



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

CALIFORNIA DIVISION

650 Capitol Mall, Suite 4-100

Sacramento, CA. 95814

June 6, 2005

IN REPLY REFER TO

HDA-CA

File # 03-Pla-CR

Placer Parkway

Document # P52636

Nova Blazej, Federal Activities Office (CMD-2)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

Attention: Ms. Nancy Levin

Dear Ms. Nova Blazej:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Placer County Transportation Agency (PCPTA) are requesting your concurrence of the criteria for selecting the range of alternatives for the Placer Parkway in Placer County, as part of the NEPA/Section 404 Memorandum of Understanding with the FHWA, Caltrans, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The criteria for selecting the range of alternatives is intended to be included in the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report for circulation to the public. The criteria were revised to address federal resource agency comments, as discussed at the Placer Parkway Coordination Meeting of May 18, 2005. The final Criteria For Selecting the Range of Alternatives, Concurrence Point #2, were attached to an e-mail from Stan Tidman on May 19, 2005, and are also attached to this letter.

Based on the comments and verbal agreement reached at the May 18 meeting, the FHWA requests final concurrence from your agency on the criteria for selecting the range of alternatives. The FHWA, Caltrans, and PCPTA greatly appreciate your ongoing involvement in the Placer Parkway Corridor project. Following your formal agreement on the criteria for selecting the range of alternatives, we look forward to working with you in the development of project alternatives.

Sincerely,

For
Gene K. Fong
Division Administrator

Enclosure



cc: w/Enclosure (by E-mail)
Jay Norvell, CT – HQ
Terry Abbott, CT – HQ
Germaine Belanger, CT – HQ
Katrina Pierce, CT – D-3
John Webb, CT – D-3
Japtej Gill, CT – D-3
Steve Probst, CT – D-3
Pat McAchren, CT – D-3
Celia McAdam, PCTPA
Stan Tidman, PCTPA
Leland Dong
Gary Sweeten

GSweeten/kmo

CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES**CONCURRENCE POINT #2****PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION TIER 1 EIS/EIR****MAY 19, 2005**

The following criteria will determine the reasonable range of alternatives to advance to the DEIS/EIR. The range of alternatives can include both new roadway and non-roadway transportation solutions, e.g. expanding existing roads, a non-freeway facility, a Transportation System Management (TSM) alternative, a shorter Parkway Alternative, or a combination of the aforementioned. Alternatives that are not consistent with this list of criteria should not be advanced to the DEIS/EIR for evaluation.

1. Meets the Project Purpose.
2. Avoids or minimizes growth inducement in environmentally sensitive areas.
3. Avoids or minimizes direct, secondary, and cumulative impacts to jurisdictional waters of the U.S. including wetlands.
4. Avoids or minimizes effects to Section 4(f) resources.
5. Is consistent with the intent of the objectives of the Placer County Conservation Plan.