



A G E N D A

**Wednesday, December 1, 2004
10:45 am**

**Board of Supervisors Chambers
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, California 95603**

- A. Roll Call**
- B. Approval of Minutes: August 25, 2004** **Action
Pg. 1**
- C. Agenda Review**
- D. Public Comment**
- E. Consent Calendar** **Action
Pg. 3**

These items are expected to be routine and non-controversial. They will be acted upon by the Board at one time without discussion. Any Board member, staff member, or interested citizen may request an item be removed from the consent calendar for discussion.

 - 1) SPRTA Capitalization Policy
- F. Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Tier 1 EIS/EIR: Commencement of Work on Draft Document** **Action
Pg. 4**
- G. Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair for 2005** **Action
Pg. 38**
- H. Executive Director's Report**
- I. Board Direction to Staff**
- J. Informational Items** **Info**
 - 1) Technical Advisory Committee Minutes
 - a) September 7, 2004 **Pg. 39**
 - b) October 12, 2004 **Pg. 40**



City of Lincoln • City of Rocklin • City of Roseville • Placer County

TO: Board of Directors

DATE: November 22, 2004

FROM: Celia McAdam, Executive Director

SUBJECT: CONSENT CALENDAR

Below is the Consent calendar item for the December 1, 2004 agenda for your review and action.

1. **SPRTA Capitalization Policy**
To comply with new government accounting standards outlined in Government Accounting Standards Board, Statement #34 (GASB 34), SPRTA must adopt a capitalization policy. Upon recommendation from our auditors, staff is recommending any purchase of \$5,000 or more for building improvements, equipment, or furniture be capitalized and depreciated.

CM:ss



City of Lincoln • City of Rocklin • City of Roseville • Placer County

DATE: November 19, 2004

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Celia McAdam, Executive Director
Stan Tidman, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION TIER 1
EIS/EIR: COMMENCEMENT OF WORK ON DRAFT DOCUMENT

Action Requested

- 1) Accept the attached report documenting the development of the range of alternatives for the Placer Parkway as complete, and
- 2) Direct staff to commence preparation of the draft Tier 1 Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) document

Background

General

The Placer Parkway is a long-range, high-priority regional transportation facility planned to connect SR 65 and SR 70/99. It will link existing and planned development in Placer and Sutter counties, reduce congestion on local roads, and improve goods/services movement including improved access to Sacramento International Airport and to downtown Sacramento.

The objective of the Corridor Preservation project is to identify and preserve an approximate 15-mile long, 500'- to 1,000'-wide corridor. A Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report (Tier 1 EIS/EIR) will be prepared to meet federal and State environmental requirements. It will evaluate a number of corridor alternatives and identify one, within which Placer Parkway will eventually be constructed. Corridor acquisition will begin once environmental clearance is obtained.

Later, as design and construction funding becomes available, a project-level Tier 2 environmental review will determine the specific footprint for the roadway within the corridor. This funding is not anticipated before 2015. The roadway would initially be a four-lane facility, but could be expanded to six lanes or include transit or rail elements. Construction completion is anticipated around 2020.

There are three key milestones for the development of the Tier 1 environmental document:

- 1) Identification Of A Range Of Reasonable Alternatives**
Included components
 - a. Purpose and need
 - b. Screening criteria
 - c. Range of alternatives

- 2) Draft EIR/EIS**

- 3) Final EIR/EIS**
Included components
 - a. Identification of Preferred Alternative
 - b. Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA)
 - c. Mitigation strategy

Staff is now requesting the Board's acceptance of the attached *Alternatives Development Summary Report*, describing the development of the range of alternatives in accordance with the requirements and definitions of the State and Federal agencies, as a completion of the first milestone. With that acceptance, it is further requested that the Board direct staff to begin preparation of the draft Tier 1 EIR/EIS document.

The Board should also note that a parallel modified NEPA/404 process is underway . This process may result in the modification or addition/deletion of these alternatives based on input from federal agencies.

Attachments

- 1 Alternatives Development Summary Report

Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Project

ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY REPORT

Placer Parkway Overview

The Placer Parkway is a long-range, high-priority regional transportation facility planned to connect SR 65 and SR 70/99. It will link existing and planned development in Placer and Sutter counties, reduce congestion on local roads, and improve goods/services movement, including improved access to Sacramento International Airport and to downtown Sacramento.

Corridor Preservation Project

The objective of the Corridor Preservation project is to identify and preserve an approximately 15-mile long, 500'- to 1,000'-wide corridor. A Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report (Tier 1 EIS/EIR) will be prepared to meet federal and State environmental requirements. It will evaluate a number of corridor alternatives and identify one, within which Placer Parkway will eventually be constructed. Corridor acquisition will begin once environmental clearance is obtained.

Later, as design and construction funding becomes available; a project-level Tier 2 environmental review will determine the specific footprint for the roadway within the corridor. This funding is not anticipated before 2015. The roadway would initially be a four-lane facility. It could be expanded to six lanes. Construction completion is anticipated around 2020. A key early milestone for the corridor preservation project is to identify feasible corridor alignment alternatives by fall 2004 in order to complete the Tier 1 EIS/EIR by late 2006 or early 2007.

The following project advisory committees were formed to help guide the project.

- Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
- Study Advisory Committee (SAC)
- Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)

See Attachments A, B, and C for membership lists.

A Project Development Team (PDT) was also established to help identify problems and develop solutions. See Attachment D for a membership list.

Alternatives Identification Process

Purpose and Need

As part of the alternatives identification process, a Purpose and Need Statement is developed. Anticipated rapid population and employment growth will create greater

regional travel demand and congestion. Preserving a corridor now, for a future transportation facility, will help to ensure that an appropriate right-of-way will not be precluded by future development, and allow acquisition/preservation. The 2001 Project Study Report (PSR) contains background discussion on the project's purpose and need.

The project team has been working with FHWA, Caltrans, and federal resource agencies to complete the formal Purpose and Need statement. The current draft of the statement emphasizes the following points:

- The need or transportation problem is based on planned development in industrial areas, and existing and projected population and job growth in Placer and Sutter counties, which will create more travel demand and congestion.
- The purpose or solution emphasizes preserving right-of-way for the corridor, responding to existing/anticipated travel demand, and providing access to the regional transportation system in areas planned or projected for job growth.

Concurrence on the final wording of the Purpose and Need is anticipated in December, 2004.

Corridor Alignment Alternatives Screening

At SPRTA's February 25, 2003 Board meeting, the alternatives screening criteria/process and recommendations were reviewed. Board discussion included issues such as the Parkway's purpose, whether the Tier 1 EIS/EIR would consider pending urban development proposals, Watt Ave., and jurisdiction/developer coordination. The Board generally concurred with each recommended modification as well as TAC direction on access/no-development buffer policies.

Attachment E summarizes TAC, SAC, and PAC input on the screening process. Attachment F summarizes advisory committee input on the no access and no-development buffer policy issues. The Technical Memorandum on PSR Alternatives Screening is on the PCTPA web site – www.pctpa.org.

Four potential corridor alignment alternatives have been identified. The focus of this work was to avoid or reduce impacts to environmental resource areas including existing development. An added emphasis was to avoid or reduce impacts to aquatic resources, because this is a focus of federal permitting agencies. The following entities provided input on these potential alternatives:

- the project's TAC (seven meetings), SAC (five meetings), and the PAC (three meetings)
- FHWA and Caltrans
- Coordination with SACOG and the Counties of Placer, Sutter, and Sacramento as well as the Cities of Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, and Sacramento
- Public input at meetings held in Roseville (August 23) and Pleasant Grove (August 26)
- November 30, 2004 Sutter County Board of Supervisors Study Session (to be recapped at the SPRTA Board meeting)

The work involved three general steps:

1. Using the conceptual alignments from the 2001 PSR as a starting point: The environmental and transportation screening process evaluated effects on environmental resources/development and future transportation operations for each PSR concept alignment. Eleven concept alternative combinations were outlined in the PSR. Figure 1 shows the three general PSR concepts and potential state route connections. Through the screening process, a number of recommendations were made to avoid or reduce potential environmental impacts to existing resources and development. See the Technical Memorandum – Screening Evaluation of PSR Alternatives at www.pctpa.org.
2. Identifying and evaluating, via the screening process, a number of other corridor alignment alternatives: These other alternatives were developed based on advisory committee input and coordination with local jurisdictions. These other alternatives included a ‘more direct’ alternative across the study area’s central segment as well as two Baseline Road variations. Overall, there were 11 modified or new corridor alignment alternatives evaluated. Figure 2 shows these other alternatives.
3. Refining these other alternatives based on TAC (May 2004) and SAC (June 2004) input to further avoid or reduce potential impacts: Figure 3 illustrates the four potential corridor alignment alternatives recommended to be considered in the Tier 1 EIS/EIR. Each would connect to SR 65 at Whitney Boulevard. They would extend west via a common segment to approximately Phillip Road where they split-out into the following distinct corridor alignment alternatives:
 - connecting to SR 70/99 at Sankey Road
 - extending south along the Locust Road alignment, connecting to SR 70/99 north of Riego Road
 - extending diagonally to the southwest, connecting to SR 70/99 north of Riego Road
 - extending south, then west parallel to and about 1 mile north of Baseline Road, connecting to SR 70/99 north of Riego Road.

Based on new Caltrans guidance for concerns with safety and high-speed connections, interchange concepts alternatives were developed for Parkway connections with:

- SR 65 at Whitney
- SR 70/99 at Sankey Rd.
- SR 70/99 approximately ½-mile north of Riego Rd.
-

On September 14, 2004, as a culmination of the alternatives screening process, the PAC reviewed the process and the four potential corridor alignment alternatives. The PAC was generally satisfied with the screening alternatives process. See Attachment G for the PAC #3 meeting minutes. Specific discussion items were:

- Alternatives consideration and elimination. To illustrate how alternative corridors were considered and eliminated, the project team used several slides comparing environmental and transportation impacts between the PSR's conceptual alignments to the four potential corridor alignment alternatives.

Through the screening and refinement process, several PSR concepts and other alternatives were eliminated because of potential environmental impacts. It was emphasized at the meeting that potential alternatives could only be eliminated if there was a valid environmental reason.

- Modified NEPA/404 process. PCTPA entered into an informal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with FHWA, Caltrans, and the federal resource agencies -- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The focus of the NEPA/404 process is wetlands and other "Waters of the U.S.". Although, no permits are required for the Corridor Preservation project and its Tier 1 EIS/EIR, the MOU outlines agreement to identify environmental issues that could affect future construction permit approvals. The process will seek to reach concurrence on several points including the LEDPA corridor (Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative).

Obtaining concurrence on the final set of alternatives is taking longer than expected. The PAC was informed that the project could be delayed several months to wait on concurrence. This would create problems for Placer County in processing the two proposed university specific plans. The project team is moving forward with the environmental work and will continue to work to obtain concurrence. The environmental work may require some 'back-tracking' to account for resource agency input.

Attachments

- A Technical Advisory Committee
- B Study Advisory Committee
- C Policy Advisory Committee
- D Project Development Team
- E TAC/SAC/PAC Comments/Input – Technical Memorandum on PSR Alternatives Screening
- F Goals/Policy Issues
- G Goals/Policies Clarification
- H September 14, 2004 PAC Meeting Minutes

Figures

1. PSR Alternatives map
2. Other Corridor Alternatives Evaluated map
3. Potential Corridor Alignment Alternatives for Tier 1 EIS/EIR Analysis map



Technical Advisory Committee

Placer County

Tom Brinkman, Dept. of Public Works –
Transportation Division
Fred Yeager, Planning Dept.

Sacramento County

Jeff Clarke, Public Works Agency –
Dept. of Transportation
Robert Sherry, Planning & Community
Development Dept.

Sutter County

George Musallam, Public Works Dept.
Lisa Wilson, Planning Services

City of Lincoln

John Pedri, Public Works Dept.
George Dellwo, Community
Development Dept.

Town of Loomis

Perry Beck, Town Manager

City of Rocklin

Larry Wing, Community Development
Dept. -- City Engineer
Terry Richardson, Community
Development Dept. -- Planning

City of Roseville

Rob Jensen, Public Works Dept.
Kathy Pease, Planning Dept.

SACOG

Gordon Garry, Research & Analysis
Robert McCrary, Planning
Ken Hough, Planning

Caltrans

Steve Propst, Local Assistance
Pat McAchren, Environmental
Cathy Chapin, Transportation Planning

FHWA

Lee Dong, California Division

Staff – PCTPA/Celia McAdam, Stan Tidman; URS/Denise Heick, Garry Horton; DKS/John Long

TAC members are also a part of the project Study Advisory Committee. FHWA and Caltrans resource specialists participate as required.

The Placer Parkway is a high priority regional transportation facility proposed to connect rapidly growing areas of western Placer County to planned development in Sacramento/Sutter Counties. The approximate 15-mile long facility would connect SR 65 and SR70/99 generally between Sunset Boulevard/Howsley Road and Baseline Road/Riego Road. The purpose of this project, via a broadly based Tier 1 EIS/EIR, is to identify and preserve a corridor for land acquisition. Later, as design and construction funding becomes available, the facility's specific alignment and environmental impacts within the Parkway corridor will be determined.



Study Advisory Committee

Agriculture

William Morebeck, Placer County
Agricultural Commission
Mark Quisenberry, Sutter County
Agriculture Dept.

Business

Wendy Gerig, Roseville Chamber of
Commerce
Tim Johnson, Yuba-Sutter Economic
Development Corp.
Joe Cruz, Sacramento Metro Chamber

Community Groups

Al Clark, Friends of Placer County
Jack Wallace, Roseville Coalition of
Neighborhood Associations
Joan Powell, Sun City – Roseville
Homeowners Association

Community/Government

George Brown, West Placer MAC
George Alves, Rural Lincoln MAC

Development

John Costa, BIA - Superior California
John Tallman, West Roseville Specific
Plan
Eric Bryant, Placer Ranch Specific Plan
Jack A. Ritchie, Lennar Properties
Julie Hanson, KT Development

Environmental

Alan Green, Sierra Club of Placer
County
Ed Pandolfino, Audubon Society &
Environmental Council of Sacramento

Staff – PCTPA/Celia McAdam, Stan Tidman; URS/Denise Heick, Garry Horton; DKS/John Long

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members are part of the SAC.

The Placer Parkway is a high priority regional transportation facility proposed to connect rapidly growing areas of western Placer County to planned development in Sacramento/Sutter Counties. The approximate 15-mile long facility would connect SR 65 and SR70/99 generally between Sunset Boulevard/Howsley Road and Baseline Road/Riego Road. The purpose of this project, via a broadly based Tier 1 EIS/EIR, is to identify and preserve a corridor for land acquisition. Later, as design and construction funding becomes available, the facility's specific alignment and environmental impacts within the Parkway corridor will be determined.

Study Advisory Committee (continued)

Environmental/Government

Loren Clark, Placer Legacy
Tom Christofk, Placer County Air
Pollution Control District
Mark Littlefield, U.S. Fish & Wildlife
Service
Nancy Levin, U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency

Erin Foresman, U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency
John Baker, U.S. NOAA – National
Marine Fisheries Svc
Patrick Gillum, Regional Water Quality
Control Board
Jeff Finn, California Dept. of Fish and
Game
Mike Jewell/Tom Cavanaugh, USACOE
Hans Kreuzberg, SHPO

The Placer Parkway is a high priority regional transportation facility proposed to connect rapidly growing areas of western Placer County to planned development in Sacramento/Sutter Counties. The approximate 15-mile long facility would connect SR 65 and SR70/99 generally between Sunset Boulevard/Howsley Road and Baseline Road/Riego Road. The purpose of this project, via a broadly based Tier 1 EIS/EIR, is to identify and preserve a corridor for land acquisition. Later, as design and construction funding becomes available, the facility's specific alignment and environmental impacts within the Parkway corridor will be determined



Policy Advisory Committee

Placer County

Bill Santucci, Board of Supervisors
District 1
Robert Weygandt, Board of Supervisors
District 2
Jan Christofferson, Executive Officer
(ex-officio member)

Sacramento County

Roger Niello, Board of Supervisors
District 4

Sutter County

Dan Silva, Board of Supervisors
District 5
Dennis Nelson, Board of Supervisors
District 2
Larry Combs, County Administrative
Officer (ex-officio member)

City of Lincoln

Tom Cosgrove, City Council

City of Rocklin

Peter Hill, City Council

City of Roseville

Gina Garbolino, City Council

Caltrans

Jody Jones, District 3 (ex-officio
member)

Staff – PCTPA/ Celia McAdam, Stan Tidman; URS/Denise Heick, Garry Horton; DKS/John Long

The Placer Parkway is a high priority regional transportation facility proposed to connect rapidly growing areas of western Placer County to planned development in Sacramento/Sutter Counties. The approximate 15-mile long facility would connect SR 65 and SR70/99 generally between Sunset Boulevard/Howsley Road and Baseline Road/Riego Road. The purpose of this project, via a broadly based Tier 1 EIS/EIR, is to identify and preserve a corridor for land acquisition. Later, as design and construction funding becomes available, the facility's specific alignment and environmental impacts within the Parkway corridor will be determined.



Project Development Team

Caltrans

Dennis Azevedo, Traffic
Japtej Gill, Environmental (info)
Pat McAchren, Environmental
Kelley Phillips, Environmental -- Biology
Steve Propst, Local Assistance
Cathy Chapin, Transportation Planning
Sarah Allred, Environmental – Cultural Resources

FHWA

Leland Dong, Transportation Engineer

Sutter County

George Musallam, Public Works
Lisa Wilson, Planning

PCTPA

Celia McAdam, Executive Director
Stan Tidman, Project Manager

URS

Denise Heick, Project Manager
Fritts Golden, Environmental Lead
Garry Horton, Engineering
Keith Dewey, Environmental

DKS

John Long

Mara Feeney and Associates

Mara Feeney

U.S. Corps of Engineers

Tom Cavanaugh

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Nancy Levin

The Placer Parkway is a high priority regional transportation facility proposed to connect rapidly growing areas of western Placer County to planned development in Sacramento/Sutter Counties. The approximate 15-mile long facility would connect SR 65 and SR70/99 generally between Sunset Boulevard/Howsley Road and Baseline Road/Riego Road. The purpose of this project, via a broadly based Tier 1 EIS/EIR, is to identify and preserve a corridor for land acquisition. Later, as design and construction funding becomes available, the facility's specific alignment and environmental impacts within the Parkway corridor will be determined

Attachment E

TAC, SAC, AND PAC COMMENTS/INPUT

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM ON PSR ALTERNATIVES SCREENING

The PSR Alternative Screening process was documented in the *Technical Memorandum: Screening Evaluation of PSR Alternatives* (draft dated December 19, 2003; final dated February 23, 2004, attached). The screening process determined that there were no “fatal flaws” but did identify a number of significant environmental issues. It resulted in a series of recommendations for specific corridor alignment modifications. These recommendations were based on an analysis that included a comparison of the initial PSR alignments with:

- The project’s GIS resource database, to identify fatal flaws or conditions that could create potentially unacceptable environmental impacts,
- The Purpose and Need for Placer Parkway, to be sure objectives enumerated for the Parkway were met or not adversely affected, and
- Parkway goals and policies adopted previously, to be sure they were met or not adversely affected.

The draft technical memorandum was provided to the TAC members and its recommendations were discussed at a TAC Meeting (January 15, 2004). The draft technical memorandum and a summary of comments/input from the TAC were then provided to the SAC at a meeting on February 12, 2004 for SAC consideration and comment. Staff and consultants then presented the technical memorandum and a summary of comment from both the TAC and SAC meetings at a PAC meeting (March 4, 2004). Attendants at the PAC meeting were asked for their input on the technical memorandum, focusing on the recommendations.

The TAC, SAC, and PAC concurred in most of the recommendations and requested additional information or considerations in some areas. The staff and consultant recommendations are presented below, with the input from TAC, SAC, and PAC shown in *italics*.

TAC, SAC, and PAC Input

Prior to the TAC, SAC, and PAC meetings, members were asked to review the technical memorandum describing the screening process and recommending certain adjustments to the PSR corridor alignment alternatives. As complements to the information in the technical memorandum, TAC, SAC, and PAC members were also asked to consider four questions:

- Should the connection at Sunset Boulevard be revisited?
- Should the connection north of Sankey be retained?
- Should the connection south of Riego be retained?

ATTACHMENT E
TAC, SAC, AND PAC COMMENTS/INPUT

- Should the location of a southern corridor be moved closer to or further from Baseline Road?

In addition to the technical memorandum, SAC members were provided the results of the TAC meeting prior to the SAC meeting. PAC members were provided with the technical memorandum and the results of the TAC and SAC meetings prior to the PAC meeting. During each meeting, the following technical memorandum recommendations were considered:

A. Eliminating or Adjusting PSR Corridor Alignments

1. Reroute central and southern alignments north of current alignment to avoid a large vernal pool complex and the West Roseville Specific Plan (WRSP) area.

- *TAC concurred that routing the central and southern alignments be adjusted to the north in the vicinity of Fiddymont Road, to avoid a large vernal pool complex and the West Roseville Specific Plan.*
- *SAC concurred in general with this recommendation. (There was discussion by some SAC members as to why the southern alignment shouldn't be located adjacent to Fiddymont Road. Staff explained that in addition to the proposed West Roseville Specific Plan, there were a number of vernal pools and an historic ranch complex that would be impacted by such an alignment (see also No. 4 below). Some SAC members also expressed concern about the ability to enforce the "no access" policy in the central segment of the Parkway and about the potential disruption to farming in the area.)*
- *PAC concurred with TAC and SAC to route the central and southern alignments north to avoid sensitive areas. Some PAC members expressed concern about the jogs in the alignment and felt they might discourage use of the Parkway.*

2. Eliminate the northern corridor alignment between SR 70/99 and approximately Amoruso Acres.

- *TAC concurred that the northern corridor alignment be eliminated between SR 70/99 and a point just east of Amoruso Acres on Sunset Blvd West. This had the effect of eliminating the North of Sankey Road connection to SR 70/99 as well. The balance of the northern corridor would be retained and would transition to the adjusted central/southern corridor alternatives.*
- *SAC concurred with this recommendation. Staff and its consultants were advised to document the justification for eliminating this corridor alignment.*

ATTACHMENT E
TAC, SAC, AND PAC COMMENTS/INPUT

- *PAC concurred with dropping the northern corridor alignment between SR 70/99 and a point just east of Amoruso Acres on Sunset Boulevard West.*

Background. Prior to any recommended adjustments to the PSR corridor alignment alternatives, the northern corridor was determined to have the fewest aquatic impacts. However, adjustments to the other corridors (described below) would narrow this distinction. Also, the northern corridor would provide the least transportation benefits, adversely affect the Pleasant Grove community, have the greatest potential for growth inducement, and would cross an area Sutter County seeks to maintain in agriculture.

3. Modify the central corridor alignment:

a. Minimize encroachment into wetland/vernal pool and conservation areas at Curry Creek

- *TAC concurred with the recommendation to shift the central corridor alignment north in the vicinity of the confluence of two branches of Curry Creek. The area includes a conservation area, vernal pools, and riparian habitat. The TAC also directed the project team to consider a suggested corridor adjustment that would run in a more southwesterly direction, rather than south and then in an east-west direction (see Section B, Additional TAC Input, below). Issues to consider included farm units, vernal pools, and wetlands.*
- *SAC concurred with shifting the alignment north, as described.*
- *PAC concurred with TAC and SAC in shifting the central corridor alignment north in the vicinity of the confluence of two branches of Curry Creek. In response to a more southwesterly direction for the alignment, the PAC felt that this warranted further study.*

b. Adjust alignment in western segment to avoid the Pleasant Grove/Sankey community and a conservation area

- *TAC concurred in shifting the central corridor northward to avoid taking the rear portions of properties along the north side of Sankey Road. Further, the TAC decided that the existing corridor alignment alternative along Sankey Road in the vicinity of the Sysco property was appropriate. They directed the project team to avoid the Sysco development (south of Sankey) and to work with the Natomas Basin Conservancy regarding mitigation for impacts to their conservation area. Subsequently, a meeting with Sutter Co. and Natomas Basin Conservancy staff determined that the Natomas Basin HCP identifies*

ATTACHMENT E
TAC, SAC, AND PAC COMMENTS/INPUT

mitigation for encroachment into existing preserve areas; this preserve area is disturbed and has not been subject to restoration or enhancement under the HCP. No substantial concerns were raised by Natomas Basin Conservancy staff at the meeting.

- *SAC concurred in shifting the central corridor northward, as described, and in avoiding Sysco and working with Natomas Basin Conservancy. Some SAC members suggested eliminating the Sankey Road connection. Staff explained that since the technical memorandum recommends eliminating the north of Sankey and south of Riego connections, eliminating the Sankey Road connection would leave but one connection to SR 70/99 to be evaluated in the EIS/EIR. Studying more than one alternative connection in the EIS/EIR will provide additional or helpful information to the decision-makers in selecting a connection to SR 70/99.*
- *PAC concurred in shifting the central corridor northward to avoid a part of the Pleasant Grove/Sankey community and the designated conservation area.*

4. Modify the southern corridor alignment:

a. At eastern end, extend it west before descending south, avoiding an historic ranch complex, vernal pool areas, and future Section 4(f) properties in WRSP

- *TAC concurred in adjusting the southern corridor westward to avoid these resources.*
- *SAC generally concurred in this adjustment.*
- *PAC concurred with adjusting the southern corridor westward to avoid resources noted.*

b. At southern edge (parallel to Baseline Road), avoid large man-made waters and one rural residential community by moving corridor north or south

- *TAC requested additional information on the status of the water body to determine if it was considered waters of the US. If determined to be jurisdictional, the TAC requested the project team to explore ways to incorporate some protection of the resource through the required buffer provisions of the project. The TAC also said to eliminate/avoid the 'bulge' – north over the water body – by shifting the entire corridor to the north. (See Other TAC Direction, below, for continuation of discussion.) Subsequent analysis based on 1962 and 1975 aerial photography determined that the water body may have been a seasonal wetland area. Because it appears to be isolated from the*

ATTACHMENT E
TAC, SAC, AND PAC COMMENTS/INPUT

nearest stream by approximately 0.5 mile, however, it may not be a jurisdictional water of the US. The final determination would be made by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

- *SAC concurred in gathering additional information on wetland status of water body and its potential as a mitigation site. Some SAC members recommended that the southern alignment “hug” Baseline Road.*
- *PAC supported moving the alignment paralleling Baseline Road one mile-north of the road and eliminating an alignment close to Baseline Road.*

c. Move corridor closer to Baseline Road to minimize growth inducement

- *See Baseline Road discussion – below.*

5. Work with Sutter and Placer Count staff to identify working farm units; evaluate corridors using this information.

- *TAC supported continued work with Placer and Sutter County agricultural staffs to identify working farms. The farm unit information could be used in the screening process.*
- *SAC members concurred in recommendation to identify working farms and use in screening.*
- *PAC concurred with the recommendation for continued coordination with Placer and Sutter County agricultural staff to identify working farms for use in evaluating alignments (and gathering more conclusive data).*

B. Additional TAC/SAC/PAC Input

Connections to State Routes

The TAC recommended the following, and the SAC and PAC concurred except as noted:

- *Eliminate Sunset Boulevard as a potential connection to SR 65. All alternative corridor termini would be at Whitney Avenue. This direction was based on the Whitney connection having fewer environmental impacts, and TAC’s observation that a full freeway interchange could not be accommodated at Sunset. Any potential connection between SR 65 and the Parkway along Sunset would be via local expressway or arterial that connected to the Parkway at Fiddymment Road or Foothills Boulevard.*

ATTACHMENT E
TAC, SAC, AND PAC COMMENTS/INPUT

- *Eliminate the south of Riego connection at SR 70/99 -- only after discussions with Sacramento and Sacramento County. Sutter County staff recommended its elimination. Issues involve potential growth inducement and an urban separator. One SAC member suggested keeping this connection alternative until policy direction is more definitive, and to have further discussions with Sacramento County and City, and Natomas Basin Conservancy regarding their development buffer objectives in this area and whether they were compatible with a Parkway connection. PAC recommended eliminating this connection (due to potential growth inducing factors) after meeting and assessing it with the City of Sacramento and Sacramento County.*
- *The TAC agreed that direction to eliminate the western portion of the northern corridor alignment alternative (discussed in A above) would eliminate the North of Sankey connection.*

Other TAC Direction

- *Consider an alternate to the revised southern corridor alignment between Phillip Road and Baseline Road. This alternate leg of the alignment would angle cross the study area in a southwesterly direction, rather than in a north/south direction (same as 3a above). No additional SAC input on this item. PAC members felt that this more southwesterly direction for the alignment warrants further study.*
- *Review two scenarios for Baseline Road/corridor separation: 1) a one mile separation between Baseline and the corridor and 2) one with a corridor closer to Baseline. The review was to be based, at least partially, on farm unit impacts. Some SAC members expressed a preference for an alignment closer to Baseline Road. PAC recommended an alignment one mile-north of Baseline Road and eliminating consideration of an alignment closer to Baseline Road.*
- *Coordinate with the Natomas Basin Conservancy regarding how to avoid or mitigate a conflict with designated but undeveloped conservation property on Sankey Road north of the Sysco distribution center (same as 3b above). No additional SAC and PAC input on this item.*
- *Consider future SR70/99 traffic levels and the effect on the number of lanes needed and how far apart to construct bridge abutments. No additional SAC and PAC input on this item.*

ATTACHMENT F

GOALS/POLICY ISSUES

Concerns or skepticism regarding the viability of the No Access and No Development Buffer provisions of the Placer Parkway project were expressed at the first PAC meeting, in scoping letters, and subsequently by Peter Hill representing several stakeholders. It was therefore decided to raise these concerns with the TAC and the SAC, and to ask the PAC to consider this input and provide direction to the project team.

Access Between Fiddymment Rd. and Pleasant Grove Rd.

The TAC's input was not to re-visit or consider any changes to this provision, which identifies that there would be no access in the central segment except for a potential future interchange with a future Watt Avenue extension. The Placer Parkway, with this provision, is in SACOG's MTP. The TAC did acknowledge that the manner in which the provision is phrased is somewhat ambiguous. They suggested revising the statement to make it clearer (i.e., recognizing that the project could include one potential access in the Central Segment, at Watt Avenue if Watt Avenue is extended). Further, the TAC directed the project team to collect information on specific strategies such as conservation/agricultural easements for land in the corridor—along the future transportation facility.

The SAC generally concurred with the TAC about not making changes to this provision. However, additional SAC member comments included whether the "no access" (limited to one potential access at a future Watt Avenue extension) policy would be enforceable, given known and anticipated development; and whether the project could accurately estimate the environmental impacts of future interchanges, should they occur.

The PAC reaffirmed that there would be one potential access point between Fiddymment Road and Pleasant Grove Road. The PAC requested that the project team define growth inducement in the Technical Memorandum and provide additional information to eliminate apparent inconsistencies, and to re-examine the Watt Avenue connection. The project team clarified that any future Watt Avenue extension would not be part of the Placer Parkway project, but that the Parkway project would study a potential future connection with it.

No-Development Buffer

The TAC's input was not to re-visit or consider changing this provision. The Placer Parkway, with this provision, is in SACOG's MTP. The TAC agreed that the buffer size and location was flexible and should be related to performance standards. For example, in areas identified as agricultural but now proceeding

ATTACHMENT F
GOALS/POLICY ISSUES

through a planning process that would result in development, the buffer could potentially be reduced.

The SAC concurred with the TAC recommendations.

The PAC stressed that the idea of the no-development buffer must be reaffirmed in terms of the current development situation. PAC concurred that the buffer size and location should be flexible and related to performance standards, and should maximize opportunities to incorporate adjacent sensitive areas into the buffer. The Parkway should include a component protective of agriculture and it needs to be elastic, i.e., have the ability to expand if necessary.

**ATTACHMENT G
DRAFT CLARIFICATION TO GOALS AND POLICIES**

Table 1 Goals, Policies and Potential Implementation mechanisms for Placer Parkway Conceptual Plan		
Goals	Policies	Potential Implementation Mechanisms
<p>Create a new east-west controlled-access highway between SR 65 and the SR 70/99 to serve Lincoln, Rocklin, and the Sunset Industrial Area, north and west Roseville, western Placer County and South Sutter County as an addition to existing Baseline Road/Riego Road.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify a precise alignment and preserve right-of-way as soon as possible • Carefully evaluate development proposals that might preclude potential alignments while precise alignment is being pursued 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund and initiate a Route Adoption Study. • Limit the study area and alternative alignments for Route Adoption Study. • Request that local jurisdictions adopt policies to carefully evaluate development that might preclude potential alignments.
<p>Maximize mobility and accommodate growth under existing general plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate Placer Parkway as high-speed, very limited access facility • Maintain level of service “C” • Maintain (or improve) travel times between SR 65 and SR 70/99 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow Caltrans freeway standards where possible. • Initially construct four-lane limited access highway but provide adequate right-of-way for expansion to six lanes (or potentially rail modes). • Restrict access in the 7-mile segment between Fiddymont Road and Pleasant Grove Road to one potential connection to a future extension of Watt Avenue or another nearby roadway extension. . Study the impacts of Placer Parkway with and without such a connection. • Allow 1-mile interchange spacing in Sunset and South Sutter County Industrial areas. • Develop a phasing plan for Placer Parkway and other roadway improvements in the region that accommodates planned development and maintains travel times.

ATTACHMENT G
DRAFT CLARIFICATION TO GOALS AND POLICIES

Table 1		
Goals, Policies and Potential Implementation mechanisms for Placer Parkway Conceptual Plan		
Goals	Policies	Potential Implementation Mechanisms
<p>Avoid growth inducement and protect rural character of agriculturally designated areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not allow access in areas currently designated for agricultural uses • Create a no-development buffer zone along Parkway. This buffer zone is to be flexible for agriculturally-designated land undergoing urban development. The buffer zone is to be based on performance standards on a case-by-case basis. The buffer zone should maximize opportunities to incorporate adjacent sensitive areas. • Control signage along corridor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request State legislature to adopt Parkway as State route and have legislation restrict access (i.e., allow only one potential access between Fiddymont Road and Pleasant Grove Blvd at an extension of Watt Avenue or another nearby roadway extension). • Buy agricultural/conservation easements in areas along Parkway to prevent development within the buffer zone. • Enact development guidelines in view corridor to regulate land uses, signage and architecture.
<p>Minimize environmental impacts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid existing homes • Avoid high-value agricultural operations • Avoid streams, creeks, riparian corridors and sensitive habitat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carefully define precise route to minimize impacts. • Consider use of existing right-of-way where possible.
<p>Improve public safety and minimize safety hazards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve emergency response times and evacuation options during natural disasters • Provide high design level to avoid potential safe issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study the tradeoffs between limiting access to Placer Parkway and its ability to improve emergency response times and evacuation options during natural disasters. • Avoid at-grade intersections due to high speeds and projected volumes on the Parkway.
<p>Achieve feasible and equitable financing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require development in areas served by corridor (i.e., Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, Sunset Industrial Area, Placer Vineyards and South Sutter Industrial Area) to finance share of Parkway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require new development to pay for cost of interchanges in urban areas (i.e., in Sunset and South Sutter County Industrial areas). • Expand CIP and fee programs in areas benefiting from the Parkway to help finance its right-of way and construction cost. • Follow State and Federal guidelines for Route Adoption Study in order to preserve the ability to use State and Federal funds for right-of-way

ATTACHMENT G
DRAFT CLARIFICATION TO GOALS AND POLICIES

Table 1		
Goals, Policies and Potential Implementation mechanisms for Placer Parkway Conceptual Plan		
Goals	Policies	Potential Implementation Mechanisms
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and pursue all existing and potential public and private funding sources for planning, design and construction of the Parkway 	acquisition and roadway construction.

Source: DKS Associates, 2000, *Conceptual Plan*.



**PLACER COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING AGENCY**

Meeting Minutes & Action Items

Attachment H

Meeting Description: Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation –Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #3

Meeting Date September 14, 2004

Minutes Date: November 3, 2004 **Location:** City of Roseville Corporate Yard – Rooms #2 and #3 – Hilltop Circle

Persons Attending

Name	Affiliation	Name	Affiliation
Bill Santucci	Placer County Board of Supervisors (District #1)	Scott Gandler	City of Roseville
Robert Weygandt	Placer County Board of Supervisors (District #2)	Jennifer Pereia	Placer County
Tom Cosgrove	City of Lincoln, City Council	Jim Holmes	Candidate for Placer County Board of Supervisors
Gina Garbolino	City of Roseville, City Council	Eric Bryant	Bryant Properties
Jan Christofferson	Placer County Executive Officer	Celia McAdam	PCTPA, Executive Director
Larry Combs	Sutter County, County Administrative Officer	Stan Tidman	PCTPA, Project Manager
Dan Silva	Sutter County Board of Supervisors (District #5)	Denise Heck	URS, Project Manager
Jody Jones	Caltrans District 3	Garry Horton	URS, Traffic Manager
Sam A Okhadi	SACOG	Fritts Golden	URS, Environmental Manager
Cathy Chapin	Caltrans District 3	John Long	DKS, Traffic Manager
Loren Clark	Placer Legacy	Daniel Iacofano	MIG, Inc., Public Outreach
Yushuo Chang	Placer County APCD	Sharon Kyle	MIG, Inc., Public Outreach
Rick Dondro	Placer County DPW		

Minutes

Purpose

To review and obtain feedback and direction on the four potential alternatives being considered for the Tier 1 EIS/EIR; to approve changes in previously discussed goal/policy clarifications; and to update coordination efforts with several other concurrent planning processes.

1. Introductions

Daniel Iacofano (MIG) noted that the meeting would focus on bringing the PAC up to date regarding project progress, including corridor alternatives and Tier 1 EIS/EIR efforts. He reviewed the meeting agenda and emphasized the importance of PAC member feedback on all items, particularly about the potential corridor alignment alternatives.

2. Progress on Phase 1 – Defining Alternatives for Study in Tier 1 EIS/EIR (Information/Feedback Item)

Stan Tidman (PCTPA Project Manager) briefly oriented attendees to the project area map, and provided background on study boundaries and the west/central/east segments.

Placer Parkway – The Concept

S. Tidman reviewed the corridor concept, explaining that the Placer Parkway was designed to be a regional facility connecting State Route 65 and State Route 70/99. Sunset Boulevard West and Howsley Road bound the project area on

the north and Baseline Road and Riego Road on the south. He noted that earlier planning documents for the Parkway include a ‘Conceptual Plan’ and ‘Project Study Report’.

Project Goals

S. Tidman explained that the earlier planning documents formed the basis for conceptual alignments, preliminary engineering/cost estimates, funding strategies, and six goals for the Parkway. The goals are:

1. Controlled access highway
2. Maximize mobility and accommodate planned growth
3. Avoid growth inducement/protect rural character
4. Minimize environmental impacts
5. Improve safety/minimize hazards
6. Feasible and equitable funding

He noted that at PAC meetings in September 2003 and March 2004, the second and third goals were discussed at length. The focus on these particular goals related to concerns about access in the central segment, planned development, and community-specific impacts.

Design and Construction

S. Tidman reiterated that the current estimated construction costs for the Parkway range from \$200 million to \$300 million (2000 dollars). Construction funding is anticipated in approximately 2015.

Purpose and Need

He next discussed the project’s purpose and need statement, which is driven by current and projected rapid residential and employment growth in Placer and Sutter counties. These would yield significant transportation problems. The project solution would be to preserve a corridor for a future facility (to reduce congestion on local roads and accommodate planned employment growth).

Corridor Preservation

In light of the rapid growth occurring and projected in the region, and to ensure long-term mobility in the region, S. Tidman reiterated the importance of preserving a corridor for development of a future Parkway. The corridor would vary in width. It would be 500 feet wide in the east and west segments and 1,000 feet wide in the central segment. The primary objectives in this phase of the project are to identify corridor alternatives and complete the environmental review process. A tiered EIS/EIR approach is being used because it focuses on broad issues appropriate to the scale of the study and to the objective of this phase -- to preserve a corridor. The document also will include impact mitigation strategies. The design and construction of the Parkway would be reviewed in a Tier 2 document at a future date. He stated that based on the project’s current schedule the Tier 1 EIS/EIR should be completed between 2006 and 2007.

Issues

S. Tidman noted the several recurring project issues:

- *Location of Corridor Alignment Alternatives*—Identification of potential corridor alignment alternatives to be considered in the Tier 1 EIS/EIR
- *Tier 1 Environmental Review*—Complex process designed to move the project process forward more expeditiously (continued project team coordination with associated project stakeholders, FHWA/Caltrans in particular)
- *Resource Agency Coordination*—Additional project step added to support the final project alignment decision process (through agency concurrence regarding the Least Environmental Damaging Practicable Alternative-LEDPA)
- *Pending and Anticipated Urban Development*—Issues (ongoing and emerging) related to timing and overlapping planning processes in various jurisdictions

(a) Potential Corridor Alignment Alternatives

S. Tidman outlined the screening process used to identify the four potential corridor alignment alternatives. This work began with the concept alignments from the 2001 Project Study Report (PSR). He noted that the project team evaluated these PSR conceptual alternatives using a transportation, engineering, and environmental screening process designed to detect major issues and fatal flaws. The results of the initial screening were described in a Technical Memorandum (January 2004). The Technical Memorandum also included several recommendations regarding the PSR concept alignments with respect to avoiding or minimizing impacts to resources and communities.

The alternatives refinement process took into consideration additional information provided by the advisory committees, as well as public meeting and NOI/NOP comments. He stated that the project team initiated a second round of the screening for the refined alignment alternatives. Through this refinement process and in meetings with the advisory committees and coordination with various city and county contacts, the project team identified additional potential corridor alignments for further evaluation, which resulted in identification of four potential alignment alternatives for Tier 1 EIS/EIR analysis.

S. Tidman illustrated the screening process by comparing the PSR concept alignments with the four potential corridor alignment alternatives. He used the following environmental issues/existing conditions criteria to make the comparison:

- Vernal pool complexes
- Riparian, wetland & conservation areas
- Socioeconomic resources (existing homes, businesses, farm buildings)
- Floodplains
- Working farm units/Power lines

These examples illustrated how resource avoidance led to the four potential corridor alignment alternatives.

Thematic Finding from Public Meetings

D. Iacofano reported on the August public meetings held in Placer County (Roseville) and Sutter County (Pleasant Grove). He explained that the purpose of the meetings was to review potential corridor alignment alternatives being considered for evaluation as part of the Tier 1 EIS/EIR, and to obtain feedback from interested stakeholders.

At the Roseville meeting, key public meeting comments were:

- *Explain the evaluation process that will determine the final alignment.*
- *Provide more detailed rationale for the “buffer areas” and what will happen to properties adjoining these areas.*
- *Provide an explanation about the land appraisal process and project timing related to appraisals.*
- *Ensure that property owners are justly compensated for their land.*
- *Indicate how the project timing relates to appraisals.*
- *Indicate how far outside the project study area impacts will be assessed.*

D. Iacofano reported that there was a great interest in impacts to property values, and the process in place to ensure fair compensation for land acquired by the project. Community members wanted to ensure that the project evaluation process was fair and complete. He noted that several people expressed concern about trade-offs between “people and species”. An example of this expressed by community members was with regard to the status of working farms versus the value of biological resources (such as vernal pools and various species).

At the Pleasant Grove meeting, key public comments were:

- *Determine how traffic impacts generated by Placer County can be mitigated without negatively impacting Sutter County.*
- *Ensure that property owners play a role as major stakeholders in the project planning process.*
- *Clarify the status of parcels affected by the alignment alternatives, and how the project will determine fair market value for properties acquired.*
- *Maintain the integrity of farmlands and farm operations.*
- *Ensure the project doesn't negatively impact the quality of life in this community.*

D. Iacofano reported that people at the Sutter County meeting expressed concerns about the potential for proportionately larger project impacts to the Pleasant Grove community due to its being relatively more geographically isolated, and the perception that Sutter County would bear the burden of negative project impacts. He noted that the community also voiced frustration that, as they perceived it, traffic impacts from Placer County would be shifted to Sutter County. D. Iacofano added that community members stressed the importance of their becoming more actively involved in planning discussions as key stakeholders. Impacts to their general quality of life were a significant concern.

Discussion:

Gina Garbolino (City of Roseville) inquired why the North of Riego Road to South of De La Salle (diagonal) alignment went through the De La Salle property. Her concern was about potential negative impacts to De La Salle University and village concept being planned at this location.

S. Tidman responded that the topic of adjusting this alignment was discussed at length with the PAC (and other advisory committees). All parties agreed to the need to find a more direct (diagonal) route. This diagonal alignment is viable because it avoids many environmental resources in the area (e.g., vernal pools, conservation areas). This one would remain a viable choice unless there was a good reason to eliminate it.

Denise Heck (URS) added that it was clear that the more direct alignment would go through a prospective project area. It was noted that no construction has taken place and the project hasn't been formally approved or permitted (it is currently in the pre-application process).

Bill Santucci (Placer County Board of Supervisors) asked who would make the final decision regarding the status of this particular alignment as an alternative. D. Heck responded that PCTPA, the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA), and the Federal Highway Authority (FHWA) ultimately make the decision. The project needs to identify the Least Environmental Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) to satisfy future permitting requirements. She noted that, therefore, the project could not make a decision to eliminate a potential alignment that may include the LEDPA solely based on a development project that hasn't been approved or permitted.

G. Garbolino asked what would happen once the final alignment choice(s) had been concluded. She wondered if the project team would send the regulatory agencies one preferred alignment or four choices. D. Heck said the objective of the Tier 1 process was to identify one final corridor for preservation. She emphasized that the project still needed more input from PAC members, as well as continued coordination with Sutter County, Placer County, and resource agencies regarding the evaluation process. The project team needed to develop a choice of potential alternatives that would be considered seriously by the resource agencies. She added that presenting choices that wouldn't stand up to agency evaluation didn't make sense strategically for the project.

Robert Weygandt (Placer County Board of Supervisors) asked Jody Jones (Caltrans) how much power agencies had in determining or changing alignments. He stressed the importance of the Parkway project staying on schedule with its activities.

J. Jones noted that resource agencies do not necessarily care about what alternatives are presented to them. For a Willits project, Caltrans was directed to an alternative that was not even being considered. She added that the agencies do care that a particular alternative meets the LEDPA standards. They are very stringent about this process. The resource

agencies are more likely to develop their own alignment variation if they are not provided a thoroughly supported array to evaluate.

T. Cosgrove asked if the resource agencies made the final decision (about the alignment) what was the point of all the evaluation and array of choices the project team developed for consideration. D. Iacofano said that the project team was displaying detailed information (for the resource agencies) upon which further analysis could proceed. D. Heick noted that the project team was working with resource agencies to head off any issues based on lack of full disclosure of information. She said the project team hoped that early agency coordination in Tier 1 would lead to a suite of corridor alternatives from which to choose a preferred alternative.

G. Garbolino asked if the resource agencies knew about the corridor alignment alternative choices developed by the project team thus far. D. Heick answered yes, these are a matter of public information.

T. Cosgrove said that the resource agencies' role strengthened his belief that the De La Salle University project should be built as soon as possible. B. Santucci agreed, saying the Placer County had invested a great deal of effort on behalf of the university project (and that should be taken into consideration even if it is not yet 'on the books').

Celia McAdam (PCTPA Executive Director) added that her experience working on the Lincoln Bypass project enlightened her about the complexities of getting agency support for projects. She noted that even with compelling evidence that a project wouldn't cause major impacts, the permitting process was grueling. C. McAdam stressed the importance of early agency coordination and involvement in the alternatives assessment process (to increase the likelihood of agency support of the final alignment alternative during Tier 2).

R. Weygandt asked if the project team had been coordinating with county planning and conservation resource agencies regarding De La Salle University. He noted that the PCTPA project's final alignment won't be identified for at least one year, and stressed the importance of the PCTPA project staying on schedule so that the university planning efforts would not be negatively impacted. D. Heick responded that there had been ongoing coordination with the county planning department and with Placer Legacy (related to various areas within its Habitat Conservation Plan area) to assist with designing alignments that separate development from conservation areas. She added that this is an ongoing process.

T. Cosgrove felt that there needed to be some policy level discussion regarding project need and purpose in light of current planning efforts (to address whether some alignments such as the 'diagonal' one adequately served the purpose and need). D. Heick noted that the wording of the P/N was being discussed with the resource agencies, but was based on the project's own goals and policies. The question of what was regarded as 'development' was in flux. The distinction is made between what is currently planned (and approved) and what is 'future' development. With regard to whether there would be a preferred alternative, the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR might not indicate a preferred alternative, but the team would wait until the Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR to indicate a preferred alternative (when more information and public input is available).

B. Santucci asked what the difference was between the data gathering process related to planned development, and approved projects. D. Heick reiterated that the Parkway project acknowledged both existing general planning efforts, and potential future projects, but that potential projects could not be considered as having the same status as existing projects or areas currently planned for development. C. McAdam said that project must be mindful of not assuming any future decisions related to planning efforts. She added that PCTPA (and the project) couldn't presume any decision of the Board of Supervisors on any project.

Larry Combs (Sutter County Administrative Officer) said that he didn't have any major changes in perspective. He noted that the North of Riego Road alternative might not be acceptable if it affected the opportunity for developing an interchange at SR 70/99 and Riego Road itself. B. Santucci inquired as to the reasoning behind the spacing between the North of Riego alignment and Riego Road. D. Heick said the current location was based on direction from Caltrans with

regard to safety issues (associated with less than one mile weaving distance between Sankey Road and the earlier location of the North of Riego interchange). The alignment was moved south to provide the necessary distance between a North of Riego interchange and a Sankey Road interchange, and the design concept provides for braided ramps at a future Riego/70/99 interchange. This would change how SR 70/99, the Parkway, and Riego Road relate to each other with regard to access.

T. Cosgrove stated that in many ways the alignment alternatives look very similar, with variations. He added that it was his understanding that the alignment alternatives were to provide very distinct choices. He said he didn't feel there was a problem with the number of choices, he just noted little difference between how they were configured in the study area. D. Iacofano asked if the PAC had a problem with the array of alternatives overall.

The PAC answered that they were generally satisfied with the choice of alignment alternatives.

D. Heick noted that the project team's job was to document the process used to narrow the study area, and then work to get the alternatives defined, based on eliminating those that had problems associated with them. She added that as the project moved forward the team would provide detailed explanations regarding why certain alignments were included and why others were rejected. A technical memo may be needed to document this process in detail.

D. Silva asked whether a Sunset Boulevard West - Howsley Road alignment was considered. John Long (DKS) said initially there was such a corridor. The conceptual plan established the north project boundary. He noted that the project team couldn't take a corridor alignment too far north because of vernal pool impacts and problems connecting it with SR 65. Anything that far north also greatly reduced the Parkway's traffic benefit. D. Silva added that people traveling towards Yuba City have indicated that this would be the most direct way to get to Roseville.

R. Weygandt acknowledged the rationale behind the screening and refinement process, and the necessity for agency support (for both the methodology and alignment choices). He noted the importance of the project team coordinating closely with county planning officials. D. Heick responded that the project team has been involved in ongoing coordination efforts with Placer Legacy, County planning staffs, and local developers. Lines of communication are good.

L. Combs asked what agency representatives the project team consulted with regarding the decision about an earlier proposed southern alignment into northern Sacramento County. D. Heick said that in discussions with all the advisory committees, they supported dropping this alignment, but deferred to City and County of Sacramento planning representatives. The team met jointly with representatives from both jurisdictions who concurred with dropping this potential alternative.

(b) Next Steps

S. Tidman reviewed the project activities needed to move forward with the alternative selection process:

- Complete Alternatives Identification
- Account for Scheduling Considerations. The Modified NEPA/404 Process is slowing the process. The project team is aware that project delay will affect Placer County's work to process the proposed university specific plans. The Project Development Team would be consulted to discuss ways to stay on schedule and to continue resource agency coordination. He also noted that an upcoming Sutter County advisory ballot measure could affect the current general plan, potentially resulting in some residential use in commercial/industrial designated areas. This may affect project roadway components, alignment configurations, and connections to SR 70/99. The project team will be meeting with Sutter County Department of Public Works representatives and developers to discuss the implications of the ballot measure.
- Begin Tier 1 EIS/EIR
- Continue Public Outreach Process

3. Goals and Policy Clarifications (Action Item)

C. McAdam reminded the meeting participants that the project team addressed the topic of goals and policy clarification at the last PAC meeting (March 2004). Direction to clarify the wording of some goals and policies was provided at this earlier PAC meeting. Most were provided to the PAC in a May 17 Staff Report and again (with one addition) in the Staff Report for this meeting. No comments were received on either version of these clarifications. C. McAdam reviewed the clarifications and asked the PAC to provide confirmation/consensus on them.

- **Goal 2: Maximize mobility and accommodate growth under existing general plans**

1. Revise the third “Potential Implementation Mechanism:”

~~Do not allow Restrict~~ access in the 7-mile segment between Fiddymont Road and Pleasant Grove Road to one potential connection to a future extension of Watt Avenue or another nearby roadway extension. ~~but study the impacts of access at a Watt Avenue extension.~~ Study the impacts of Placer Parkway with and without such a connection.

- **Goal 3: Avoid growth inducement and protect rural character of agriculturally designated areas**

1. Revise the second Policy:

Create a no-development buffer zone along Parkway. This buffer zone is to be flexible for agriculturally-designated land undergoing urban development. The buffer zone is to be based on performance standards on a case-by-case basis. The buffer zone should maximize opportunities to incorporate adjacent sensitive areas.

2. Revise the first “Potential Implementation Mechanism:”

Request State legislature to adopt Parkway as State route and have legislation restrict access (i.e., allow only one potential access between Fiddymont Road and Pleasant Grove Blvd ~~except~~ at an extension of Watt Avenue or another nearby roadway extension).

3. Revise the second Potential Implementation Mechanism:

Buy agricultural/conservation easements in areas along Parkway to prevent development within the buffer zone.

T. Cosgrove asked for clarification regarding the reference to “existing general plans”. D. Heick responded that “existing general plans” referred to Board of Supervisors approved plans only. C. McAdam noted that the project team was aware of the nuances regarding the various planning efforts underway in Placer and Sutter counties, and continued to work with the respective jurisdictions and various developer representatives.

D. Silva expressed a concern about local road continuity across the Parkway and how this might affect emergency services. Several project team members responded that this topic had also been noted by several stakeholders, and that the project would restore local access. This would be evaluated in detail in Tier 2.

4. Multiple Concurrent Planning Processes (Information Item)

S. Tidman cited ten different planning or development projects in or just outside of the corridor preservation's project area. Each had different issues, processes, and schedules. Most of these reviews and their accompanying environmental work would be done before the corridor preservation's Tier 1 EIS/EIR. He said there appeared to be a lot of confusion about how the Parkway project 'fit' with these as well as how they were being coordinated among several jurisdictions. He reported that the project team continued to meet with representatives for De La Salle University and Community, Placer Ranch, and local jurisdictions including Public Works departments to sort out various land use planning issues. He noted that the project team also met with SACOG (re. its Blueprint planning process and to review their vision of the Parkway project). S. Tidman noted at that meeting the intention to follow the Parkway project's stated goals and policies (as adopted by the SPRTA and SACOG boards) and to work through environmental permitting considerations. A 'Main Street' concept with multiple access in the central segment was not compatible with Parkway goals and policies. It was acknowledged that some local plans might not mesh with the more regional perspective SACOG takes. There was agreement between the project team and SACOG that the Blueprint's land use scenario and supporting transportation policies being put forward would mirror the Parkway project's goals and policies.

S. Tidman added that the project would continue its coordination efforts, with the primary focus being the development of a reasonable range of alternatives to satisfy federal requirements.

T. Cosgrove noted that many resource agencies had a very 'linear' review process that can prove time consuming. He suggested that the project team get all the resource agencies in a room at one time work through outstanding issues. C. McAdam shared that EPA and COE were meeting with the project team in the Modified NEPA/404 process. However, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) had not been responsive to invitations, attending no NEPA/404 meetings to date. C. McAdam added that it was virtually impossible to convene all parties at once to discuss issues, and that resource agencies have their own way of working through their review processes. There is no guarantee as to what an 'agreement' would mean, as agencies sometimes change their minds later.

5. Conclusions and Next Steps

D. Heick noted that this would probably be the last general PAC meeting for this year—unless the PAC indicated a need to meet again. The Tier 1 EIS/EIR process may be initiated before the next PAC meeting. She stated that the project team would remain in contact with the PAC membership through email.

Rick Dondro, Placer County Public Works, asked if FHWA and the SPRTA Board would make final corridor alignment choices. D. Heick confirmed that this was the process, with input from Sutter County, Placer County, and resource agencies. She cautioned the PAC about not prematurely eliminating an alignment based on future planning decisions, as the resource agencies were interested in identifying a LEDPA, which could traverse potential future projects.

T. Cosgrove asked everyone to remember to temper final alignment recommendations, and not be influenced by uncertain future planning decisions. Also, to be aware that issues extended beyond only the environment. B. Santucci said that if the current project focus was to evaluate the range of alternatives, he could support where the project was in that process. There is a need to take into account all the pluses and minuses in the characteristics of each alternative.



City of Lincoln • City of Rocklin • City of Roseville • Placer County

TO: Board of Directors

DATE: November 22, 2004

FROM: Celia McAdam, Executive Director

SUBJECT: APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR 2005

ACTION REQUESTED

Select Boardmembers to act as Chair and Vice Chair for 2005.

DISCUSSION

Subsection c.(1) of Section 7 of the Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement among the Authority's member entities provides that a Chairperson shall be elected from among the membership of the Board to preside over the meetings of the Board.

CM:ss