

**Table of Contents
VOLUME I**

	Page
Cover Sheet	
Executive Summary	ES-1
Table of Contents	i
List of Technical Studies that are Bound Separately	xii
List of Figures	xiii
List of Tables	xv
List of Acronyms	xx
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR PROJECT	1-1
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.2 PROJECT NEED	1-6
1.2.1 Need to Preserve Right-of-Way	1-6
1.2.2 Travel Demand and Anticipated Congestion	1-7
1.3 PROJECT PURPOSE	1-7
1.3.1 Preserving Right-of-Way	1-8
1.3.2 Responding to Existing and Anticipated Travel Demand	1-8
1.3.3 Providing Access to the Regional Transportation System in Areas Planned or Projected for Job Growth	1-8
1.4 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND PROJECTED GROWTH	1-8
1.4.1 Introduction	1-8
1.4.2 Project History	1-11
1.4.3 Population and Employment	1-12
1.4.4 Land Use Trends	1-20
1.4.5 Roadway Operations and Travel Demand	1-22
1.5 REGIONAL PLANNING CONTEXT	1-30
1.5.1 Population Allowances in Adopted Plans	1-30
1.5.2 Proposed and Anticipated Major Developments	1-33
1.5.3 Other Potential Development Areas	1-34
2.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	2-1
2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2-1
2.2 COMMON DESIGN FEATURES OF THE BUILD ALTERNATIVES	2-1
2.2.1 Conceptual Roadway Configuration	2-1
2.2.2 Conceptual Roadway Elevation	2-2
2.2.3 Interchange Concepts	2-2
2.2.4 No-Development Buffer Concept	2-9
2.2.5 Landscaping Concept	2-10
2.2.6 Preliminary Cost Estimate	2-11
2.3 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	2-11
2.3.1 No-Build Alternative	2-11
2.3.2 Alternative 1 – the Red Alternative	2-12
2.3.3 Alternative 2 – the Orange Alternative	2-12
2.3.4 Alternative 3 – the Blue Alternative	2-12
2.3.5 Alternative 4 – the Yellow Alternative	2-12
2.3.6 Alternative 5 – the Green Alternative	2-21
2.4 PLANNING HISTORY	2-21

2.5	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER REVIEW	2-25
2.5.1	PSR Alternatives.....	2-26
2.5.2	Modifications to PSR Alternatives	2-27
2.5.3	Alternatives Eliminated for Reasons Related to Purpose and Need, Safety, and/or Environmental Considerations.....	2-27
2.5.4	Avoidance Alternatives – Modified NEPA/404 Process	2-30
2.5.5	Landowner-Identified Alignments.....	2-35
2.6	ANALYSIS OF A LAND USE AND POLICY SCENARIO	2-36
2.6.1	Assumed Robust Transit System	2-37
2.6.2	SACOG’s Blueprint.....	2-38
2.6.3	SACOG’s 4D Model Post-Processor	2-39
2.6.4	Pricing Mechanisms.....	2-39
2.6.5	Forecasts for the Tier 1 EIS/EIR.....	2-40
2.6.6	Analysis	2-40
2.7	AGENCY PERMITS AND APPROVALS	2-41
3.0	ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK.....	3-1
3.1	INTRODUCTION	3-1
3.2	ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES INCLUDED IN THE TIER 1 EIS/EIR	3-1
3.3	TIER 1 AND TIER 2 ANALYSES	3-2
3.4	ANALYSIS YEARS AND COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES.....	3-3
3.4.1	Time of Analysis.....	3-3
3.4.2	Analysis of Alternatives.....	3-8
3.5	STUDY AREAS	3-8
3.5.1	Project Study Area.....	3-8
3.5.2	Regional Analysis Districts in the Local Project Vicinity	3-8
3.5.3	Transportation Analysis Study Area.....	3-9
3.5.4	Analysis Focus Area	3-9
3.5.5	Air Quality Analysis Study Area	3-9
3.5.6	Area of Potential Effects.....	3-9
3.5.7	Secondary and Indirect Impact Analysis Study Area	3-9
3.6	TIME MARCHES ON.....	3-10
3.6.1	Evolving Existing Conditions.....	3-10
3.6.2	Future Availability of Fossil Fuels	3-13
4.0	ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	4-1
4.1	LAND USE.....	4-1-1
4.1.1	Regulatory Setting	4-1-1
4.1.1.1	General Plans and Policies	4-1-1
4.1.1.2	Other Plans and Policies.....	4-1-4
4.1.2	Affected Environment.....	4-1-6
4.1.2.1	Existing General Plan Designations.....	4-1-8
4.1.2.2	Developable Land	4-1-8
4.1.3	Impact Analysis	4-1-23
4.1.3.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4-1-23
4.1.3.2	Evaluation Criteria	4-1-24
4.1.3.3	Direct Impacts	4-1-24
4.1.3.4	Consistency with Other Local Plans and Policies.....	4-1-36
4.1.3.5	Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4-1-43
4.1.3.6	Cumulative Impacts	4-1-43

4.1.4	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	4.1-44
4.1.4.1	Land Use Conversion/Potentially Bisected Parcels	4.1-44
4.1.4.2	Land Use Compatibility	4.1-45
4.1.4.3	Consistency with Adopted Plans, Policies, and Regulations	4.1-46
4.1.5	Tier 1 and Tier 2 Studies.....	4.1-47
4.1.5.1	Land Use Conversion/Bisected Parcels.....	4.1-47
4.1.5.2	Compatibility with Adjacent/Proposed Development.....	4.1-47
4.1.5.3	Consistency with Zoning Minimum Acreage Requirements	4.1-47
4.1.5.4	Compatibility with Applicable General Plan Policies and Other Local Plans	4.1-47
4.2	SOCIOECONOMICS AND COMMUNITY IMPACTS	4.2-1
4.2.1	Regulatory Setting	4.2-1
4.2.1.1	Federal Statutes and Regulations	4.2-1
4.2.1.2	General Plans and Policies	4.2-1
4.2.2	Affected Environment.....	4.2-5
4.2.2.1	Population Growth and Demographic Characteristics	4.2-5
4.2.2.2	Housing	4.2-11
4.2.2.3	Economic Conditions	4.2-13
4.2.3	Impact Analysis	4.2-16
4.2.3.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.2-16
4.2.3.2	Evaluation Criteria	4.2-19
4.2.3.3	Direct Impacts	4.2-19
4.2.3.4	Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.2-24
4.2.3.5	Cumulative Impacts	4.2-26
4.2.4	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Strategies.....	4.2-27
4.2.4.1	Tier 1 – Avoidance/Minimization Strategies	4.2-27
4.2.4.2	Tier 2 – Consultation/Coordination.....	4.2-28
4.2.4.3	Tier 2 – Mitigation Commitments.....	4.2-28
4.2.4.4	Tier 2 – Mitigation Considerations	4.2-28
4.2.5	Tier 1 and Tier 2 Studies.....	4.2-29
4.3	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	4.3-1
4.3.1	Regulatory Setting	4.3-1
4.3.1.1	Federal Regulations.....	4.3-1
4.3.1.2	Other Plans and Policies.....	4.3-1
4.3.2	Affected Environment.....	4.3-1
4.3.3	Impact Analysis	4.3-2
4.3.3.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.3-2
4.3.3.2	Evaluation Criteria	4.3-3
4.3.3.3	Direct Impacts	4.3-3
4.3.3.4	Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.3-3
4.3.3.5	Cumulative Impacts	4.3-3
4.3.4	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	4.3-3
4.3.5	Tier 1 and Tier 2 Studies.....	4.3-3
4.4	FARMLANDS	4.4-1
4.4.1	Regulatory Setting	4.4-1
4.4.1.1	Federal Regulations.....	4.4-1
4.4.1.2	State Regulations.....	4.4-1
4.4.1.3	General Plans and Policies	4.4-2
4.4.2	Affected Environment.....	4.4-3
4.4.2.1	Existing Agricultural Activities	4.4-5
4.4.2.2	Trends in Agricultural Production and Farmland Conversion	4.4-6

	4.4.2.3	Farmland Classifications and Soil Patterns	4.4-9
	4.4.2.4	Williamson Act Lands.....	4.4-10
4.4.3		Impact Analysis	4.4-16
	4.4.3.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.4-16
	4.4.3.2	Evaluation Criteria	4.4-17
	4.4.3.3	Direct Impacts	4.4-17
	4.4.3.4	Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.4-20
	4.4.3.5	Cumulative Impacts	4.4-21
4.4.4		Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Strategies.....	4.4-21
	4.4.4.1	Farmland Conversion	4.4-21
	4.4.4.2	Disruption to Agricultural Activities.....	4.4-24
	4.4.4.3	Williamson Act Conflicts.....	4.4-25
	4.4.4.4	Consistency with Plans and Policies	4.4-26
4.4.5		Tier 1 and Tier 2 Studies.....	4.4-26
4.5		PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES	4.5-1
	4.5.1	Regulatory Setting	4.5-1
	4.5.1.1	General Plans and Policies	4.5-1
	4.5.2	Affected Environment.....	4.5-3
	4.5.2.1	Public Services	4.5-3
	4.5.2.2	Utilities and Municipal Facilities	4.5-8
4.5.3		Impact Analysis	4.5-9
	4.5.3.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.5-9
	4.5.3.2	Evaluation Criteria	4.5-10
	4.5.3.3	Direct Impacts	4.5-10
	4.5.3.4	Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.5-13
	4.5.3.5	Cumulative Impacts	4.5-14
4.5.4		Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Strategies.....	4.5-14
	4.5.4.1	Tier 1 – Avoidance/Minimization Strategies	4.5-14
	4.5.4.2	Tier 2 – Consultation/Coordination.....	4.5-15
	4.5.4.3	Tier 2 – Mitigation Commitments.....	4.5-15
	4.5.4.4	Tier 2 – Mitigation Considerations	4.5-15
4.5.5		Tier 1 and Tier 2 Studies.....	4.5-15
4.6		VISUAL/AESTHETICS	4.6-1
	4.6.1	REGULATORY SETTING.....	4.6-1
	4.6.1.1	General Plans and Policies	4.6-1
	4.6.2	Affected Environment.....	4.6-1
	4.6.2.1	Existing Typical Viewsheds.....	4.6-1
	4.6.2.2	Visual Character.....	4.6-6
	4.6.2.3	Visual Quality	4.6-13
	4.6.2.4	Existing Viewshed Lighting.....	4.6-14
4.6.3		Impact Analysis	4.6-14
	4.6.3.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.6-14
	4.6.3.2	Evaluation Criteria	4.6-14
	4.6.3.3	Direct Impacts	4.6-17
	4.6.3.4	Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.6-30
	4.6.3.5	Cumulative Impacts	4.6-30
4.6.4		Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	4.6-34
	4.6.4.1	Tier 1 – Avoidance/Minimization Strategies	4.6-34
	4.6.4.2	Tier 2 – Consultation/Coordination.....	4.6-35
	4.6.4.3	Tier 2 – Mitigation Commitments.....	4.6-35
	4.6.4.4	Tier 2 – Mitigation Considerations	4.6-36

4.6.5	Tier 1 and Tier 2 Studies.....	4.6-36
4.7	CULTURAL RESOURCES	4.7-1
4.7.1	Regulatory Setting	4.7-1
4.7.1.1	Archaeological and Historic Resources	4.7-1
4.7.1.2	Paleontological Resources	4.7-3
4.7.2	Affected Environment.....	4.7-3
4.7.2.1	Archaeological Resources.....	4.7-3
4.7.2.2	Historic Built Environment Resources.....	4.7-10
4.7.2.3	Paleontological Resources	4.7-12
4.7.3	Impact Analysis	4.7-19
4.7.3.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.7-19
4.7.3.2	Evaluation Criteria	4.7-19
4.7.3.3	Direct Impacts	4.7-19
4.7.3.4	Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.7-24
4.7.3.5	Cumulative Impacts	4.7-24
4.7.4	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Strategies.....	4.7-25
4.7.4.1	Tier 1 – Avoidance/Minimization Strategies	4.7-25
4.7.4.2	Tier 2 – Consultation/Coordination.....	4.7-26
4.7.4.3	Tier 2 – Mitigation Commitments.....	4.7-26
4.7.4.4	Tier 2 – Mitigation Considerations	4.7-27
4.7.5	Tier 1 and tier 2 Studies	4.7-27
4.8	TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION	4.8-1
4.8.1	Regulatory Setting	4.8-1
4.8.1.1	General Plans and Policies	4.8-1
4.8.1.2	Other Plans and Policies.....	4.8-4
4.8.2	Affected Environment.....	4.8-5
4.8.2.1	Existing Roadway System.....	4.8-5
4.8.2.2	Existing Traffic Levels of Service	4.8-5
4.8.2.3	Existing Transit Service	4.8-14
4.8.2.4	Existing Bicycle Facilities.....	4.8-16
4.8.3	Impact Analysis	4.8-16
4.8.3.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.8-16
4.8.3.2	Evaluation Criteria	4.8-25
4.8.3.3	Direct Impacts	4.8-26
4.8.3.4	Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.8-72
4.8.3.5	Cumulative Impacts	4.8-73
4.8.4	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	4.8-111
4.8.4.1	Tier 1 – Avoidance/Minimization Strategies	4.8-111
4.8.4.2	Tier 2 – Mitigation Commitments.....	4.8-122
4.8.4.3	Tier 2 – Mitigation Considerations	4.8-122
4.8.5	Tier 1 and Tier 2 Studies.....	4.8-126
4.9	AIR QUALITY	4.9-1
4.9.1	Regulatory Setting	4.9-1
4.9.1.1	Federal and State Air Quality Standards.....	4.9-1
4.9.1.2	Federal Regulations.....	4.9-5
4.9.1.3	Regional Regulations	4.9-6
4.9.2	Affected Environment.....	4.9-7
4.9.2.1	Compliance with Air Quality Standards in the Study Area	4.9-8
4.9.2.2	Existing Emissions Sources	4.9-15
4.9.3	Impact Analysis	4.9-17
4.9.3.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.9-17

	4.9.3.2	Evaluation Criteria	4.9-18
	4.9.3.3	Existing Conditions Analysis (2004)	4.9-18
	4.9.3.4	Future Analysis (2020) Conditions	4.9-19
	4.9.3.5	Year 2027 – Conformity Year.....	4.9-27
	4.9.3.6	Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.9-27
	4.9.3.7	Greenhouse Gases	4.9-28
	4.9.3.8	Cumulative Impacts	4.9-30
4.9.4		Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Strategies.....	4.9-36
	4.9.4.1	Tier 1 – Avoidance/Minimization Strategies	4.9-36
	4.9.4.2	Tier 2 – Consultation.....	4.9-36
	4.9.4.3	Tier 2 – Mitigation Commitments.....	4.9-37
	4.9.4.4	Tier 2 – Mitigation Considerations	4.9-38
4.9.5		Tier 1 and Tier 2 Studies.....	4.9-38
4.10		NOISE.....	4.10-1
	4.10.1	Regulatory Setting	4.10-1
		4.10.1.1 Federal Regulations.....	4.10-1
		4.10.1.2 State Regulations.....	4.10-1
		4.10.1.3 General Plans and Policies	4.10-2
	4.10.2	Affected Environment.....	4.10-4
	4.10.3	Impact Analysis	4.10-4
		4.10.3.1 Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.10-4
		4.10.3.2 Evaluation Criteria	4.10-7
		4.10.3.3 Direct Impacts	4.10-9
		4.10.3.4 Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.10-25
		4.10.3.5 Cumulative Impact Evaluation.....	4.10-26
4.10.4		Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Strategies.....	4.10-38
	4.10.4.1	Tier 1 – Avoidance/Minimization Strategies	4.10-38
	4.10.4.2	Tier 2 – Consultation.....	4.10-40
	4.10.4.3	Tier 2 – Mitigation Commitments.....	4.10-40
	4.10.4.4	Tier 2 – Mitigation Considerations	4.10-40
4.10.5		Tier 1 and Tier 2 Studies.....	4.10-41
4.11		HYDROLOGY AND FLOODPLAINS	4.11-1
	4.11.1	Regulatory Setting	4.11-1
		4.11.1.1 Federal Regulations.....	4.11-1
		4.11.1.2 State Regulations.....	4.11-2
		4.11.1.3 General Plans and Policies	4.11-2
	4.11.2	Affected Environment.....	4.11-4
		4.11.2.1 Watersheds	4.11-4
		4.11.2.2 Floodplains.....	4.11-7
	4.11.3	Impact Analysis	4.11-8
		4.11.3.1 Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.11-8
		4.11.3.2 Evaluation Criteria	4.11-8
		4.11.3.3 Direct Impacts	4.11-12
		4.11.3.4 Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.11-27
		4.11.3.5 Cumulative Impacts	4.11-28
4.11.4		Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	4.11-29
	4.11.4.1	Tier 1 – Avoidance/Minimization Strategies	4.11-29
	4.11.4.2	Tier 2 – Consultation.....	4.11-29
	4.11.4.3	Tier 2 – Mitigation Commitments.....	4.11-29
	4.11.4.4	Tier 2 – Mitigation Considerations	4.11-30
4.11.5		Tier 1 and Tier 2 Studies.....	4.11-31

4.12	WATER QUALITY	4.12-1
4.12.1	Regulatory Setting	4.12-1
4.12.1.1	Federal Regulations.....	4.12-1
4.12.1.2	State Regulations.....	4.12-1
4.12.1.3	General Plans and Policies	4.12-2
4.12.2	Affected Environment.....	4.12-2
4.12.2.1	Natomas Basin	4.12-3
4.12.2.2	Pleasant Grove Creek Watershed.....	4.12-3
4.12.2.3	Curry Creek Watershed.....	4.12-4
4.12.2.4	Auburn Ravine Watershed	4.12-4
4.12.2.5	Natomas East Main Drainage Canal Watershed	4.12-4
4.12.3	Impact Analysis	4.12-4
4.12.3.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.12-4
4.12.3.2	Evaluation Criteria	4.12-5
4.12.3.3	Direct Impacts	4.12-7
4.12.3.4	Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.12-18
4.12.3.5	Cumulative Impacts Evaluation	4.12-19
4.12.4	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	4.12-20
4.12.4.1	Tier 1 – Avoidance/Minimization Strategies	4.12-20
4.12.4.2	Tier 2 – Consultation.....	4.12-20
4.12.4.3	Tier 2 – Mitigation Commitments.....	4.12-20
4.12.4.4	Tier 2 – Mitigation Considerations	4.12-21
4.12.5	Tier 1 and Tier 2 Studies.....	4.12-23
4.13	SOILS, GEOLOGY, AND SEISMICITY	4.13-1
4.13.1	Regulatory Setting	4.13-1
4.13.2	Affected Environment.....	4.13-1
4.13.2.1	Topography	4.13-1
4.13.2.2	Geology	4.13-1
4.13.2.3	Faults and Seismicity	4.13-2
4.13.2.4	Landslides	4.13-6
4.13.2.5	Liquefaction	4.13-6
4.13.2.6	Mineral Resources.....	4.13-6
4.13.2.7	Seiches and Tsunamis	4.13-9
4.13.2.8	Subsidence	4.13-10
4.13.2.9	Expansive Soils	4.13-10
4.13.3	Impact Analysis	4.13-10
4.13.3.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.13-10
4.13.3.2	Evaluation Criteria	4.13-10
4.13.3.3	Direct Impacts	4.13-11
4.13.3.4	Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.13-11
4.13.3.5	Cumulative Impacts Evaluation	4.13-11
4.13.4	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	4.13-12
4.13.5	tier 1 and 2 studies	4.13-12
4.14	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	4.14-1
4.14.1	Regulatory Setting	4.14-1
4.14.1.1	Federal Regulations.....	4.14-1
4.14.1.2	State Regulations.....	4.14-2
4.14.1.3	General Plans and Policies	4.14-3
4.14.1.4	Placer County Conservation Plan.....	4.14-4
4.14.2	Affected Environment.....	4.14-4
4.14.2.1	Physical Conditions.....	4.14-4

	4.14.2.2	Habitats and Natural Communities	4.14-4
	4.14.2.3	Regional Species and Habitats of Concern	4.14-5
4.14.3		Impact Analysis	4.14-5
	4.14.3.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.14-5
	4.14.3.2	Evaluation Criteria	4.14-5
	4.14.3.3	Direct Impacts	4.14-11
	4.14.3.4	Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.14-30
	4.14.3.5	Cumulative Impacts	4.14-31
4.14.4		Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	4.14-32
	4.14.4.1	Tier 1 – Avoidance/Minimization Strategies	4.14-32
	4.14.4.2	Tier 2 – Consultation.....	4.14-34
	4.14.4.3	Tier 2 – Mitigation Commitments.....	4.14-34
	4.14.4.4	Tier 2 – Mitigation Considerations	4.14-34
4.14.5		Tier 1 and Tier 2 Studies.....	4.14-36
4.15		HAZARDOUS WASTE/MATERIALS	4.15-1
	4.15.1	Regulatory Setting	4.15-1
	4.15.1.1	Federal Regulations.....	4.15-1
	4.15.1.2	State Regulations.....	4.15-1
4.15.2		Site History	4.15-1
	4.15.2.1	Site History and Regulatory Files	4.15-1
	4.15.2.2	Orphan Facilities	4.15-2
	4.15.2.3	Sutter County Environmental Health Division	4.15-6
	4.15.2.4	Sutter County Agricultural Commission.....	4.15-6
	4.15.2.5	Placer County Office of Emergency Services.....	4.15-6
	4.15.2.6	Placer County Environmental Health Department.....	4.15-6
	4.15.2.7	Regional Water Quality Control Board.....	4.15-7
	4.15.2.8	Department of Toxic Substances Control	4.15-7
4.15.3		Affected Environment.....	4.15-7
	4.15.3.1	Past Uses of the Property	4.15-7
	4.15.3.2	Site Observations	4.15-7
	4.15.3.3	Neighboring Properties	4.15-11
4.15.4		Impact Analysis	4.15-11
	4.15.4.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.15-11
	4.15.4.2	Evaluation Criteria	4.15-11
	4.15.4.3	Direct Impacts	4.15-11
	4.15.4.4	Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.15-14
	4.15.4.5	Cumulative Impacts	4.15-14
4.15.5		Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	4.15-15
	4.15.5.1	Tier 1 – Avoidance/Minimization Strategies	4.15-15
	4.15.5.2	Tier 2 – Consultation.....	4.15-15
	4.15.5.3	Tier 2 – Mitigation Commitments.....	4.15-15
	4.15.5.4	Tier 2 – Mitigation Considerations	4.15-16
4.15.6		Tier 1 and Tier 2 Studies.....	4.15-16
4.16		ENERGY	4.16-1
	4.16.1	Regulatory Setting	4.16-1
	4.16.2	Affected Environment.....	4.16-1
	4.16.3	Impact Analysis	4.16-1
	4.16.3.1	Methodology for Impact Evaluation	4.16-1
	4.16.3.2	Evaluation Criteria	4.16-2
	4.16.3.3	Direct Impacts	4.16-2
	4.16.3.4	Comparison of Alternatives	4.16-4

	4.16.3.5 Secondary and Indirect Impacts	4.16-5
	4.16.3.6 Cumulative Impacts	4.16-5
	4.16.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	4.16-6
	4.16.5 Tier 2 Studies	4.16-6
5.0	CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT EVALUATION	5-1
5.1	LAND USE.....	5-2
5.1.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-2
5.1.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-4
5.2	POPULATION AND HOUSING.....	5-5
5.2.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-5
5.2.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-5
5.3	FARMLANDS.....	5-6
5.3.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-6
5.4	PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES	5-7
5.4.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-7
5.4.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-7
5.5	VISUAL AND AESTHETICS	5-9
5.5.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-9
5.5.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-9
5.6	CULTURAL RESOURCES	5-9
5.6.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-9
5.6.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-10
5.7	TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION.....	5-10
5.7.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-10
5.7.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-12
5.8	AIR QUALITY.....	5-12
5.8.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-12
5.8.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-13
5.9	NOISE.....	5-14
5.9.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-14
5.9.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-14
5.10	HYDROLOGY	5-14
5.10.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-14
5.10.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-15
5.11	WATER QUALITY	5-16
5.11.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-16
5.11.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-16
5.12	SOILS, GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY	5-17
5.12.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-17

5.12.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-17
5.13	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	5-18
5.13.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-18
5.13.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-19
5.14	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	5-20
5.14.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-20
5.14.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-20
5.15	ENERGY	5-21
5.15.1	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	5-21
5.15.2	Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Can Be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	5-21
5.16	GROWTH	5-21
5.17	SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED IF THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS IMPLEMENTED AND SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES WHICH WOULD BE CAUSED BY THE PROPOSED PROJECT SHOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED	5-22
5.17.1	Significant Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided if the Proposed Project Is Implemented	5-22
5.17.2	Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes Which Would Be Caused by the Proposed Project Should it Be Implemented.....	5-24
5.18	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	5-24
5.19	ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE	5-29
5.19.1	No-Build Alternative	5-30
5.19.2	System-Wide Impacts of Build Alternatives	5-30
5.19.3	Impacts of Build Alternatives by Segment	5-32
5.19.4	Conclusion	5-35
6.0	OTHER IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS	6-1
6.1	GROWTH	6-1
6.1.1	Regulatory Framework	6-1
6.1.2	Methodological Approach	6-2
6.1.3	Impact Analysis	6-3
6.1.4	Findings and Conclusions	6-12
6.2	IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES	6-23
7.0	POTENTIAL WATT AVENUE INTERCHANGE	7-1
7.1	LAND USE	7-2
7.1.1	Alternative 1 (Option 1).....	7-2
7.1.2	Alternative 1 (Option 2)/Alternative 2.....	7-2
7.1.3	Alternative 2	7-5
7.1.4	Alternatives 3 and 4.....	7-5
7.1.5	Alternative 5	7-5
7.2	SOCIOECONOMICS AND COMMUNITY IMPACTS	7-5
7.3	FARMLAND	7-6
7.3.1	Farmland Conversion.....	7-6
7.3.2	Williamson Act Contracts.....	7-6
7.4	PUBLIC SERVICE AND UTILITIES	7-6

7.5	VISUAL AND AESTHETICS	7-6
7.6	CULTURAL RESOURCES	7-7
7.7	TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION.....	7-7
7.8	AIR QUALITY.....	7-13
	7.8.1 Alternative 1	7-13
	7.8.2 Alternative 2	7-16
	7.8.3 Alternative 3	7-17
	7.8.4 Alternative 4	7-18
	7.8.5 Alternative 5	7-19
	7.8.6 Cumulative Impacts Associated with a Watt Avenue Interchange.....	7-20
7.9	NOISE.....	7-21
	7.9.1 2020 Impact Analysis with Watt Avenue Interchange	7-21
	7.9.2 2040 Impact Analysis with Watt Avenue Interchange	7-22
	7.9.3 Relative Impacts on Future Roadways	7-23
7.10	HYDROLOGY AND FLOODPLAINS	7-25
7.11	WATER QUALITY AND STORMWATER RUNOFF	7-25
7.12	GEOLOGY/SOIL/SEISMIC/TOPOGRAPHY	7-25
7.13	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	7-26
7.14	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	7-26
7.15	ENERGY	7-26
8.0	LIST OF PREPARERS AND REVIEWERS	8-1
8.1	PREPARERS	8-1
	8.1.1 URS Corporation (Consultant)	8-1
	8.1.2 DKS Associates	8-2
	8.1.3 Lawler Associates Geoscience.....	8-2
	8.1.4 JRP Historical Consulting, LLC	8-2
	8.1.5 Mara Feeney & Associates	8-2
	8.1.6 Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc.	8-2
	8.1.7 North fork Associates	8-2
8.2	REVIEWERS.....	8-2
	8.2.1 South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (via Placer County Transportation Planning Agency).....	8-2
	8.2.2 California Department of Transportation, District 3.....	8-3
	8.2.3 Federal Highway Administration.....	8-4
9.0	LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PERSONS TO WHOM COPIES ARE SENT	9-1
10.0	REFERENCES	10-1
10.1	CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR PROJECT.....	10-1
10.2	CHAPTER 2 – PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	10-3
10.3	CHAPTER 3 – ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK.....	10-4
10.4	CHAPTER 4 – ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	10-5
10.5	CHAPTER 5 – CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT EVALUATION	10-19
10.6	CHAPTER 6 – OTHER IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS	10-20
10.7	CHAPTER 7 – POTENTIAL WATT AVENUE INTERCHANGE	10-21

INDEX

VOLUME II

Appendices

Appendix A	Comments and Coordination
Appendix B	NOI/NOP and Comment Letters
Appendix C	Purpose and Need Statement—Agency Concurrence Version
Appendix D	Section 4(f) Evaluation
Appendix E	Placer Parkway Programmatic Agreement
Appendix F	Species List from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

List of Figures

Figure ES-1	Project Alternatives
Figure 1-1	Project Location Map
Figure 1-2	Regional Analysis Districts Within the Local Project Vicinity
Figure 1-3	Historic and Forecasted Population Growth in Sutter, Placer, and Sacramento Counties
Figure 1-4	Historic and Forecasted Employment in Sutter, Placer, and Sacramento Counties
Figure 1-5	Historic and Forecasted Population in the Local Project Vicinity by Regional Analysis District
Figure 1-6	Historic and Forecasted Employment in the Local Project Vicinity by Regional Analysis District
Figure 1-7	Changes in Land Use Along SR 65 Corridor 1984 – 2002
Figure 1-8	Historic and Projected Traffic Growth on Interstate 80
Figure 1-9	Historic and Projected Traffic Growth on State Route 65
Figure 1-10	Historic and Projected Traffic Growth on State Route 70/99
Figure 1-11	Historic and Projected Traffic Growth on Riego Road/Baseline Road
Figure 1-12	Historic and Projected Traffic Growth on Howsley Road/Sunset Boulevard West
Figure 1-13	Traffic Growth on Fiddymont Road
Figure 1-14	Historic and Projected Traffic Growth on Pleasant Grove Road
Figure 1-15	Planned/Proposed Development
Figure 2-1	Project Alternatives
Figure 2-2	Typical Cross Section (Conceptual)
Figure 2-3	Alternative 1
Figure 2-4	Alternative 2
Figure 2-5	Alternative 3
Figure 2-6	Alternative 4
Figure 2-7	Alternative 5
Figure 3-1	Secondary and Indirect Impact Analysis Study Area
Figure 4.1-1	Existing Land Use
Figure 4.1-2	Existing Designated Land Use
Figure 4.1-3	Existing Zoning
Figure 4.1-4	Important Farmland in Relation to Designated Land Use
Figure 4.1-5	Parcel Boundaries
Figure 4.2-1	Homes, Farmsteads, and Potential Communities
Figure 4.2-2	Employment Centers and Businesses
Figure 4.4-1	Important Farmland
Figure 4.4-2	Soil Types in Sutter, Placer, and Sacramento Counties
Figure 4.5-1	Community Services and Municipal Facilities
Figure 4.6-1	Viewshed Locations for Western, Central, and Eastern Segment Landscape Units
Figure 4.6-2	Western Segment Landscape Unit
Figure 4.6-3	Central Segment Landscape Unit
Figure 4.6-4	Eastern Segment Landscape Unit
Figure 4.7-1	Area of Potential Effect
Figure 4.7-2	Common Alignment
Figure 4.7-3	RD 1000 Historic District and Project APE
Figure 4.7-4A, B	Other Potentially Historic Properties
Figure 4.8-1	Existing Roadway Network and Transportation Analysis Study Area
Figure 4.8-2	Assumed Development Areas and Roadway Network in 2020

Figure 4.8-3	Assumed Development Areas and Roadway Network in 2040
Figure 4.8-4	Location of Roadway Segments for 2020 Traffic Analysis
Figure 4.8-5	Changes in 2020 Daily Traffic Volumes – Alternative 1 Compared to No-Build Alternative
Figure 4.8-6	Changes in 2020 Daily Traffic Volumes – Alternative 2 Compared to No-Build Alternative
Figure 4.8-7	Changes in 2020 Daily Traffic Volumes – Alternative 3 Compared to No-Build Alternative
Figure 4.8-8	Changes in 2020 Daily Traffic Volumes – Alternative 4 Compared to No-Build Alternative
Figure 4.8-9	Changes in 2020 Daily Traffic Volumes – Alternative 5 Compared to No-Build Alternative
Figure 4.8-10	Location of Roadway Segments for 2040 Traffic Analysis
Figure 4.8-11	Changes in 2040 Daily Traffic Volumes – Alternative 1 Compared to No-Build Alternative
Figure 4.8-12	Changes in 2040 Daily Traffic Volumes – Alternative 2 Compared to No-Build Alternative
Figure 4.8-13	Changes in 2040 Daily Traffic Volumes – Alternative 3 Compared to No-Build Alternative
Figure 4.8-14	Changes in 2040 Daily Traffic Volumes – Alternative 4 Compared to No-Build Alternative
Figure 4.8-15	Changes in 2040 Daily Traffic Volumes – Alternative 5 Compared to No-Build Alternative
Figure 4.9-1	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
Figure 4.9-2	Air Quality Monitoring Stations
Figure 4.10-1	Measurement Locations
Figure 4.10-2	Noise Contours – 2020 – Alternative 1
Figure 4.10-3	Noise Contours – 2020 – Alternative 2
Figure 4.10-4	Noise Contours – 2020 – Alternative 3
Figure 4.10-5	Noise Contours – 2020 – Alternative 4
Figure 4.10-6	Noise Contours – 2020 – Alternative 5
Figure 4.10-7	Noise Contours – 2040 – Alternative 1
Figure 4.10-8	Noise Contours – 2040 – Alternative 2
Figure 4.10-9	Noise Contours – 2040 – Alternative 3
Figure 4.10-10	Noise Contours – 2040 – Alternative 4
Figure 4.10-11	Noise Contours – 2040 – Alternative 5
Figure 4.11-1	Watershed Boundaries
Figure 4.11-2	FEMA Floodplains
Figure 4.11-3	Stream Crossings
Figure 4.12-1	Watershed Boundaries, Wetlands, and Vernal Pool Complexes
Figure 4.13-1	Geology
Figure 4.13-2	Regional Faults
Figure 4.14-1	Seasonally Flooded and Upland Wildlife Habitats
Figure 4.14-2	Wetland, Riparian, Conservation Areas, and Vernal Pool Complexes
Figure 4.14-3	Potential Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Habitat
Figure 4.14-4	Potential Swainson’s Hawk Habitat
Figure 4.14-5	Potential Giant Garter Snake Habitat and Sightings
Figure 4.15-1	Potential Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) with Respect to Project Alternatives
Figure 4.15-2	Potential Hazardous Waste Sites in the Study Area
Figure 7-1	Potential Watt Avenue Interchange

List of Tables

Table ES-1	Summary of Potential Impacts from the Placer Parkway Alternatives
Table 1-1	Population Information from Various Sources: Sutter, Placer, and Sacramento Counties
Table 1-2	Historic and Forecasted Population and Employment Growth in Sutter, Placer, and Sacramento Counties
Table 1-3	Historic and Forecasted Population and Employment in the Local Project Vicinity by Regional Analysis District
Table 2-1	Assumed Improvements in TSM Alternative (Beyond Those in the No-Build Alternative)
Table 2-2	Increase in Daily Traffic Volumes Due to the TSM Alternative
Table 2-3	Change in Peak Period Level of Service Due to the TSM Alternative
Table 3-1	Summary of Placer County Growth
Table 3-2	Summary of Development Assumptions – 2020 and 2040 Scenarios
Table 4.1-1	Acreage and Percentage of Land Use in the Study Area
Table 4.1-2	Existing Zoning Within Study Area
Table 4.1-3	Comparison of Build Alternatives’ Impacts on Land Use
Table 4.1-4	Consistency of the Parkway with Existing General Plan Policies
Table 4.2-1	Summary of Population, Household, Race, and Income Projections for the SACOG Region, 2000, 2030, and 2050
Table 4.2-2	Population in Study Area Counties, 1970 to 2000
Table 4.2-3	Population in Study Area Counties, 2000, 2020, and 2040
Table 4.2-4	Total Housing Units, SACOG Region and Study Area Counties, 2000 and 2025 (Projected)
Table 4.2-5	New Home Average Sale Price Trends, 2001 through 2005
Table 4.2-6	Comparison of Existing Homes with Buildout Potential in Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln
Table 4.2-7	Full-Time and Part-Time Employment by Industry, 2003
Table 4.2-8	Annual Average Labor Force Size and Unemployment Rates, California and Study Area Counties, 2000 and 2005
Table 4.2-9	Total Employment and Per Capita Income, California and Study area Counties, 2000 and 2003
Table 4.2-10	Summary of Direct Impacts to Community Resources Associated with the Parkway Build Alternatives, by Segment
Table 4.2-11	Summary of Direct Impacts to Employment Centers Associated with the Project Alternatives
Table 4.3-1	Race, Ethnicity, and Poverty in Study Area Census Block Groups
Table 4.4-1	Sutter and Placer Counties Agricultural Policies
Table 4.4-2	Top Five Crops for Sutter County in 2004
Table 4.4-3	Five-Year Comparison of Sutter County Agricultural Production
Table 4.4-4	Top Five Agricultural Operations for Placer County in 2003
Table 4.4-5	Five-Year Comparison of Placer County Agricultural Production
Table 4.4-6	Sutter County Williamson Act Newly Enrolled Land
Table 4.4-7	Placer County Williamson Act Contract Status Trends
Table 4.4-8	Important Farmland Potentially Affected by Alignment Alternatives
Table 4.4-9	Potentially Affected Williamson Act Land

Table 4.4-10	Cumulative Impacts to Farmland
Table 4.4-11	Cumulative Impacts to Williamson Act Land
Table 4.5-1	Summary of Impacts on Public Services and Utilities
Table 4.6-1	Summary of General Plan Policies and Goals (P&Gs)
Table 4.6-2	FHWA Visual Quality Assessment
Table 4.6-3	Existing Visual Character/Quality and Viewer Sensitivity/Exposure by Landscape Unit
Table 4.6-4	Summary of Potential Visual Impacts of Alternative 1 (FHWA Criteria)
Table 4.6-5	Summary of Potential Visual Impacts of Alternative 2 (FHWA Criteria)
Table 4.6-6	Summary of Potential Visual Impacts of Alternative 3 (FHWA Criteria)
Table 4.6-7	Summary of Potential Visual Impacts of Alternative 4 (FHWA Criteria)
Table 4.6-8	Summary of Potential Visual Impacts of Alternative 5 (FHWA Criteria)
Table 4.6-9	Comparison of Aesthetic Impacts with Alternatives in Place
Table 4.6-10	Summary and Ranking of Alternatives by Aesthetic Impact Rating
Table 4.7-1	Predictive Model for Assessment of Archaeological Sensitivity of Build Alternatives (Excluding Common Alignment)
Table 4.8-1	Summary of Level of Service Standards and Methodologies for Local Jurisdictions
Table 4.8-2	Level of Service Definitions – Daily Segment-Based Analysis
Table 4.8-3	Existing Daily Traffic Volumes and Roadway Segment Levels of Service in the Transportation Analysis Study Area
Table 4.8-4	Existing Transit Routes in the Transportation Analysis Study Area
Table 4.8-5	Assumed Transit Service Changes for 2040 Funded Constrained Scenario
Table 4.8-6	Projected 2020 Daily Traffic Volumes on Placer Parkway Mainline
Table 4.8-7	Projected 2020 Daily Traffic Volumes on Placer Parkway Ramps
Table 4.8-8	Estimated Daily Traffic Volumes for Build Alternatives under 2020 Conditions
Table 4.8-9	Estimated Change in Daily Traffic Volumes for Build Alternatives under 2020 Conditions
Table 4.8-10	Projected 2020 Level of Service on Placer Parkway with Four Travel Lanes
Table 4.8-11	Estimated Volume/Capacity Ratios on Roadway Segments for Build Alternatives under 2020 Conditions
Table 4.8-12	Estimated Level of Service on Roadway Segments for Build Alternatives under 2020 Conditions
Table 4.8-13	Estimated 2020 VMT by Level of Service Category – Transportation Analysis Study Area
Table 4.8-14	Summary of 2020 VMT by Level of Service Category – Transportation Analysis Study Area
Table 4.8-15	Estimated Percentage of 2020 VMT by Level of Service Category – Transportation Analysis Study Area
Table 4.8-16	Summary of the Percentage of 2020 VMT by Level of Service Category – Transportation Analysis Study Area
Table 4.8-17	Estimated 2020 VMT by Level of Service Category – Analysis Focus Area
Table 4.8-18	Summary of 2020 VMT by Level of Service Category – Analysis Focus Area
Table 4.8-19	Estimated Percentage of 2020 VMT by Level of Service Category – Analysis Focus Area
Table 4.8-20	Summary of the Percentage of 2020 VMT by Level of Service Category – Analysis Focus Area
Table 4.8-21	Estimated Vehicle Hours of Delay within the Transportation Analysis Study Area
Table 4.8-22	Estimated Vehicle Hours of Delay within the Analysis Focus Area
Table 4.8-23	Projected 2040 Daily Traffic Volumes on Placer Parkway Mainline
Table 4.8-24	Projected 2040 Daily Traffic Volumes on Placer Parkway Ramps

Table 4.8-25	Estimated Daily Traffic Volumes for Build Alternatives under 2040 Conditions
Table 4.8-26	Estimated Change in Daily Traffic Volumes Compared to No-Build Alternative under 2040 Conditions
Table 4.8-27	Projected 2040 Level of Service on Placer Parkway with Four or Six Travel Lanes (without Potential Watt Interchange)
Table 4.8-28	Estimated Volume/Capacity Ratios on Roadway Segments for Build Alternatives under 2040 Conditions
Table 4.8-29	Estimated Level of Service on Roadway Segments for Build Alternatives under 2040 Conditions
Table 4.8-30	Estimated 2040 VMT by Level of Service Category – Transportation Analysis Study Area
Table 4.8-31	Summary of 2040 VMT by Level of Service Category – Transportation Analysis Study Area
Table 4.8-32	Estimated Percentage of 2040 VMT by Level of Service Category – Transportation Analysis Study Area
Table 4.8-33	Summary of the Percentage of 2040 VMT by Level of Service Category – Transportation Analysis Study Area
Table 4.8-34	Estimated 2040 VMT by Level of Service Category – Analysis Focus Area
Table 4.8-35	Summary of 2040 VMT by Level of Service Category – Analysis Focus Area
Table 4.8-36	Estimated Percentage of 2040 VMT by Level of Service Category – Analysis Focus Area
Table 4.8-37	Summary of the Percentage of 2040 VMT by Level of Service Category – Analysis Focus Area
Table 4.8-38	Estimated Vehicle Hours of Delay within the Transportation Analysis Study Area
Table 4.8-39	Estimated Vehicle Hours of Delay within the Analysis Focus Area
Table 4.9-1	Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards
Table 4.9-2	FRAQMD Significance Thresholds, Sutter and Yuba Counties
Table 4.9-3	PCAPCD Operational and Significance Thresholds, Placer County
Table 4.9-4	Maximum Measured Pollutant Concentrations at Pleasant Grove, California, Monitoring Station
Table 4.9-5	Maximum Measured Pollutant Concentrations at Roseville, California (I-80), Monitoring Station
Table 4.9-6	Maximum Measured Pollutant Concentrations at North Highlands, California, Monitoring Station
Table 4.9-7	Summary of 2005 Estimated Annual Average Emissions in Sutter County
Table 4.9-8	Summary of 2005 Estimated Annual Average Emissions in Placer County
Table 4.9-9	Summary of 2005 Estimated Annual Average Emissions in Sacramento County
Table 4.9-10	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Year 2005
Table 4.9-11	Estimated Amount of Pollutants Emitted During Site Grading Activities
Table 4.9-12	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 4.9-13	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 1 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 4.9-14	Percentage Change in VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions Between Alternative 1 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 4.9-15	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 2 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 4.9-16	Percentage Change in VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions Between Alternative 2 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 4.9-17	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 3 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020

Table 4.9-18	Percentage Change in VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions Between Alternative 3 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 4.9-19	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 4 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 4.9-20	Percentage Change in VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions Between Alternative 4 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 4.9-21	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 5 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 4.9-22	Percentage Change in VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions Between Alternative 5 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 4.9-23	Comparison of VMT and Operational Emissions for Build Alternatives in 2020
Table 4.9-24	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for the No-Build Alternative in 2040
Table 4.9-25	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 1 in 2040
Table 4.9-26	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 2 in 2040
Table 4.9-27	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 3 in 2040
Table 4.9-28	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 4 in 2040
Table 4.9-29	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 5 in 2040
Table 4.9-30	Operational Emissions from All Alternatives in 2040
Table 4.9-31	Comparison of VMT and Operational Emissions from All Alternatives in 2040
Table 4.10-1	Sutter County Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure (Transportation Noise Sources)
Table 4.10-2	Placer County Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure (Transportation Noise Sources)
Table 4.10-3	Short-Term Sound Level Measurement Summary
Table 4.10-4	Federal Highway Administration Noise Abatement Criteria
Table 4.10-5	Relative Impacts for Existing/Future Roadways (2020)
Table 4.10-6	Placer Parkway Absolute Noise Impact Summary (2020)
Table 4.10-7	Noise Impact Ranking by Alternative (2020)
Table 4.10-8	Cumulative Absolute Noise Impact Summary (2040)
Table 4.10-9	Cumulative Relative Impact for Existing Roadways (2040)
Table 4.11-1	Summary of Criteria Used for Evaluation of Alternatives: Hydrology and Floodplains
Table 4.11-2	Summary of Alternatives: Hydrology and Floodplains
Table 4.11-3	Summary of Alternatives Ranking: Hydrology and Floodplains
Table 4.11-4	Amount of Parkway Impervious Area in Watersheds
Table 4.11-5	Distribution of Curry Creek Floodplain Crossed by Alternative
Table 4.12-1	Summary of Criteria Used for Evaluation of Alternatives: Water Quality
Table 4.12-2	Summary of Corridor Alignment Alternatives: Water Quality Parameters
Table 4.12-3	Summary of Distribution of Watersheds Crossed by Corridor Alignment Alternatives
Table 4.12-4	Summary of Alternative Ranking: Water Quality
Table 4.13-1	Active Faults Zoned by CDMG Within 60 Miles of the Study Area
Table 4.13-2	Selected Potentially Active Faults Within 60 Miles of the Study Area
Table 4.14-1	Listed and Proposed Threatened/Endangered Species Potentially Occurring or Known to Occur in the Study Area
Table 4.14-2	Listed and Proposed Threatened/Endangered Species with Low Potential to Occur in the Study Area
Table 4.14-3	Other Species of Concern with Potential to Occur in the Project Study Area
Table 4.14-4	Sensitive Resources Potentially Impacted by Each Build Alternative
Table 4.14-5	Number of New Waterway Crossings Potentially Impacted by Each Build Alternative

Table 4.15-1	Number of Potential Hazardous Materials/Waste Sites within the Study Area
Table 4.15-2	Comparison of Alternatives Impacts Associated with Hazardous Materials
Table 4.16-1	Length and Number of Interchanges Associated with Parkway Alternatives
Table 4.16-2	Estimated Energy Consumption Associated with VMT for the Build Alternatives in Transportation Analysis Study Area (2020)
Table 4.16-3	Estimated Energy Consumption Associated with VMT for the Build Alternatives in Transportation Analysis Study Area (2040)
Table 5-1	Important Farmlands Affected in the Central Segment
Table 5-2	Biological Resources Affected in the Central Segment
Table 7-1	Parcels Potentially Affected by Potential Watt Avenue Interchange
Table 7-2	Watt Avenue Interchange Impacts on Farmland
Table 7-3	Estimated 2020 VMT by Level of Service Category – TASA
Table 7-4	Summary of 2020 VMT by Level of Service Category – TASA
Table 7-5	Estimated Percentage of 2020 VMT by Level of Service Category – TASA
Table 7-6	Summary of the Percentage of 2020 VMT by Level of Service Category – TASA
Table 7-7	Estimated 2040 VMT by Level of Service Category – TASA
Table 7-8	Summary of Estimated 2040 VMT by Level of Service Category – TASA
Table 7-9	Estimated 2040 VMT by Level of Service Category – TASA
Table 7-10	Summary of Estimated 2040 VMT by Level of Service Category – TASA
Table 7-11	Estimated Vehicle Hours of Delay within TASA
Table 7-12	Estimated 2040 Vehicle Hours of Delay within TASA
Table 7-13	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 1 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 7-14	Percentage Change in VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions Between Alternative 1 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 7-15	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 2 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 7-16	Percentage Change in VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions Between Alternative 2 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 7-17	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 3 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 7-18	Percentage Change in VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions Between Alternative 3 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 7-19	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 4 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 7-20	Percentage Change in VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions Between Alternative 4 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 7-21	VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions for Alternative 5 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 7-22	Percentage Change in VMT and Criteria Pollutant Emissions Between Alternative 5 and the No-Build Alternative in 2020
Table 7-23	Placer Parkway Absolute Noise Impact Summary, with Watt Avenue Interchange (2020)
Table 7-24	Relative Noise Impacts for Existing Roadways, with Watt Avenue Interchange (2020)
Table 7-25	Placer Parkway Absolute Noise Impact Summary, with Watt Avenue Interchange (2040)
Table 7-26	Relative Noise Impact for Existing Roadways, with Watt Avenue Interchange (2040)
Table 7-27	Noise Impact Rating by Alternative, with Watt Avenue Interchange (2040)

List of Acronyms

AADT	annual average daily traffic
AAQS	Ambient Air Quality Standards
ACM	asbestos-containing materials
ADL	aerially deposited lead
AFA	Analysis Focus Area
APCD	Air Pollution Control District
APE	Area of Potential Effects
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
AQAP	Air Quality Attainment Plan
AQMD	Air Quality Management District
ASR	Archaeological Survey Report
BFE	Base Flood Elevation
BMP	Best Management Practice
CAA	Clean Air Act
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CCCP	Curry Creek Community Plan
CDF	California Department of Forestry
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology
CDP	Census Designated Place
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFCs	chlorofluorocarbons
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CGS	California Geological Survey
CHP	California Highway Patrol
CIA	Community Impact Assessment
CIP	Capital Improvement Program
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CO	carbon monoxide
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CPA	California Power Authority
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CSA	County Service Area
CSP	Creekview Specific Plan
CTR	California Toxics Rule
CVRWQCB	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	decibel(s)
dba	A-weighted decibel(s)
DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
DLRP	Division of Land Resource Protection
DO	dissolved oxygen
DOC	Department of Conservation
DOF	California Department of Finance
DPM	diesel particulate matter

DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
DU	dwelling unit
EAP	Energy Action Plan
EC	electrical conductivity
EDR	Environmental Data Resources, Inc.
EIS/EIR	Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report
EMSA	Emergency Medical Services Authority
EMSA	Emergency Services Authority
ERP	Ecosystem Restoration Plan
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
FPPA	Farmland Protection Policy Act
FRAQMD	Feather River Air Quality Management District
FSZ	Farmland Security Zone
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
General Permit	NPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity
GHG	Greenhouse gases
GIS	Geographic Information System
GLO	General Land Office
HAPs	hazardous air pollutants
HCD	California Housing and Community Development Department
HCFCs	partially halogenated chlorofluorocarbons
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
HFCs	halogenated fluorocarbons
HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle
HPSR	Historic Properties Survey Report
HRER	Historic Resources Evaluation Report
I-5	Interstate 5
I-80	Interstate 80
I-C Reserve	Industrial-Commercial Reserve
JPA	joint powers authority
LBP	lead-based paint
L _{dn}	Day-Night Noise Level
L _{eq}	Equivalent Noise Level
LESA	Land Evaluation and Site Assessment
LFG	landfill gas
LID	Low Impact Development
LOS	level of service
LRT	Light Rail Transit
m	Meters
Ma	million years ago
MCE	Maximum Credible Earthquake
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Level
mg/L	milligrams per liter
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
mph	miles per hour
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization

MSATs	mobile sources air toxics
msl	mean sea level
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
N ₂ O	nitrous oxide
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAC	Noise Abatement Criteria
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NASS	National Agricultural Statistics Service
NBHCP	Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan
NCCP	Natural Communities Conservation Plan
NDIR	non-dispersive infrared photometry
NEMDC	Natomas East Main Drainage Canal
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
NO _x	oxides of nitrogen
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPS	National Park Service
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
O ₃	ozone
OES	Office of Emergency Services
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PAC	Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Policy Advisory Committee
Pb	lead
PCAPCD	Placer County Air Pollution Control District
PCCP	Placer County Conservation Plan
PCEHD	Placer County Environmental Health Department
PCFCWCD	Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
PCTPA	Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
PGWWTP	Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant
PM ₁₀	particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns
POAQC	Project of Air Quality Concern
Porter-Cologne	Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act
ppm	parts per million
PRC	Public Resources Code
PRSP	Placer Ranch Specific Plan
PSR	Project Study Report
PVSP	Placer Vineyards Specific Plan
RAD	Regional Analysis District
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RD 1000	Reclamation District No. 1000
REC	recognized environmental condition
REP	Roseville Energy Park
ROG	reactive organic gases
ROW	right-of-way
RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RUSP	Regional University Specific Plan

RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SAC	Study Advisory Committee
SACMET	Sacramento Metropolitan Travel Demand Model
SACOG	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
SAFCA	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SIAP	Sunset Industrial Area Plan
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMA	Sacramento Metropolitan Area
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SOI	Sphere of Influence
SO _x	oxides of sulfur
SPRTA	South Placer Regional Transportation Authority
SPSP	Sutter Pointe Specific Plan
sq. ft.	square feet
SR	State Route
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
SVSP	Sierra Vista Specific Plan
SWDR	Stormwater Data Report
SWMP	Stormwater Management Plan
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWQA	Stormwater Quality Assessment
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Technical Advisory Committee
TACs	toxic air contaminants
TASA	Transportation Analysis Study Area
TAZ	traffic analysis zone
TCM	Transportation Control Measures
TCR	Transportation Concept Report
TCZ	Transmission corridor zone
TDS	total dissolved solids
TeNS	(Caltrans) Technical Noise Supplement
Tier 1 EIS/EIR	Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement/Program Environmental Impact Report
TNM	Traffic Noise Model
TOC	total organic carbon
TSM	Transportation Systems Management
U.S. EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
UC	University of California
UPRR	Union Pacific Rail Road
URS	URS Corporation
USCOE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UST	underground storage tank
VHD	Vehicle Hours of Delay
VHT	vehicle-hours of travel
VIAHP	Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects

VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compounds
WDR	Waste Discharge Requirement
WPWMA	Western Placer Waste Management Authority
WRSL	Western Regional Sanitary Landfill
WRSP	West Roseville Specific Plan