



A G E N D A

Wednesday, February 25, 2009
10:45 am

Board of Supervisors Chambers
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, California 95603

- A. Roll Call**
- B. Approval of Minutes:** **Action**
1. December 4, 2008 Pg. 1
2. December 23, 2008 Pg. 3
- C. Agenda Review**
- D. Public Comment**
- E. Consent Calendar** **Action**
These items are expected to be routine and non controversial. Pg. 6
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. Acceptance of Financial Audit
- F. PUBLIC HEARING: Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation** **Action**
Partially Revised Draft Tier 1 Environmental Impact Pg. 7
Statement/Environmental Impact Report (PRD Tier 1 EIS/EIR)
- G. Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Tier 1 Environmental** **Action**
Process: Next Steps Pg. 8
- H. Executive Director's Report**
- I. Board Direction to Staff**
- J. Informational Items** **Info**
1. Technical Advisory Committee Minutes:
a. January 13, 2009 Pg. 10
b. February 10, 2009 Pg. 12

Board of Directors Meeting Agenda
SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
February 25, 2009
Page 2

2. Status Report: Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Project & Tier 1 EIS/EIR Pg. 14
3. Quarterly Financial Statement (under separate cover)

**SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
MINUTES
DECEMBER 4, 2008**

The South Placer Regional Transportation Authority met on Thursday, December 4, 2008 at 11:30 a.m. at the Placer County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 175 Fulweiler Avenue, Auburn, California.

ATTENDANCE: Peter Hill Celia McAdam
 Primo Santini Shirley LeBlanc
 Kirk Uhler Sue Sholtis
 Stan Tidman

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon motion by Santini and second by Hill, the Board unanimously approved the minutes of the October 9, 2008 meeting as submitted.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

SELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR 2009

Celia McAdam noted that pursuant to the rotation schedule previously designated by the Board, the representative from Placer County would become Chair for 2009 and the representative from the City of Lincoln would become Vice Chair.

Upon motion by Hill and second by Santini, the Board unanimously designated the representative from Placer County to act as Chair and the representative from the City of Lincoln to act as Vice Chair for 2009.

**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AND AIR QUALITY MITIGATION FEE
ALLOCATION REQUEST FOR LINCOLN BYPASS**

Celia McAdam stated this item will be deferred until the next Board meeting since allocation requests require four affirmative votes and there are only three Board members present.

**STATUS REPORT: PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION PROJECT &
TIER 1 EIS/EIR**

Celia McAdam reported we have come to a bit of an impasse in putting together the Tier 1 document and elevation process. We have made significant strides to gain the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) agreement with the regulatory agencies.

SACOG consultant Stacey McKinley arranged a meeting with Chip Smith from the United States Army Corps of Engineers, who was persuaded by our evidence that Alternative 5 is the LEDPA. Another meeting has been scheduled for December 16 in Washington, DC which Celia and Stan Tidman will attend. This meeting brings in the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and United States Fish & Wildlife Service.

Staff hopes to obtain a similar reaction from these agencies in DC who will then instruct district staff to sign off on Alternative 5 as the LEDPA. McAdam hopes we will have a LEDPA by our next Board meeting.

Kirk Uhler stated how impressed he was by Stan Tidman's ability to answer every question posed to him which led to the quick scheduling of this meeting. Hopefully the Tier 2 process will be in the near future.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

None.

Kirk Uhler inquired when the City of Lincoln will take action on appointing a new representative to the SPRTA Board. Primo Santini replied the Council will take action in January.

Meeting adjourned at 11:52 a.m.

Celia McAdam
Executive Director

Kirk Uhler, Chair

**SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
MINUTES
DECEMBER 23, 2008**

The South Placer Regional Transportation Authority met on Tuesday, December 23, 2008 at 2:00 p.m. at the Placer County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 175 Fulweiler Avenue, Auburn, California.

ATTENDANCE: Tom Cosgrove Celia McAdam
 Jim Gray Sue Sholtis
 Peter Hill Stan Tidman
 Kirk Uhler

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

AMENDMENT TO COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT FOR REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AND AIR QUALITY MITIGATION FEE CONTRIBUTION TO THE LINCOLN BYPASS

Celia McAdam stated this item was the key reason for this emergency meeting to consider Caltrans' request to amend the Cooperative Agreement for the Lincoln Bypass project to cover construction payments suspended due to the lack of a balanced state budget. McAdam stated this project could be shut down at any time due to lack of cash flow to pay contractor billings.

McAdam outlined the various funding sources for the Lincoln Bypass project, including State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Proposition 1B Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) funds and SPRTA regional fees. McAdam explained the Pooled Money Investment Board has voted to stop paying bills for bond-funded projects including the I-80 Bottleneck and Lincoln Bypass projects. Fortunately I-80 Phase 2 project funding can continue payments using federal earmark funds. We will go out to bid on Phase 3 and hopefully by the time the contract is awarded in April or May of 2009, the state budget will have passed and funding issues will have been resolved.

The Lincoln Bypass funding comes from state coffers and allocations are funded through bond funds. Without an infusion of local cash or a special exemption from the Department of Finance, which efforts have thus far been unsuccessful in this regard, we will have to shut down the Lincoln Bypass project. SPRTA can briefly fund the project with Board approval to advance about \$8M which is not yet committed to other projects. Caltrans has estimated that amount would keep the project going for about two more months. McAdam noted, however, that fees and revenues are down due to decline in development. Further, other allocations are forthcoming for projects such as the Sierra College Boulevard widening.

Although the SPRTA Board has always been proactive and aggressive with their efforts in keeping projects going and willing to take risks, staff recommends not amending the Coop Agreement. McAdam feels it is not a prudent idea to grant what amounts to a

bridge loan because, even if we funded the project for 60 days, there is no guarantee the state would pick up the tab after that and the project shut down anyway. Caltrans is committed to keeping this project going but we are at the mercy of the state.

Jim Gray asked what the consequences would be if we chose not to cover construction payments for this project. McAdam responded the project will be shut down within a short amount of time and we will incur demobilization costs to close down the project. The state needs to pass the budget as well as sell bonds before they are in a position to continue funding. We are looking at \$10M in additional costs and an additional year for construction as a result of shutting the project down.

Tom Cosgrove stated how ironic it was for him to be serving as an alternate at this meeting, voting on whether to stop work on the Lincoln Bypass project, after all his efforts on behalf of the Lincoln Bypass as well as his efforts in creating SPRTA. Cosgrove stated the latest events with the State are unbelievable. Cosgrove recommends following staff's recommendation not to fund continued work on the Lincoln Bypass.

Upon motion by Cosgrove and second by Hill, the Board unanimously denied the request from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to amend the Cooperative Agreement for the Lincoln Bypass to advance Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee contributions to cover construction payments suspended due to the lack of a balanced state budget.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AND AIR QUALITY MITIGATION FEE ALLOCATION REQUEST FOR LINCOLN BYPASS

Celia McAdam noted this item was deferred from our December 4 meeting due to a lack of quorum. Staff recommends allocating \$109,000 of Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation fees to the City of Lincoln for reimbursement for mainline design preconstruction work.

Upon motion by Hill and second by Gray, the Board unanimously adopted Resolution #08-05 allocating \$109,000 of Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fees to the City of Lincoln for mainline design associated with the Ferrari Ranch Road Interchange as part of the Lincoln Bypass.

STATUS REPORT: PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION PROJECT & TIER 1 EIS/EIR

Stan Tidman reported on the December 16 LEDPA concurrence meeting in Washington, D.C. for the Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Project. Tidman noted the conclusions from this meeting included sharing information with headquarters-based staff from the Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Protection Agency and US Fish and Wildlife Service; the Fish and Wildlife Service reinserting themselves into the process; and we are continuing to work on setting up the formal elevation meeting to resolve the LEDPA concurrence dispute.

Celia McAdam added we are looking at both January 23 and January 28 as potential meeting dates for this elevation meeting and as a result we may request that the January 28 PCTPA and SPRTA Board meetings be rescheduled. The Board concurred with this request.

Kirk Uhler noted the Washington, D.C. meeting was a bit frustrating in that meeting participants engage in “a game you have to play that you pretend that you don’t know what their real agenda is”. Uhler stated that some good came out of the meeting in that the message is clear that the Washington folks are looking at the local folks to get this issue resolved. Uhler recommended moving forward with the project even without LEDPA concurrence.

Tom Cosgrove, who also attended the meeting, stated he was surprised by the look on the EPA representative’s face when Cosgrove mentioned our involvement in regional planning. They have a different mindset and approach with a disregard of local planning efforts.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

None.

Meeting adjourned at 2:28 p.m.

Celia McAdam
Executive Director

Kirk Uhler, Chair



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

TO: Board of Directors

DATE: February 10, 2009

FROM: Celia McAdam, Executive Director

SUBJECT: CONSENT CALENDAR

Below is the Consent Calendar item for the February 25, 2009 agenda for your review and action.

1. Acceptance of Financial Audit
Accept the 2007/08 annual audit of the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority. (Audit under separate cover.)



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

TO: Board of Directors

DATE: February 10, 2009

FROM: Stan Tidman, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: PUBLIC HEARING: PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION PARTIALLY REVISED DRAFT TIER 1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (PRD TIER 1 EIS/EIR)

Action Requested

Conduct a public hearing to obtain public input on the Partially Revised Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR for the Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Project.

Background

On February 27, 2008, the SPRTA Board conducted a workshop in response to several comments about how the project's access and 'no-development' buffer components were referred to in the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR, which was released in June 2007. These components would limit access (no new interchanges) between Pleasant Grove Road and Fiddymont Road as well as create a no-development buffer along the future roadway. The comments identified concerns that in the future, new proposals by others might result in additional interchanges, or reduce/eliminate the no-development buffer, resulting in potentially more growth inducement.

On March 26, 2008, the SPRTA Board directed the staff to prepare an analysis of these hypothetical future actions as a Partially Revised Draft (PRD) Tier 1 environmental document and circulate for public comment. The board felt that this approach would provide a fuller disclosure of potential future impacts and would provide a stronger foundation for later Tier 2 (construction-level) environmental work, which will analyze the impacts of roadway alignments within the selected corridor.

Discussion

The purpose of the public hearing is to receive comments on the Partially Revised Draft (PRD). While the staff will provide a brief overview of the PRD Tier 1 EIS/EIR as background, neither the Board nor the staff can respond to public questions and comments at the hearing itself.

Once the public comment period closes, responses to PRD comments as well as the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR comments will be prepared for the Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR. This is still scheduled for a summer 2009 release.



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

TO: Board of Directors

DATE: February 12, 2009

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

**SUBJECT: PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION TIER 1
ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS: NEXT STEPS**

Action Requested

Authorize the Executive Director to take the following actions related to the proposed project's Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) and the modified National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) Section 404 process:

1. Conclude work on the Tier 1 EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) independently of the federal NEPA (EIS) process.
2. Continue to work with the regulatory agencies to resolve the current stalemate over the corridor most likely to contain the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) in a timely and cost-effective fashion.
3. Organize and attend a followup meeting in Washington, D.C. with headquarters-level regulatory agency staff to resolve the LEDPA concurrence dispute.

Background

In 2003, work began to identify corridor alignment alternatives for the Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Project's Tier 1 EIS/EIR. An underlying project planning goal was to avoid or minimize effects to biological resources, particularly to aquatic species and habitats. After an extensive technical and public outreach program, the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR was released for public comment in June 2007 and public hearings in August 2007. At Board direction, a Partially Revised Draft (PRD) Tier 1 EIS/EIR was released, last month, to address concerns about the certainty of project's access and no-development buffer. The comment period closes in mid-March. The Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR is on schedule for release in summer 2009.

Later in 2003, a parallel process began with the federal regulatory agencies, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and others. This early consultation resulted in agreement to complete a modified NEPA/404 process, with a goal of ensuring that Tier 1 decisions reflect careful consideration of the Clean Water Act guidelines to eliminate the need to re-visit Tier 1 decisions during the later Tier 2 (construction-level) permitting process.

Board of Directors
PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION – TIER 1 EIS/EIR &
MODIFIED NEPA/404 PROCESS
February, 2009
Page 2

The modified NEPA/404 process stalled in August 2008 after the ACOE and EPA did not concur with a June 2008 concurrence request that Alternative #5 was the corridor most likely to contain the LEDPA.

The regulatory agencies believe it is Alternative #1, the southernmost alignment. Two meetings, with higher-level management staff, have not resolved the dispute. A summary of the most recent meeting, held January 23, is shown in the Placer Parkway Status Report under Agenda Item #J.

Discussion

SPRTA has gone far above and beyond the requirements for a Tier 1 environmental document, and done everything that the regulatory agencies have said would be needed for a LEDPA. At every turn, we have presented consistent and supportable data that supports Alternative #5 as the LEDPA. The regulatory agencies feel it is Alternative #1, yet offer no substantive data to support their selection.

This dilemma affects our ability to complete the Final EIS/EIR for release in summer 2009. Specifically, the FHWA cannot complete its clearance of the Final EIS, via a Record of Decision, without LEDPA concurrence from the regulatory agencies.

Up until now, the state environmental review process has been coordinated with the FHWA and the NEPA process. However, the SPRTA Board, as the lead agency, can act to independently conclude the state CEQA process, with or without a federal Final EIS clearance. With the concurrence of the transportation agencies and local jurisdictions, staff therefore recommends we resolve this dilemma by completing the CEQA process separately.

Staff requests the Board authorize the Executive Director to complete the Final EIR under CEQA for a summer 2009 release and to continue work with the regulatory agencies for LEDPA concurrence to sign off on the EIS. This continued work may require meetings with headquarters-level regulatory staff in Washington DC to resolve the LEDPA concurrence dispute.

SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
January 13, 2009

ATTENDANCE: Leo Rubio, City of Lincoln
 Bob Blaser, Placer County Public Works
 Andrew Gaber, Placer County Public Works
 Ken Grehm, Placer County Public Works
 Larry Wing, City of Rocklin
 Scott Gandler, City of Roseville
 Mike Wixon, City of Roseville

Luke McNeel-Caird, Fehr & Peers

Celia McAdam, PCTPA
Scott Aaron, PCTPA
Sue Sholtis, PCTPA
Stan Tidman, PCTPA

Comprehensive Update to Regional Transportation and Air Quality Developer Impact Fee Program

Celia McAdam reported this was the kick-off for the latest comprehensive fee update. McAdam introduced Luke McNeel-Caird from Fehr & Peers who will be working with Sarah Brandenburg on performing the update.

McNeel-Caird provided a technical memorandum to SPRTA TAC members which provided the land use data that will be used as an input to the analysis. There was a discussion regarding which model to use for the fee update. There was TAC consensus to use the 2025 model for this update.

Scott Gandler stated that due to the economic climate and development slowing down he felt only projects that had been approved should be included in the update. Past updates have only included approved projects as well. A discussion ensued regarding adding projects. McAdam suggested adding money to the fee program as new growth areas came online.

Bob Blaser stated he saw some value in widening the list of projects. There is value in having that shown versus generating a new list. McAdam mentioned we can see what we can get by adding new units without radical changes to the dollar amounts. McNeel-Caird stated a flat fee was used prior to the 2007 fee update.

McNeel-Caird asked TAC members to review the technical memo and respond with input on the land use assumptions by January 30. After input is received from TAC members, McNeel-Caird will come back at the February 10 TAC meeting with a final land use basis to be considered by the TAC for the update. McNeel-Caird offered to meet with each jurisdiction individually to review land use assumptions if necessary.

Update on State Budget/Proposition 1B Impacts to SPRTA Projects

Celia McAdam provided TAC members an update on the State budget. The State is running out of cash to pay contractors for work performed on projects. Since Phase 2 of the I-80 Bottleneck project came in under estimate and most of the funding for that project is from federal dollars, that project will remain under construction. The challenge will be with Phase 3 of that project. Phase 3 is going to bid but the contract won't be awarded until the State budget situation has been resolved.

McAdam stated the Lincoln Bypass project is a different story. The Bypass is funded mostly with bond dollars and very little federal dollars. The contractor on this project has been paid for work done through December 20. Payment for work completed through January 20 is due February 3. The contractor will stop work at that point if not paid.

Caltrans asked SPRTA to front money to keep the Bypass project going. SPRTA conducted a special Board meeting in December and the Board decided not to front the money for the project. McAdam asked TAC for their opinion on fronting money for the Lincoln Bypass project. McAdam stated if the project stops it could cost an additional \$10M for mobilization and demobilization and cause a delay of 12 to 18 months. It was TAC consensus not to fix the State's issues and not to front the money for the Bypass project. McAdam clarified we would not be lending money to Caltrans, we would be accelerating funding.

Tier II MOA Status

Celia McAdam reported the Tier II MOA has been approved by Placer County and the City of Rocklin. The MOA was going to go before the Lincoln City Council at tonight's meeting, but due to personnel layoffs being considered on that agenda the MOA was pulled and will be considered at its January 27 meeting. The MOA will go before the Roseville City Council in February.

Other Items

Andrew Gaber inquired whether after the Tier II MOA has been approved by jurisdictions members whether they can state that the Placer Parkway project is funded. McAdam suggested stating that funding has been identified for the Placer Parkway project.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

SOUTH PLACER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2009

ATTENDANCE: John Pedri, City of Lincoln (arrived 2:50 p.m.)
 Rick Dondro, Placer County Public Works
 Andrew Gaber, Placer County Public Works
 Ken Grehm, Placer County Public Works

Luke McNeel-Cairn, Fehr & Peers

Celia McAdam, PCTPA
Sue Sholtis, PCTPA
Stan Tidman, PCTPA

Tier II MOA Status

Celia McAdam reported that the Tier II Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) has been approved by all member jurisdictions except Lincoln. John Pedri indicated he will be organizing briefings with some council members and the city manager to resolve questions regarding the MOA. The MOA is expected to go to the Lincoln City Council the end of this month for approval.

Update on State Budget/Proposition 1B Impacts to SPRTA Projects

Celia McAdam stated there is still no State budget. The latest information we have is that the Lincoln Bypass project will be funded through February 17. There is enough federal funding for the I-80 Bottleneck project to continue. We are awaiting approval of an exception from FHWA for their federal match. Phase 3 is scheduled to go out to bid March 2 with contract award set for May. However, if the bond funding remains questionable, those dates could change. McAdam will continue to keep TAC members apprised of developments with the State budget as they arise.

Placer Parkway

Celia McAdam noted we are currently in the elevation process with the Placer Parkway project. During a frustrating meeting in Washington, D.C. last December it was decided that Ken Sanchez from the Fish & Wildlife Service would coordinate a subsequent meeting to develop conservation strategies to be used in the Tier 2 environmental document. Mr. Sanchez did not follow through with this effort in a timely manner, thus PCTPA staff is working with EPA to organize this strategy meeting which most likely will be held in March.

McAdam will be seeking Board approval to continue working with the regulatory agencies and pursue the LEDPA but move forward with CEQA to preserve the corridor for this project. This may necessitate another trip to Washington, D.C.

Public hearings have been scheduled in Sutter County on February 23 and during our February 25 SPRTA Board meeting to comment on the Partially Revised Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR. Staff is targeting this summer for completion of the EIS/EIR.

Comprehensive Update to Developer Impact Fee Program

Luke McNeel-Cairn from Fehr & Peers reported on his efforts regarding land use assumptions. Celia McAdam noted we need to keep the fee levels the same and add projects for this current comprehensive update. Since representatives from Rocklin and Roseville were not present it was agreed to schedule a special SPRTA TAC meeting to finalize the land use assumptions and project list.

Meeting adjourned.



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

TO: Board of Directors **DATE: February 10, 2009**

FROM: Stan Tidman, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: STATUS REPORT: PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION PROJECT & TIER 1 EIS/EIR

Action Requested

None. For information only.

Discussion

Project Management

- On January 23, 2009, the Formal (Senior-level Managers) Elevation Meeting was held at U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) offices in San Francisco. It addressed the Corridor Preservation Project's modified NEPA/404 process and the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) concurrence dispute.

The meeting objective was to resolve the dispute between the transportation agencies (Federal Highway Administration --FHWA/California Department of Transportation -- Caltrans/SPRTA and the regulatory agencies (U. S. Army Corps of Engineers --USACOE/USEPA/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – USFWS) regarding the corridor alternative most likely to contain the LEDPA. The transportation agencies documented Alternative #5 as the corridor most likely to contain the LEDPA. The regulatory agencies believe it to be Alternative #1.

Meeting participants consisted of the following principals along with support staffs:

- FHWA – California Division – Acting Chief
- Caltrans – District 3, Chief -- Environmental Services
- SPRTA – SPRTA Board Chairman
- USACOE -- Sacramento District -- Regulatory Chief
- USEPA -- Community and Ecosystems Division Director
Water Division Director
- USFWS -- Assistant Field Supervisor – Endangered Species

The dispute resolution process began in August 2008, after the regulatory agencies did not concur with the transportation agencies' June 2008 LEDPA concurrence request. This meeting was required because the dispute was not resolved at the October 15, 2008 Informal (Mid-level Managers) Elevation Meeting.

SPRTA Board of Directors
STATUS REPORT – PLACER PARKWAY
February 10, 2009
Page 2

SPRTA staff provided a brief, with a handout, which summarized the project, the modified NEPA/404 process, and LEDPA dispute issues (growth inducement and habitat fragmentation- related to growth). A Project Purpose clarification was also outlined, which was based on December 16, 2008 Washington, D.C. meeting guidance. This clarification further justified Alternative #5 as the LEDPA because the conceptual SR 70/99 Sankey Road interchange would:

- Advance economic development goals in south Sutter County because it would be consistent with the proposed Sutter County Specific Plan.
- Be less complicated to design – with better access -- than the conceptual SR 70/99 interchange – north of Riego Road.
- Cost less to build than the north of Riego Road interchange

SPRTA staff concluded that the data and analyses contained in the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR and the additional analyses completed for the LEDPA concurrence request documented that Alternative #5 would be the corridor most likely to contain the LEDPA. Specific points included:

- The project vicinity and surrounding area are targeted for growth via SACOG's Blueprint and by city/county general plans -- with or without the Placer Parkway.
- Alternative #5's direct impacts would be less than those for Alternative #1.
- Alternative #5's secondary/indirect impacts – related to growth inducement would be less than Alternative #1's based on extensive qualitative and quantitative analyses.
- The regulatory agencies concern with the floodplain constraint – related to potentially developable land -- is not realistic.

USEPA staff generally concurred with the SPRTA background and the two dispute issues. However, they re-iterated that their analysis (floodplains should not be a development constraint) showed that Alternative #1 would contain the LEDPA. SPRTA staff observed this conclusion was based on the most speculative of all of the analyses. It used additional hypothetical interchanges and reduced/eliminated the 'no-development' buffer. These hypothetical components are not a part of the Project Description.

The meeting did not resolve the concurrence dispute. However, it was agreed to suspend the dispute resolution process in order to explore developing a 'framework or approach' to link conservation measures to the indirect impacts related to the Parkway's potential growth inducement. The meeting's objective would not be to identify specific parcels for conservation. Rather, it would be to develop a conservation framework to be implemented in Tier 2. To accomplish this, the

SPRTA Board of Directors
STATUS REPORT – PLACER PARKWAY
February 10, 2009
Page 3

difference between Alternative #1 and #5 potential growth inducement would have to be determined. Then, a framework/approach would have to be developed, which links conservation measures to the difference in potential growth inducement.

- Work began to schedule for the 'framework/approach' meeting.
- On February 3, the staff submitted a comment letter on the proposed Sutter Pointe Specific Plan's DEIR. The comments focused on: 1) making consistent references to the Parkway between the DEIR and proposed Sutter County General Plan amendments (GPAs); 2) ensuring Specific Plan consistency with the 500'-wide Parkway corridor width; 3) identifying that the GPA's functional roadway classification does not include a category for the Parkway, 4) pointing out that the DEIR does not analyze Parkway corridor alternatives #1, #2, and #3; and 5) citing that the Public Facilities Financing Plan does not discuss participation in financing the Placer Parkway.

Public Outreach

- The project's fifth newsletter was completed. It describes the Partially Revised Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR (below). During the week of January 19, it was mailed to approximately 1,700 agencies, organizations, and interested individuals. Copies were made available to planning and public works departments in Placer, Sacramento, and Sutter counties as well as the cities of Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, and Sacramento.
- SPRTA Board public hearings were set for the following to get public comments on the PRD for:
 - February 23 – 6:00 p.m. at the Veterans Memorial Community Building, 1425 Veterans Circle, Yuba City
 - February 25 – 10:45 a.m. at the SPRTA Board meeting, Placer County Board of Supervisors Chambers (the Domes), 175 Fulweiler St., Auburn
- The project's web site was updated with background information, the PRD, and public notice dates/times.

Environmental Document Preparation

- The Partially Revised Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR (PRD) was completed and distributed for public comment. The deadline for written comments is March 16, 2008.

The primary objective of the PRD is to analyze whether including additional hypothetical interchanges and not prohibiting development in the 'no-development' buffer would affect the growth-inducing potential of the Parkway's five build alternatives. In March 2008, the SPRTA Board directed the staff to complete the analyses and to provide the information to the public for a fuller disclosure of potential environmental effects and to make a stronger foundation for later Tier 2 environmental reviews. The PRD also includes updated information on farmland, a

SPRTA Board of Directors
STATUS REPORT – PLACER PARKWAY
February 10, 2009
Page 4

number of general plan amendments to be processed following certification of the environmental document, and an expanded discussion on greenhouse gases.

- Approximately 200 copies of the PRD were shipped directly to specific agencies, organizations, and individuals. Approximately, 1,700 PRD Notices of Availability (NOA) were mailed to interested agencies, organizations, and individuals. The NOA was published in the legal notice sections of eight newspapers.