

Stan Tidman

From: Sweeten, Gary [Gary.Sweeten@fhwa.dot.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2008 11:45 AM
To: Mulvihill.carolyn@epa.gov; Jones.Paul@EPA.GOV; Thomas Cavanaugh; Jennifer.C.MacLean@usace.army.mil; Steve_Propst@dot.ca.gov; laura_walsh@dot.ca.gov; joanne@koegelassociates.com; Denise Heick; Julie_Watson@URSCorp.com; steve_leach@urscorp.com; JPL@DKSassociates.com; mara@marafeeney.com; Stan Tidman; john.baker@noaa.gov; Jana_Milliken@fws.gov
Cc: John Webb; catherine_short@urscorp.com; Celia McAdam; gmh@dkssacramento.com; Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov; gina.moran@dot.ca.gov; arelin@nossaman.com; kpease@roseville.ca.us; rjensen@roseville.ca.us; rdondro@placer.ca.gov; rmoorehe@placer.ca.gov; andrew_agustinovich@dot.ca.gov; eva.begley@dot.ca.gov; Lupe_Jimenez@dot.ca.gov; Chris Collison; dunning.connell@epamail.epa.gov; jfinn@dfg.ca.gov; Katrina_Pierce@dot.ca.gov; Kenneth Sanchez; cshaw@placer.ca.gov; Sue Sholtis
Subject: Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation & Tier 1 EIS/EIR - SPRTA Board Direction

I wanted to give you an update on the project's status. The project team has been working to address the USEPA recommendations and LEDPA issues discussed at our November 7, 2007 meeting.

On February 27, the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) Board conducted a workshop to discuss issues related to the project's access and buffer requirements. At this meeting it was explained that USACE and USEPA were working with PCTPA staff on the determination of the corridor most likely to contain the LEDPA, and that the resource agencies had requested additional information regarding the potential effects of the Parkway under different assumptions for future interchanges and the buffer zone.. It was noted that additional interchanges are not a part of the proposed project, and neither additional intersections nor new arterial roadways which could intersect with the Parkway are included in any local plan. The Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR acknowledged the possibility of future buffer zone modifications, but no specific changes have been analyzed or approved. On March 26, the Board directed the PCTPA staff to complete preparation of this information and, for full disclosure, to circulate the result for public comment.

The SPRTA Board felt that this approach would provide a transparent public process and would also make a stronger foundation for later Tier 2 (project-level) environmental work, to locate the roadway within the selected corridor.

A Project Development Team (PDT) meeting is scheduled for April 17 to review the scope for this expanded analysis and to get input. Once the analysis is completed and integrated into the recommended LEDPA concurrence request, another meeting will be scheduled with you. At that time, prior to formulating and circulating the additional information, we expect to provide you with a draft letter describing the analysis and requesting concurrence on the staff's recommendation of the corridor most likely to contain the LEDPA.

I appreciate your continuing interest in this high-priority regional transportation project. Please let me know if you have any questions.