2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

SPRTA proposes to select and preserve a corridor for the future construction of Placer Parkway, a new east-west roadway linking SR 70/99 in Sutter County east to SR 65 in Placer County (see Figure 1, Project Alternatives).

2.2 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PLACER PARKWAY

Placer Parkway is intended to reduce anticipated congestion on both the local and regional transportation system and to advance economic development goals in south Sutter County and southwestern Placer County. Please see Appendix C for the agency concurrence version of the Purpose and Need Statement, and Chapter 1 of the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR for more detailed information, summarized below.

2.2.1 Need for Placer Parkway

Need to Preserve Right-of-Way: The project vicinity includes some of the fastest growing communities in the Sacramento Metropolitan region—Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln, and the Sunset Industrial Area. SACOG projects that the population in southwestern Placer County will nearly double between 2000 and 2025. Employment in the SR 65 high-technology corridor is expected to grow even faster than the population. The anticipated development to support this increased population and employment will dramatically increase travel demand over the next 20 years and beyond. The study area has been under intense development pressure. While the current economic climate has slowed the pace of this development pressure, at least two major specific plans have been approved within the last year (Regional University Specific Plan and Sutter Pointe Specific Plan), and several others are proceeding through environmental review. Based on the number of recent applications or pre-application submittals, and interest by the development community, it is apparent that it will become increasingly difficult and expensive to identify an appropriate corridor as a solution that meets the ultimate purpose of the proposed project. Failure to preserve a corridor as soon as feasible could result in potentially increased costs and greater environmental impacts because ongoing planning for development could result in approved projects that would foreclose opportunities for locating the roadway in areas that would minimize environmental impacts, leading to substantially higher mitigation costs.

Travel Demand and Anticipated Congestion: The anticipated population growth in south Sutter County, southwestern Placer County, and northern Sacramento County will dramatically increase travel demands over the next 20 years and beyond. Travel speeds/travel times from Placer County to both Sacramento and Sutter counties are projected to deteriorate over the next 20 years, even with improvements to local roadways already identified in local general plans.

Job Growth and Goods Movement: The Interstate 80 (I-80) corridor is the major trans-Sierra roadway in northern California accommodating the movement of goods and services. The combined increase of vehicles used for the movement of goods and services as well as passenger vehicles has led to increased congestion, which in turn increases travel times in the study area and competition for roadway capacity. Congestion on the regional roadways connecting Placer

County with Sutter and Sacramento counties will adversely impact access to jobs. The projected increase in travel times will affect the movement of goods and people, and will have an impact on the region's economy. The high-technology industry in the SR 65 corridor, plus development of Sutter County's industrial/commercial reserve area, requires dependable access to airports to move high-value/time-critical freight. Thus, direct and convenient access and reliable travel times to both the Sacramento International Airport and the Lincoln Regional Airport are very important to this growing regional job center.

2.2.2 Purpose of Placer Parkway

Preserving Right-of-Way: The goal of the Tier 1 EIS/EIR for the proposed project is to preserve right-of-way for a new or upgraded east-west connector between SR 65 and SR 70/99 serving cities and unincorporated areas across southwestern Placer County and south Sutter County.

Responding to Existing and Anticipated Travel Demand: The proposed Placer Parkway would be designed to reduce pressure on the existing transportation network and to address anticipated future congestion on the local roadway system in southwestern Placer County and South Sutter County. The proposed project would be designed to reduce total vehicle hours traveled during the morning and evening peak commute periods (i.e., 6 to 9 a.m. and 3 to 6 p.m.), reduce the amount and duration of travel that is spent in congested conditions in southwestern Placer County, and improve travel times between the SR 65 corridor and SR 70/99 by maintaining a travel speed at or near the free flow speed of the Parkway, which on a freeway reflects Level of Service (LOS) C to D conditions.[1]

Providing Access to the Regional Transportation System in Areas Planned or Projected for Job Growth: Placer Parkway would be designed to improve regional accessibility for businesses and jobs in the project vicinity, including access to SR 70/99. The Parkway is proposed to serve major travel flows from SR 65 to (1) the south Sutter Industrial area, (2) Sacramento International Airport, (3) Sacramento County, and (4) the Interstate 5 (I-5) corridor.

2.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND CORRIDOR ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED

The proposed project being considered by SPRTA is to select and preserve a 500- to 1,000-foot-wide corridor in the project study area, within which the future four- or six-lane Placer Parkway may be constructed. Five build alternatives and a No-Build Alternative were analyzed in the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR and the PRD. Depending upon the alternative, the corridor's length ranges from a minimum of 14.2 miles to a maximum of 16.2 miles. The selected corridor would contain the roadway, including the median, travel lanes, shoulder, associated access ramps, and a no-development buffer zone. The alternatives are described in detail in the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR

[1] LOS is a qualitative measure of the effect of a number of factors which include speed, travel time, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver, safety, driving comfort/convenience, and operation costs. LOS is designated A through F, from best to worst, covering the entire range of traffic operations that might occur. LOS E describes conditions approaching or at maximum capacity. Free-flow speed and LOS C and D conditions on a freeway do not preclude an alternative based on expanding existing roads, a non-freeway facility, a Transportation System Management alternative, a shorter Parkway Alternative, or a combination of the aforementioned.

(pages 2-12 through 2-21). Throughout, the study area has been divided into three segments, as shown on Figure 1, which depicts these segments and the build alternatives analyzed in this Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR:

- The Western Segment extends from SR 70/99 to Pleasant Grove Road in Sutter County.
- The Central Segment extends from Pleasant Grove Road in Sutter County to approximately 2,300 feet north of Pleasant Grove Creek in Placer County.
- The Eastern Segment extends from approximately 2,300 feet north of Pleasant Grove Creek to SR 65 in Placer County.

Five or six interchanges are proposed, depending on the corridor alignment alternative. Although the Parkway would be designed and construction-level impacts analyzed during Tier 2, several assumptions have been made about potential design and configuration concepts for the purpose of this Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR. These assumptions would be subject to further development and refinement, and specific decisions about design of the roadway would be made during the Tier 2 process. For example, the number, location, and design of over-crossings would be determined at the time of final Parkway design, in consultation with local jurisdictions. Several key assumptions about the future roadway used to develop the environmental analysis can be found in Chapter 2 of the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR.

As envisioned, Placer Parkway would include a corridor that is wider than what is needed for the proposed roadway, with lands adjacent to the facility called "no-development buffer zones," which would be intended to further a "parkway" concept by maintaining a visual open space concept and encouraging linkages to other open spaces along the corridor, preserving open space and agricultural uses adjacent to the Parkway, providing opportunities to preserve biological resources along the corridor; and limiting future development along the Parkway from encroaching to the facility's edge by maintaining it as a zone where development is either not permitted or is severely restricted. Limiting access to the Parkway would preserve a high-speed facility, through preventing unplanned Parkway interchanges from being constructed by controlling the land required for such interchanges, and would limit opportunities for growth inducement that might otherwise result from provision of access in areas not planned for growth.

It is intended that the no-development buffer zones would be owned and managed in the future to achieve these objectives. Section 2.2.4.2 of the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR describes a number of mechanisms that may be used to control development and other activity within the buffer. These include land use controls, laws, policies and regulations, and real property interests, including Fee Simple (Fee Title) Land, Undivided Interest, Conservation Easements, Transfer (Purchase) of Development Rights, Leases, Land Repackaging, and Options/First Rights of Refusal. Although the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR included the no-development buffer zone as part of the project description, it did not assume any environmental benefits. It is not the intent of the project that the buffer provides mitigation for direct adverse environmental impacts from the project.

Since the value of the no-development buffer zones to maintain the parkway concept and limit access depends to some extent on the adjacent land uses, it may be appropriate to adjust the final size and shape of the buffer based on Tier 2 analysis of the Parkway. It is anticipated that such adjustments are most likely to occur in parts of the Parkway near agriculturally designated land undergoing urban development. This determination would be based on performance standards on a case-by-case basis, depending on the land use needs of future approved development, taking into account the primary objective of restricting future access to the Parkway, and subject to agreements made under the Modified NEPA/404 process described in Section 2.8.2 below and in Appendix A.

2.4 EVALUATION OF OTHER ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives were considered, evaluated, and rejected or modified, all as described in more detail in Section 2.5 of the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR:

1. **Project Study Report (PSR) Alternatives**: Early screening was initiated in the Conceptual Plan/Placer Parkway Interconnect Study and developed in more detail in the PSR, which resulted in the PSR Alternatives;

2. **Modification of the PSR Alternatives**: The PSR Alternatives were modified based on screening and preliminary evaluation that focused on avoidance of environmental resources, with special focus on aquatic resources, and including input from the advisory committees and the public;

3. **Alternatives Eliminated for Reasons Related to Purpose and Need, Safety, and/or Environmental Considerations**: Alignments were evaluated with respect to their ability to meet purpose and need and to avoid out-of-direction travel with the major travel flows that the Parkway would serve. Connections to SR 70/99 and SR 65 were evaluated relative to Caltrans' minimum spacing requirements between interchanges on freeways. Alignments or portions of alignments were evaluated with respect to conflicts with existing environmental resources or planning processes, including but not limited to avoidance of an historic ranch complex, large vernal pool areas, wetlands, farmland, residences, the active portion of the City of Roseville Retention Basin, and designated recreation areas in the West Roseville Specific Plan;

4. **Avoidance Alternatives – Modified NEPA/404 Process**: Through participation in a modified NEPA/404 process with federal agencies, various alternatives were evaluated that would avoid or reduce the need to construct a Parkway, including a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative, a Shorter Parkway Alternative, and a Shorter Parkway Plus TSM Alternative; and

5. **Landowner-Identified Alignments**: Evaluations of four alignments identified by a landowner were conducted.

2.5 SUMMARY OF EFFECTS

Revised Table ES-1 at the end of this chapter summarizes the potential environmental impacts of the corridor alignment alternatives. Key differences among the corridor alignment alternatives are presented below. More detailed information is provided in the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR and the PRD.

The No-Build Alternative would not have the potential environmental impacts of the corridor alignment alternatives described below, except with respect to traffic, air quality, and noise, which would be substantially worse than for all of the build alternatives.

2.5.1 Direct Effects

Land Use

The build alternatives would involve land use conversion ranging from a minimum of approximately 1,627 acres under Alternative 5 to a maximum of 1,918 acres under Alternative 1. They would result in bisecting a number of parcels ranging from a minimum of 26 parcels under Alternative 1 to a maximum of 35 parcels under Alternative 5.

All build alternatives could present similar potential inconsistencies with General Plan policies involving preservation of agriculturally designated areas.

Socioeconomics

Three of the build alternatives, Alternatives 1, 4, and 5, would affect existing residential communities. All of the build alternatives would displace homes or farms, ranging from a minimum of three under Alternative 3 to a maximum of ten under Alternative 5. All of the build alternatives would affect the same two existing employment centers in the Sunset Industrial Area Plan. In addition, Alternatives 4 and 5 would also affect two other existing employment areas in Sutter County.

Farmlands

The build alternatives would affect between 1,578 and 1,814 acres of farmland, including Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, and Grazing Land. Alternative 5 would affect the least – approximately 1,578 acres. Alternative 3 would affect the most – approximately 1,814 acres. Each alternative would convert Williamson Act contracted lands, ranging from a minimum under Alternative 1 of 119.85 acres to a maximum under Alternative 2 of 243.7 acres.

Public Services and Utilities

The build alternatives would similarly affect one municipal facility, the City of Roseville Retention Basin property, although no retention facilities are planned in the area affected. There could also be future impacts on the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill Expansion area under the cumulative scenario.

Visual and Aesthetics

Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in Moderate/High visual impacts, while impacts associated with Alternatives 4 and 5 would be Moderate.

Cultural Resources

No known archaeological sites would be affected by the build alternatives. All build alternatives could affect one built environment resource: Reclamation District No. 1000 Rural Historic District, which is a property that is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources. Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could also affect three other properties that require further evaluation to determine NRHP and CRHR eligibility. All of the build alignment alternatives are of similarly high paleontological sensitivity, and the alternatives could impact unknown paleontological resources.

Traffic and Transportation

All of the build alternatives would result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT), a decrease in Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD), and improvements in LOS on the majority of roadways in the study area.

Under the No-Build Alternative, VMT is projected to be 17,723,337 in the opening year. VMT for build alternatives would range from a minimum of 17,844,410 under Alternative 1 to a maximum of 17,871,704 under Alternative 5. In 2040 the No-Build Alternative VMT is projected to be 25,977,539, and VMT under the build alternatives would range from a minimum of 26,419,100 under Alternative 1 to a maximum of 26,482,608 under Alternative 3.

By 2040, portions of SR 70/99 and SR 65 would operate at LOS F with or without the project; the build alternatives would worsen the LOS on portions of these roads, as well as on four other roadways. Under all build alternatives, VHD would improve as compared to the No-Build Alternative. However, there is no clear preference among build alternatives with respect to traffic because the differences among them are not substantive. The increase in VMT among all build alternatives differs by less than one-quarter of 1 percent. The decrease in VHD among all build alternatives differs by less than 1 percent overall.

Air Quality

Construction emissions would exceed the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) and Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD) construction emissions thresholds for reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NO_X), and particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}). In 2020, all build alternatives would exceed FRAQMD significance thresholds for ROG during operation; all build alternatives would exceed PCAPCD and FRAQMD significance thresholds for NO_X during operation. In 2040, all build alternatives would exceed FRAQMD significance thresholds for ROG; all build alternatives would exceed PCAPCD significance thresholds for carbon monoxide (CO); all build alternatives exceed FRAQMD and PCAPCD significance thresholds for NO_x.

Noise

Three of the build alternatives would result in noise levels at a number of existing residential units exceeding 66 A-weighted decibels (dBA) in the opening year. This would range from a minimum of one unit being affected under Alternative 5 and a maximum of two units being affected under Alternatives 2 and 3. These impacts would be the same in 2040. No assumptions regarding new residential units were taken into account in these analyses.

The build alternatives would result in projected noise increases of more than 12 dBA on one roadway in 2020. This effect would also occur under the No-Build Alternative. In 2040, the number of such roadways would increase to ten for Alternatives 4 and 5, eleven for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, and fifteen under the No-Build Alternative.

Hydrology and Floodplains

All build alternatives would result in an increase in impervious area ranging from a minimum of 622 acres under Alternative 5 to a maximum of 745 acres under Alternative 4. These impacts would be mitigated according to regulatory and permit requirements.

All build alternatives would result in new stream or canal crossings. These would range from a minimum of ten crossings under Alternatives 4 and 5 and a maximum of sixteen under Alternative 1. All build alternatives would also cross the 100-year and 500-year floodplains. Impacts would range from 269 acres under Alternative 1 to 370 acres under Alternatives 4 and 5. Impacts on the 500-year floodplain would range from a minimum of 87 acres under Alternative 5 to a maximum of 201 acres under Alternatives 2 and 3.

Water Quality

All build alternatives would result in an increase in impervious area ranging from a minimum of 622 acres under Alternative 5 to a maximum of 745 acres under Alternative 4. These impacts would be mitigated according to regulatory and permit requirements.

All build alternatives would traverse watersheds, with Alternatives 4 and 5 crossing four watersheds and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 crossing five. These impacts would be mitigated according to regulatory and permit requirements.

Biological Resources

All build alternatives would affect biological resources. All build alternatives would affect riparian habitat, ranging from a minimum of 4.8 acres under Alternatives 4 and 5 to a maximum of 12.3 acres under Alternative 2. Build alternatives would also affect the habitat of special-status species. Potential giant garter snake habitat would be affected, ranging from a minimum of approximately 268 acres under Alternatives 4 and 5 to a maximum of approximately 340 acres under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Potential Swainson's hawk and white-tailed kite nesting habitat would be affected, ranging from a minimum of 3.3 acres under Alternative 4 to a maximum of approximately 7.9 acres under Alternative 2. Potential Swainson's hawk foraging habitat would be affected, ranging from a minimum of approximately 759 acres affected under Alternative 5 to a maximum of approximately 10,244 acres under Alternative 1. Potential Valley elderberry

longhorn beetle habitat would be affected, ranging from a minimum of approximately 1.2 acres under Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 to a maximum of approximately 1.9 acres under Alternative 1.

All build alternatives would result in effects on wetlands ranging from a minimum of 28 acres under Alternative 5 to a maximum of 35.8 acres under Alternative 1. Effects on vernal pool complexes would range from a minimum of 107 acres under Alternative 4 to a maximum of 127 acres under Alternative 3.

Hazardous Waste/Materials

All of the build alternatives would be within the vicinity of potential sources of hazardous materials due to their proximity to sites of Recognized Environmental Concern. Three such sites are in the vicinity of Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, and four are in the vicinity of Alternatives 4 and 5. Potential hazards associated with these sites would be mitigated according to regulatory requirements.

2.5.2 Other Effects

With respect to secondary and indirect impacts, growth inducement, and cumulative impacts, little or no differentiation was identified among the build alternatives, except as described below.

2.6 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE UNDER NEPA

In accordance with FHWA's NEPA regulations, and after consideration of the public and agency comments received on the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR, the PRD, and ongoing coordination with federal, state and local resource/regulatory agencies, a Preferred Alternative has been identified by FHWA. Alternative 5 with a no-access buffer is the corridor alignment alternative identified as the Preferred Alternative for purposes of the NEPA process.

With respect to direct impacts, Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would have substantially more impacts than Alternatives 4 or 5. Alternatives 4 and 5 are generally similar, except that Alternative 4 has fewer direct impacts to potentially bisected parcels, homes and farmsteads, and to vernal pool complexes than Alternative 5, and Alternative 5 has fewer direct impacts to Swainson's hawk and white-tailed kite foraging habitat, farmlands, and wetlands, and it is the least archaeologically sensitive alignment.

Additional key factors favoring Alternative 5 over Alternative 4 and leading to the selection of the Preferred Alternative under NEPA include the following:

- Alternative 5 with a no-access buffer has been determined to be the corridor alignment alternative most likely to contain the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USCOE) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA).

- Alternative 5 has less potential for inducing growth.

- Alternative 5 has the least potential for secondary and indirect impacts on biological resources, including the lowest potential for habitat fragmentation.

- Alternative 5 is most consistent with the regional habitat conservation plan (Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP)) being developed by Placer County.

- Alternative 5 is the shortest alternative, which limits its potential direct effects and construction costs.

- Local jurisdictions support Alternative 5.

Through the modified NEPA/404 process (described in Appendix A) and specifically concurrence that Alternative 5 with a no-access buffer is the corridor most likely to contain the LEDPA, a conservation framework was identified to further refine the general mechanisms to limit new interchanges in the no-development buffer zone (identified in Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR Section 2.2.4) in portions of the project area's Western and Central segments. This refinement is to be applied to an approximately 5.1-mile-long segment (from the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal to a point approximately 3,250 feet west of the Reason Farms Retention Basin's "panhandle"). Figure A-1 in Appendix A depicts this area.

This conservation framework focuses on the use of a conservation easement to be implemented during the Tier 2 stage to help preclude new interchanges and help preserve agricultural and open space lands. The attributes of the easement would include the following:

- The easement will be in the form of a conservation easement created pursuant to California Civil Code Section 815.

- The easement will be perpetual in duration. The no-access provision will be binding on successive owners for the purpose of retaining the land predominantly in its natural, scenic, historical, agricultural, forested or open-space condition. (California Civil Code §815.1, §815.2)

- An instrument creating the conservation easement will be recorded in the county where the land is located. (California Civil Code §815.5)

- The easement will be held by a tax-exempt nonprofit organization qualified under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and qualified to do business in California that has as its primary purpose the preservation, protection, or enhancement of land in its natural, scenic, historical, agricultural, forested, or open-space condition or use.

- If the easement will not be accepted by such non-profit organization, or if the organization is no longer able to hold the easement, the first priority shall be to convey it to a federal agency or to a state government entity such as the California Department of Fish and Game. Failing that, the NEPA/404 agencies will work together through the NEPA/404 process to identify and to concur on an acceptable conservation easement holder.

- The terms of the easement may be enforced in court, and violation of the easement may result in damages, including the cost of restoration.

- Under the Subdivision Map Act, a city or county must generally deny approval of a tentative map if the land is subject to an open-space easement, agricultural conservation easement, or conservation easement.

- The easement will include a grantor's covenant not to allow access to right-of-way from adjacent land, and not to participate in planning or construction of interchange(s) between the highway project and any surface streets from 3,250 feet west of the western boundary of the Reason Farms Retention Basin panhandle to the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal. The easement is expressly to provide that this covenant is specifically enforceable. The easement may also identify certain third-party beneficiaries with the right to enforce the covenant.

- The covenant not to allow access will include a specific prohibition regarding interchange structures in the airspace over the property.

This conservation framework is incorporated and made a part of the Preferred Alternative identified under NEPA, as well as the Environmentally Superior Alternative under CEQA, as described below. Please also refer to Section 2.8.2 below for a description of the Modified NEPA/404 Process, through which the LEDPA was identified.

2.7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE UNDER CEQA

Alternative 4 was identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative in the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR (see Chapter 5). Based on new information provided in the PRD, and as described in Chapter 4 of this Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR, Alternative 5 is identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Alternatives 4 and 5 are generally similar. The changes that led to the identification of Alternative 5 as the Environmentally Superior Alternative in this Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR are the following:

- New information in the California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Based on updated information that became available after analysis for the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR was completed, the alternative with the least total impacts on all categories of farmland changed from Alternative 4 to Alternative 5.

- The information that Alternative 5 is the least archaeologically sensitive of all alternatives was not previously considered in the CEQA evaluation of the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

2.8 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, CONSULTATION, AND COORDINATION

2.8.1 Public Involvement Process

The Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Tier 1 EIS/EIR development process included extensive outreach to the public. The components of the public participation program leading up to publication of the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR are documented in Appendix A of that document.

Following publication of the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR, coordination and consultation continued through the Project Development Team and with individual jurisdictions, interested stakeholders, community members, and property owners. Federal agency coordination also continued through the Modified NEPA/404 process described in Section 2.8.2 below and in Appendix A of this Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR.

Scoping meetings were held in Roseville and Pleasant Grove in October 2003. Community meetings on potential corridor alignment alternatives were held in Roseville and Pleasant Grove in August 2004. Public hearings were held to receive comments on the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR and the Partially Revised Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR in August 2007 and February 2009, respectively. Public notices and public hearings are described in Sections 2.8.3 and 2.8.4, respectively, and public hearing transcripts are included in Appendix B.

Four newsletters and PCTPA's web site kept the public informed as to project progress. The February 2007 newsletter provided information regarding the corridor alignment alternatives selected for analysis in the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR. The July 2007 newsletter provided information about the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR. The January 2009 newsletter let the public know that a Partially Revised Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR was in preparation. A final newsletter provided information about this Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR and the Preferred Alternative it identifies. Copies of these newsletters are provided in Appendix B.

2.8.2 Modified NEPA/404 Process

The goal of the modified NEPA/404 process undertaken for the Placer Parkway Tier 1 EIS/EIR process was to ensure that Tier 1 decisions reflect careful consideration of the 404(b)(1) Guidelines (40 CFR 230), which are binding, substantive regulations implementing the Clean Water Act. FHWA, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), SPRTA, the USCOE, and the U.S. EPA agreed to engage in a modified NEPA/404 process, a federal coordination process, based on the NEPA/404 process set forth in the 1993 Memorandum of Understanding among federal agencies[2], modified for Tier 1 to reflect decisions made at Tier 1, and to anticipate the permit application requirements at Tier 2. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service participated informally in portions of this process.

The modified process for Tier 1 commits the agencies to seek concurrence on five points:

1. Purpose and Need
2. Criteria for Selecting the Range of Alternatives
3. Range of Alternatives
4. Alternative(s) Most Likely to Contain the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative
5. Mitigation Framework

[2] Signed by Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, California Department of Transportation, Arizona Department of Transportation, and Nevada Department of Transportation (1993). Here and elsewhere this document was referred to as the 1993 document. However, it was not fully executed until 1994, and is sometimes referred to elsewhere as a 1994 document.

This process has resulted in concurrence on all five points. Formal requests for concurrence were made by FHWA (acting on its own behalf, Caltrans, and PCTPA acting on behalf of SPRTA), and concurrence letters were received from the USCOE and the U.S. EPA. The Modified NEPA/404 Process Memorandum of Understanding and agency concurrence letters are included in Appendix A.

Alternative 5 with a no-access buffer has been identified as the corridor most likely to contain the LEDPA. Alternative 5 includes the conservation framework described in Section 2.6 above. FHWA and SPRTA have agreed to incorporate the conservation easement as part of the Tier 2 project description.

2.8.3 Public Notices

Informational notices for two public scoping meetings were mailed in September 2003 to community members in the project study area, including businesses, community leaders, agency staff, environmental groups, project advisory committee members, local elected officials, property owners, and the general public. Informational notices for two public workshops were mailed to the same group in September 2004. Copies of these notices are provided in Appendix B of the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR. More than 1,300 notices were mailed.

In late June 2007, a Notice of Availability of the Placer Parkway Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR was mailed to approximately 1,500 agencies, organizations, and interested individuals. This notice also identified the dates of two public hearings on the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR. In January 2009, a Notice of Availability of the Placer Parkway Partially Revised Draft (PRD) Tier 1 EIS/EIR was mailed to an updated mailing list. This notice also identified the dates of two public hearings on the PRD. The original comment period began on January 23, 2009 and closed on March 16, 2009. In March 2009, an additional Notice of Availability was issued to provide public notification of an extension to the comment period for an additional 45 days. The additional time for comments began March 27, 2009 and ended on May 11, 2009. These notices are provided in Appendix B of this Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR. Federal notices included the following: U.S. EPA Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft Tier 1 EIS published in the Federal Register (FR) on July 6, 2007 (72 FR 37,006); U.S. EPA notice regarding extension of the comment period published in the Federal Register on August 17, 2007 (72 FR 46,218); U.S. EPA notice regarding extension of the comment period published in the Federal Register on September 14, 2007 (72 FR 52,558); NOA regarding U.S. EPA comments published on October 5, 2007 (72 FR 57,029); FHWA NOA of the PRD published in the Federal Register on January 30, 2009 (74 FR 5,719); U.S. EPA NOA of the PRD on March 27, 2009 (74 FR 13,432); and NOA regarding U.S. EPA comments published on May 29, 2009 (74 FR 25,736).

2.8.4 Public Hearings

Two public hearings were held to receive public comment on the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR in August 2007. The August 6, 2007 public hearing was held in Yuba City, California and the August 8, 2007 public hearing was held in Roseville, California. Hearing transcripts are provided in Appendix B of this Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR, as is a copy of the PowerPoint presentation at the meetings.

Two public hearings were held to receive public comments on the Partially Revised Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR in March 2009. The February 23 public hearing was held in Yuba City, California and the February 25 public hearing was held in Auburn, California. Hearing transcripts are provided in Appendix B of this Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR, as is a copy of the PowerPoint presentation at the meetings.

2.8.5 Permits and Approvals

The Proposed Action is to identify and acquire a corridor; it does not require environmental permits because no physical construction would occur until after a Tier 2 environmental document is prepared and a roadway alignment within the corridor is determined. Applications for necessary permits, approvals, and agreements for construction of the Parkway will be prepared at the Tier 2 level of environmental review. As appropriate, information from this Tier 1 EIS/EIR may be used in the preparation of such applications.

2.9 AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY

The proposed project is partially funded and is programmed in the SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) 2035, which was found to conform by the SACOG Board on March 20, 2008, and FHWA and FTA adopted the air quality conformity finding on May 16, 2008.

2.10 SUMMARY OF MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Revised **Table ES-1** summarizes the potential environmental impacts of the No-Build Alternatives and the five build alternatives analyzed in this Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR. In Table ES-1, changes from the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR are shown as <u>underlined</u> (for additions) or as ~~strike-through~~ (for deletions).

The following substantial environmental effects cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented:

Land Use

- land use conversion
- incompatibility with proposed land uses
- inconsistency with applicable General Plan policies

Farmland

- farmland conversion
- Williamson Act conversion
- conflicts with agricultural plans or policies

Visual and Aesthetics

- change in visual character and quality of the study area

Cultural Resources

- potential substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource

Traffic and Transportation

- addition of traffic on SR 70/99 (between I-5 and Elkhorn Boulevard), and on SR 65 (between I-80 and the SR 65 Lincoln Bypass), thereby lengthening the period of time during the peak period where these two freeways operate at LOS F conditions

Air Quality

- construction emissions would exceed FRAQMD and PCAPCD thresholds for ROG, NO_X, and PM_{10}
- exceedance of FRAQMD operational emission thresholds for ROG and NO_X
- exceedance of PCAPCD operational emission thresholds for NO_X

Noise

- exceedances of noise standards set by FHWA and Caltrans, and exceedances of noise thresholds as specified in the Sutter and Placer County General Plans

Biological Resources

- potential to affect seven special-status species and their habitat: vernal pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, Valley elderberry longhorn beetle, Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, giant garter snake, and Boggs Lake hedge hyssop

- potential loss of vernal pool species and their habitat

Growth

- one of many factors that would encourage growth in and near the study area by extending and improving the regional transportation system

Cumulative Impacts

Impacts related to the proposed project's cumulatively considerable contribution to (see Section 5.18):

- Land Use and Farmland – farmland conversion and Williamson Act conversion;
- Visual Resources – change in visual character and quality of the study area;
- Cultural Resources – potential adverse change in historic architectural resources;
- Traffic and Transportation

  - Add traffic, in 2040, to SR 70/99 and thereby lengthen the period of time during the peak period where SR 70/99 would operate at LOS F conditions (from I-5 to the proposed Placer Parkway)
  - Add traffic, in 2040, to SR 65 and thereby lengthen the period of time during the peak period where SR 70/99 would operate at LOS F conditions (between I-80 and Lincoln Bypass)
  - LOS impacts on Sierra College Boulevard between the future Valley View Parkway and English Colony Way; on Valley View Parkway, and on Whitney Ranch Parkway between SR 65 and University Avenue

- Air Quality
  - Exceed FRAQMD significance thresholds for ROG and NO_X during operation
  - Exceed PCAPCD significance thresholds for CO and NO_X
  - Potential air toxic impacts (diesel particulates) could occur depending on the future roadway alignment within the selected corridor and the distance to existing/future sensitive receptors
- Noise – increased noise related to vicinity development and associated roadway systems
- Hydrology – the combined effects of floodplain encroachment, loss of pervious surfaces, increased rates of runoff, and increased flooding
- Water Quality – degradation of water quality when combined with upstream flow increases
- Biological Resources – habitat loss and fragmentation

All substantial environmental effects identified above would be "significant impacts" under CEQA. All other impacts of the proposed project would be "less than significant," or "less than significant with mitigation incorporated" under CEQA. Minimization and mitigation strategies are identified in Chapter 4 of the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR and included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program in Appendix D of this Final Tier 1 EIS/EIR.

Revised Table ES-1
Summary of Potential Impacts from the Placer Parkway Alternatives

Potential Impact*		2004 No-Build	2004 Alternative 1 (Red)	2004 Alternative 2 (Orange)	2004 Alternative 3 (Blue)	2004 Alternative 4 (Yellow)	2004 Alternative 5 (Green)	2020	2040
For Tier 1 analysis, direct impacts assume all resources within a corridor would be affected. This is an extremely conservative assumption, which is likely to overstate impacts.									
Land Use	Land Use Conversion	No impact	1,918.43 acres	1,836.78 acres	1,863.56 acres	1,627.64 acres	**1,623.47 acres**	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Potentially Bisected Parcels	No impact	**26**	28‡	**26**	30	35†	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Compatibility with Proposed Land Uses	No impact	Depends on future land use approvals	Depends on future land use approvals	Depends on future land use approvals	Depends on future land use approvals	Depends on future land use approvals	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Conflict with General Plan Policies	No impact	Unavoidable conflict with policies related to preservation of agricultural land	Unavoidable conflict with policies related to preservation of agricultural land	Unavoidable conflict with policies related to preservation of agricultural land	Unavoidable conflict with policies related to preservation of agricultural land	Unavoidable conflict with policies related to preservation of agricultural land	Not analyzed**	Quantitative analysis only
Socioeconomics	Number of Residential Communities Affected	No impact	1†	**0**	**0**	1	1	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Number of Homes, Farmsteads Affected	No impact	4	4	**3**	7	10	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Number of Employment Centers Affected	No impact	**1**	**1**	**1**	2	2	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
Farmlands	Prime Farmland	No impact	68.5 ~~195.07~~acres	68.5 ~~309.60~~acres	68.62 ~~265.20~~acres	**38.44 ~~161.35~~acres**	38.65‡~~168.09~~ acres	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Unique Farmland	No impact	**89.99 ~~167.87~~acres**	419.11 ~~191.11~~acres	421.54 ~~203.26~~acres	433.98 ~~289.22~~acres	530.82 ~~388.69~~acres	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Farmland of Statewide Importance	No impact	435.75 ~~422~~acres	466.70 ~~464.13~~acres	464.01 ~~472.77~~acres	**302.23 ~~305.90~~acres**	307.48 ~~319.01~~acres	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Farmland of Local Importance	No impact	756.12 acres	592.79 acres	619.23 acres	569.44 acres	**452.9 acres**	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only

[1] LOS F2 is the added travel time for vehicles faced with 3 hours or more of LOS F conditions during the 3-hour a.m. and p.m. commute periods.

* For the build alternatives, the greatest potential impact is shown in a shaded cell; the least potential impact is shown in **bold**. The greatest and least potential impacts are not identified for criteria resulting in identical impacts among all build alternatives.
** A quantitative analysis for this resource was performed for existing conditions only (2004) in order to determine potential environmental impacts under Existing Plus Project conditions.
† Shading added
‡ Shading removed

Revised Table ES-1
Summary of Potential Impacts from the Placer Parkway Alternatives
(Continued)

Potential Impact*		2004 No-Build	2004 Alternative 1 (Red)	2004 Alternative 2 (Orange)	2004 Alternative 3 (Blue)	2004 Alternative 4 (Yellow)	2004 Alternative 5 (Green)	2020	2040
For Tier 1 analysis, direct impacts assume all resources within a corridor would be affected. This is an extremely conservative assumption, which is likely to overstate impacts.									
Farmlands (continued)	Grazing Land	No impact	**237.42 acres**	240.73 acres	240.77 acres	246.1 acres	248.5 acres	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Williamson Act Land Affected	No impact	**119.85 acres**	243.70 acres	240.56 acres	240.62 acres	240.26 acres	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
Public Service and Utilities	Municipal Facilities Affected	No impact	108.5 acres City of Roseville Retention Basin	109 acres City of Roseville Retention Basin	100 acres City of Roseville Retention Basin	100 acres City of Roseville Retention Basin	**96 acres** City of Roseville Retention Basin	Not analyzed**	Potential encroachment into future Western Regional Sanitary Landfill expansion area
Visual and Aesthetics	Potential Level of Impact from Build Alternative	No impact	Moderate/High	Moderate/High	Moderate/High	**Moderate**	**Moderate**	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
Cultural Resources	Archaeological Resources	No impact	No identified impact	No identified impact	No identified impact	No identified impact	No identified impact	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Built Environment Resources	No impact	1 property and 3 potential properties	1 property and 3 potential properties	1 property and 3 potential properties	**1 property**	**1 property**	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Paleontological Resources	No impact	High sensitivity	High sensitivity	High sensitivity	High sensitivity	High sensitivity	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
Traffic and Transportation	Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	**No-Build = 17,723,337** Alt 1 = 17,844,410 Alt 2 = 17,872,706 Alt 3 = 17,885,664 Alt 4 = 17,869,007 Alt 5 = 17,871,704‡	**No-Build = 25,977,539** Alt 1 = 26,419,100 Alt 2 = 26,472,170 Alt 3 = 26,482,608 Alt 4 = 26,476,869 Alt 5 = 26,455,500

[1] LOS F2 is the added travel time for vehicles faced with 3 hours or more of LOS F conditions during the 3-hour a.m. and p.m. commute periods.

* For the build alternatives, the greatest potential impact is shown in a shaded cell; the least potential impact is shown in **bold**. The greatest and least potential impacts are not identified for criteria resulting in identical impacts among all build alternatives.
** A quantitative analysis for this resource was performed for existing conditions only (2004) in order to determine potential environmental impacts under Existing Plus Project conditions.
† Shading added
‡ Shading removed

Revised Table ES-1
Summary of Potential Impacts from the Placer Parkway Alternatives
(Continued)

Potential Impact*		2004 No-Build	2004 Alternative 1 (Red)	2004 Alternative 2 (Orange)	2004 Alternative 3 (Blue)	2004 Alternative 4 (Yellow)	2004 Alternative 5 (Green)	2020	2040
For Tier 1 analysis, direct impacts assume all resources within a corridor would be affected. This is an extremely conservative assumption, which is likely to overstate impacts.									
Traffic and Transportation (continued)	Level of Service Impacts	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	All Alternatives affect: • Portions of SR 70/99 • Portions of SR 65	All Alternatives affect: • Portions of SR 70/99 • Portions of SR 65 • Portions of Fiddyment Road • Portions of Sierra College Blvd • Portions of Valley View Parkway • Portions of Whitney Ranch Parkway
	Vehicle Hours of Delay 3-hour a.m. and 3-hour p.m. Commute Periods	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	LOS D: No Build = 35,694 **Alternative 1 = 34,206** Alternative 2 = 34,272 Alternative 3 = 34,409 Alternative 4 = 34,501 Alternative 5 = 34,382	LOS D: No Build = 100,775 **Alternative 1 = 94,619** Alternative 2 = 95,077 Alternative 3 = 95,100 Alternative 4 = 95,493 Alternative 5 = 94,929
		Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	LOS E: No Build = 25,077 **Alternative 1 = 23,783** Alternative 2 = 23,880 Alternative 3 = 23,992 Alternative 4 = 24,077 Alternative 5 = 23,951	LOS E: No Build = 81,200 **Alternative 1 = 76,003** Alternative 2 = 76,450 Alternative 3 = 76,479 Alternative 4 = 76,885 Alternative 5 = 76,335
		Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	LOS F2[1] No Build = 16,447 **Alternative 1 = 15,448** Alternative 2 = 15,530 Alternative 3 = 15,617 Alternative 4 = 15,739 Alternative 5 = 15,588	LOS F2[1] No Build = 62,327 **Alternative 1 = 57,974** Alternative 2 = 58,463 Alternative 3 = 58,473 Alternative 4 = 58,885 Alternative 5 = 58,351

[1] LOS F2 is the added travel time for vehicles faced with 3 hours or more of LOS F conditions during the 3-hour a.m. and p.m. commute periods.

* For the build alternatives, the greatest potential impact is shown in a shaded cell; the least potential impact is shown in **bold**. The greatest and least potential impacts are not identified for criteria resulting in identical impacts among all build alternatives.
** A quantitative analysis for this resource was performed for existing conditions only (2004) in order to determine potential environmental impacts under Existing Plus Project conditions.
† Shading added
‡ Shading removed

Revised Table ES-1
Summary of Potential Impacts from the Placer Parkway Alternatives
(Continued)

Potential Impact*		2004 No-Build	2004 Alternative 1 (Red)	2004 Alternative 2 (Orange)	2004 Alternative 3 (Blue)	2004 Alternative 4 (Yellow)	2004 Alternative 5 (Green)	2020	2040
For Tier 1 analysis, direct impacts assume all resources within a corridor would be affected. This is an extremely conservative assumption, which is likely to overstate impacts.									
Air Quality	Construction Emissions – ROG, NO_X, PM_1	No impact	Exceeds FRAQMD and PCAPCD significance thresholds	Exceeds FRAQMD and PCAPCD significance thresholds	Exceeds FRAQMD and PCAPCD significance thresholds	Exceeds FRAQMD and PCAPCD significance thresholds	Exceeds FRAQMD and PCAPCD significance thresholds	N/A	N/A
	Operational Emissions-reactive organic gases (ROG)	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Alts 1-5 exceed FRAQMD significance thresholds	Alts 1-5 exceed FRAQMD significance thresholds ~~Alts 1-5~~ No exceedance of PCAPCD significance thresholds
	Operational Emissions – carbon monoxide (CO)	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Significance thresholds not exceeded	Alts 1-5 exceed PCAPDs ~~S~~Significance thresholds ~~not exceeded~~
	Operational Emissions – nitrogen oxide (NO_X)	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Alts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 exceed FRAQMD and PCAPCD significance thresholds	Alts 1-5 exceed FRAQMD significance thresholds Alts 1-5~~2, 3, 4, and 5~~ exceed PCAPCD significance thresholds
	Operational Emissions – respirable particulate matter (PM_{10})	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Significance thresholds not exceeded	Significance thresholds not exceeded
	Operational Emissions – sulfur dioxide (SO_X)	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Significance thresholds not exceeded	Significance thresholds not exceeded

[1] LOS F2 is the added travel time for vehicles faced with 3 hours or more of LOS F conditions during the 3-hour a.m. and p.m. commute periods.

* For the build alternatives, the greatest potential impact is shown in a shaded cell; the least potential impact is shown in **bold**. The greatest and least potential impacts are not identified for criteria resulting in identical impacts among all build alternatives.
** A quantitative analysis for this resource was performed for existing conditions only (2004) in order to determine potential environmental impacts under Existing Plus Project conditions.
† Shading added
‡ Shading removed

Revised Table ES-1
Summary of Potential Impacts from the Placer Parkway Alternatives
(Continued)

Potential Impact*		2004 No-Build	2004 Alternative 1 (Red)	2004 Alternative 2 (Orange)	2004 Alternative 3 (Blue)	2004 Alternative 4 (Yellow)	2004 Alternative 5 (Green)	2020	2040
For Tier 1 analysis, direct impacts assume all resources within a corridor would be affected. This is an extremely conservative assumption, which is likely to overstate impacts.									
Noise and Vibration	Noise at Residential Units Exceeding Threshold (66 dBA)	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	**Alt 1 = 0** Alt 2 = 2 Alt 3 = 2 **Alt 4 = 0** Alt 5 = 1	**Alt 1 = 0** Alt 2 = 2 Alt 3 = 2 **Alt 4 = 0** Alt 5 = 1
	Number of Roadways with projected increases in traffic noise > 12 dBA	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	No-Build = 1 Alt 1 = 1 Alt 2 = 1 Alt 3 = 1† Alt 5 = 1	No-Build = 15 Alt 1 = 11 Alt 2 = 11 Alt 3 = 11† **Alt 4 = 10**† **Alt 5 = 10**†
Energy	Estimated Fuel Consumption	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	Similar to but less than 2020	**No-Build = 717,544 gallons** Alt 1 = 722,445 gallons Alt 2 = 723,591 gallons Alt 3 = 724,115 gallons Alt 4 = 723,441 gallons Alt 5 = 723,550 gallons	**No-Build = 1,051,722 gallons** Alt 1 = 1,069,599 gallons Alt 2 = 1,071,747 gallons Alt 3 = 1,072,170 gallons Alt 4 = 1,071,938 gallons Alt 5 = 1,071,072 gallons
Hazardous Materials/Waste	Number of RECs potentially located within alignment	No impact	**3**	**3**	**3**	4	4	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
Hydrology and Floodplains	New Impervious Area	No impact	745 acres	737 acres	740 acres	624 acres	**622 acres**	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Stream/Canal Crossings	No impact	16	12	11	**10**	**10**	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Area Affected Within 100-Year Floodplain	No impact	**269 acres**	302 acres	317 acres	370 acres	372 acres	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only

[1] LOS F2 is the added travel time for vehicles faced with 3 hours or more of LOS F conditions during the 3-hour a.m. and p.m. commute periods.

* For the build alternatives, the greatest potential impact is shown in a shaded cell; the least potential impact is shown in **bold**. The greatest and least potential impacts are not identified for criteria resulting in identical impacts among all build alternatives.
** A quantitative analysis for this resource was performed for existing conditions only (2004) in order to determine potential environmental impacts under Existing Plus Project conditions.
† Shading added
‡ Shading removed

Revised Table ES-1
Summary of Potential Impacts from the Placer Parkway Alternatives
(Continued)

Potential Impact*		2004 No-Build	2004 Alternative 1 (Red)	2004 Alternative 2 (Orange)	2004 Alternative 3 (Blue)	2004 Alternative 4 (Yellow)	2004 Alternative 5 (Green)	2020	2040
For Tier 1 analysis, direct impacts assume all resources within a corridor would be affected. This is an extremely conservative assumption, which is likely to overstate impacts.									
Geology – Soils, Seismic	Soils or Geology Affected; Seismic or Geologic Factors	No impact	No major potential impacts	No major potential impacts	No major potential impacts	No major potential impacts	No major potential impacts	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
Water Quality	Watersheds Traversed	No impact	5	5	5	**4**	**4**	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
Biology	Riparian Habitat	No impact	5.9 acres	12.3 acres	**4.8 acres**	**4.8 acres**	4.9 acres	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Potential Giant Garter Snake Habitat	No impact	340.8 acres	340.8 acres	340.8 acres	**268.2 acres**	**268.2 acres**	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Potential Swainson's Hawk/White-Tailed Kite Nesting Habitat	No impact	6.4 acres	7.9 acres	4.6 acres	**3.3 acres**	3.6 acres	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Potential Swainson's Hawk Foraging Habitat	No impact	1,024.0 acres	952.3 acres	989.0 acres	863.5 acres	**759.4 acres**	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Potential Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Habitat	No impact	1.9 acres	1.3 acres	**1.2 acres**	**1.2 acres**	**1.2 acres**	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Wetlands	No impact	35.8 acres	30.9 acres	32 acres	28.3 acres	**28.0 acres**	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
	Vernal Pool Complexes	No impact	122.7 acres	124.1 acres	127.6 acres	**106.7 acres**	124.0 acres	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only

[1] LOS F2 is the added travel time for vehicles faced with 3 hours or more of LOS F conditions during the 3-hour a.m. and p.m. commute periods.

* For the build alternatives, the greatest potential impact is shown in a shaded cell; the least potential impact is shown in **bold**. The greatest and least potential impacts are not identified for criteria resulting in identical impacts among all build alternatives.
** A quantitative analysis for this resource was performed for existing conditions only (2004) in order to determine potential environmental impacts under Existing Plus Project conditions.
† Shading added
‡ Shading removed

Revised Table ES-1
Summary of Potential Impacts from the Placer Parkway Alternatives
(Continued)

		2004							
Potential Impact*		**No-Build**	**Alternative 1 (Red)**	**Alternative 2 (Orange)**	**Alternative 3 (Blue)**	**Alternative 4 (Yellow)**	**Alternative 5 (Green)**	**2020**	**2040**
For Tier 1 analysis, direct impacts assume all resources within a corridor would be affected. This is an extremely conservative assumption, which is likely to overstate impacts.									
Growth Inducement		No impact	Would help facilitate planned and proposed developments in the region and is expected to influence the timing of development in the vicinity of its proposed interchanges, particularly those proposed near vacant land adjacent to rapidly developing areas or areas now proposed for urban development	Would help facilitate planned and proposed developments in the region and is expected to influence the timing of development in the vicinity of its proposed interchanges, particularly those proposed near vacant land adjacent to rapidly developing areas or areas now proposed for urban development	Would help facilitate planned and proposed developments in the region and is expected to influence the timing of development in the vicinity of its proposed interchanges, particularly those proposed near vacant land adjacent to rapidly developing areas or areas now proposed for urban development	Would help facilitate planned and proposed developments in the region and is expected to influence the timing of development in the vicinity of its proposed interchanges, particularly those proposed near vacant land adjacent to rapidly developing areas or areas now proposed for urban development	Would help facilitate planned and proposed developments in the region and is expected to influence the timing of development in the vicinity of its proposed interchanges, particularly those proposed near vacant land adjacent to rapidly developing areas or areas now proposed for urban development	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only
Section 4(f) Analysis	4(f) Resources in the study area	No impact	RD 1000	RD 1000	RD 1000	RD 1000	RD 1000	Not analyzed**	Qualitative analysis only

[1] LOS F2 is the added travel time for vehicles faced with 3 hours or more of LOS F conditions during the 3-hour a.m. and p.m. commute periods.

* For the build alternatives, the greatest potential impact is shown in a shaded cell; the least potential impact is shown in **bold**. The greatest and least potential impacts are not identified for criteria resulting in identical impacts among all build alternatives.

** A quantitative analysis for this resource was performed for existing conditions only (2004) in order to determine potential environmental impacts under Existing Plus Project conditions.

† Shading added

‡ Shading removed