by each alternative. You will also be able to comment on the project when it is circulated for public review and both your questions and our response will be included in the official project record and published in the final environmental document.

If you have any additional questions you believe I might be able to help address please feel free to contact me.

Regards,  
Scott  
Scott Smith  
Senior Environmental Planner

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****DISTRICT 6**

855 M St. Suite 200, Fresno, CA 93721

PHONE (559) 445-6172

www.dot.ca.gov

*Flex your power!  
Be energy efficient!*

June 11, 2015

Mr. Pat Bicknell  
9708 Rams Hill Ct.  
Oakdale, CA 95361

Dear Mr. Bicknell:

Thank you for your interest in the North County Corridor project.

After reading your letter it appears most of your comments are centered around the Oakdale Airport. Your concerns related to the viability, safety, and reasonableness of the airport are all questions that fall outside the scope of the North County Corridor project.

Your local elected representatives voted to adopt both the Stanislaus County General Plan and the 2030 Oakdale General Plan which included the Oakdale Airport. Both of these documents were publicly circulated and the public was given a chance to comment on them before they were adopted by the respective elected bodies. These were not planning documents prepared by Caltrans but must be considered by this agency when planning a new facility such as the North County Corridor.

Caltrans will be circulating a draft environmental document for this project and at this time we will be able to provide the data you are requesting with regards to specific numbers of households impacted by each alternative. You will also be able to comment on the project when it is circulated for public review and both your questions and our response submitted during the circulation period will be included in the official project record and published in the final environmental document.

It should be noted that Gail Miller is no longer working on this project and I have taken her place. If you have any further questions, please contact me at (559) 445-6172.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "SCOTT SMITH".

SCOTT SMITH  
Senior Environmental Planner  
Caltrans Central Region Environmental Division