



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

TO: Board of Directors **DATE: March 12, 2008**

FROM: Celia McAdam, Executive Director

SUBJECT: PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT – EXPANDED ANALYSIS CHAPTER & RE-CIRCULATION

Action Requested

Direct the staff to implement “Option 2” for proceeding with the Placer Parkway environmental document. Specifically,:

1. Prepare a new chapter to the Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation’s Draft Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR) to analyze the potential impacts of more interchanges/corridor buffer reductions that may be proposed by others in the future and,
2. Re-circulate this part of the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR for public comment.

Background

Because of re-emerging questions about how the access and buffer provisions should be treated in the Placer Parkway environmental document, the Board conducted a workshop at your February 27, 2008. The purpose of that workshop was to review and discuss various options for moving forward.

Three options for addressing the issues, in addition to the current approach, were outlined for the Board, with a summary of pros and cons provided for each. A fourth option, to redefine the Placer Parkway project scope, was also suggested.

The Board directed staff to analyze the additional option and to place the issue on the next agenda for action.

Discussion

Each of the options presented have benefits and costs. Generally speaking, the greater the certainty in regards to the access issue is coupled with longer timelines and higher costs. The analysis of the various options is shown in Attachment 1.

In considering the options at the February 27 workshop, several Boardmembers indicated a preference for Option 2, which would continue the Tier 1 process and create a new chapter for the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR containing the expanded analysis on the potential impacts of hypothetical additional interchanges and buffer adjustments that may be proposed by others in the future. This new portion of the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR would be ‘re-circulated’ for public input.

These Boardmembers indicated that this option would provide a fuller disclosure of potential environmental effects and make a stronger foundation for subsequent Tier 2 (construction-level) environmental reviews and consideration of any new interchanges or buffer adjustments.

SPRTA Board of Directors
PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT
March, 2008
Page 2

As noted on Attachment 1, Option 2 would add approximately six months to the project schedule and require an estimated \$150,000 to \$200,000. This increased cost can largely be paid for with the current budget, but must be augmented by an estimated \$20,000 to \$30,000.

Staff requests the Board consider the attached options analysis, and direct staff to implement Option 2.

CM:ST:ss

PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION – SPRTA BOARD WORKSHOP – February 27, 2008 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT APPROACHES SUMMARY

March 26, 2008 – UPDATE

CURRENT APPROACH --	PRO	CON	COST/TIMELINES
Continue Tier 1 -- Expanded Access/Buffer Analysis	Eliminates unselected corridors by identifying a single corridor to move forward for Tier 2 (construction-level) analysis in short term (by end of 2008). Removes other corridors from further consideration.	Provides opportunity, but no <u>certainty</u> , for potential future additional interchanges/buffer modifications.	Estimated completion – Dec. 2008 Estimated cost – within existing budget
	Provides disclosure and some foundation for future potential interchanges/buffer modifications.		(Tier 2 – 2012/2013 -- \$7.5 million; could be phased)
	Tier 2 (construction-level) environmental process streamlined by completing the Tier 1 EIS/EIR and maintaining continuity with Resource Agencies & Tier 1 modified NEPA/404 process.		
	Shortens timeline and reduces cost for Tier 2 (construction-level) environmental document.		
	Provides opportunity to phase the Tier 2 environmental document to allow construction to coincide with adjacent development		
OPTIONS	PRO	CON	NOTES
OPTION 1: Start-over -- Tier 2 (construction-level) EIR	<i>Provides <u>highest certainty</u> for potential future additional interchanges/buffer modifications -- if adopted.</i>	<i>Fails to identify a corridor to preserve in the short term. All five alternatives would have to be examined at a project-level analysis until the final document is completed, which will take up to 8 years.</i>	<i>Estimated completion -- 2015/2016 Estimated cost -- \$8 to 10 million</i>
		<i>Would eliminate the opportunity to phase construction to coincide with adjacent development.</i>	
		<i>Loses much of the technical and public outreach work to date</i>	
		<i>Higher cost than Current Approach, adding from \$500,000 to \$2.5 million more for a construction level document</i>	
		<i>Requires substantially more time than Current Approach, approximately three years longer for a construction level document.</i>	

PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION – SPRTA BOARD WORKSHOP – February 27, 2008 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT APPROACHES SUMMARY

March 26, 2008 – UPDATE

<u>OPTIONS</u>	<u>PRO</u>	<u>CON</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
OPTION 2: Continue Tier 1 -- Expanded Access/Buffer Chapter & Re-Circulate	Same as <u>Current Approach</u> – but adds fuller disclosure and stronger foundation for future potential interchanges/buffer modifications.	Same as <u>Current Approach</u> - but six months for additional documentation, analysis, and recirculation	Estimated completion – June 2009 Estimated cost – within existing budget
		Adds \$150,000 to \$200,000 in additional cost	(Tier 2 – 2012/2013 -- \$7.5 million; could be phased)
OPTION 3: Continue Tier 1 -- No Access/Buffer Analysis	Eliminates unselected corridors by identifying a single corridor to move forward for Tier 2 (construction-level) analysis in short term (by end of 2008). Removes other corridors from further consideration.	Same as <u>Current Approach</u> – but significantly reduces streamlining opportunities in Tier 2 (construction-level) environmental process by losing continuity with Resource Agencies & Tier 1 modified NEPA/404 process.	Estimated completion – Oct. 2008 Estimated cost – within existing budget
	Removes three months from <u>Current Approach</u> timelines.	Probable lack of Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) designation in Tier 1 will require additional analysis in Tier 2 document	(Tier 2 – 2012/2013 -- \$8 million; could be phased)

PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION – SPRTA BOARD WORKSHOP – February 27, 2008 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT APPROACHES SUMMARY

March 26, 2008 – UPDATE

<u>OPTIONS</u>	<u>PRO</u>	<u>CON</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
OPTION 4: Start-over – Redefine ‘SPRTA’ EIS/EIR -- SR70/99 to Watt Ave. Extension with Corridor Alternatives 4 & 5	Same as Option 1 – provides highest certainty for potential future additional interchange/buffer modifications.	CEQA prohibits project ‘segmenting’ (chopping a project into smaller pieces). Western and Central Segments are a part of a regional connector.	Defers remainder of Tier 1/Tier 2 environmental reviews to occur concurrent with proposed specific plans.
	Eliminates potential conflicts with proposed specific plans. Developers, via environmental reviews/development agreements, provide ROW dedication and roadway construction	Same as Option 1 -- Fails to identify a corridor between the State highways in the short term. All five alternatives would have to be examined until the final document is completed, which will take up to 5 years.	Estimated completion Tier 1 – 2013 Estimated cost – \$4 million
	Shortens the ‘SPRTA’ analysis to Central and Western Segments.	Would require proposed specific plans to analyze off-site Parkway corridor alternatives until Tier 1 or Tier 2 is completed.	(Tier 2 – 2016/2017 -- \$5 million)
		Tier 2 concern with ‘Sunset Industrial Plan Area gap’ (SR 65 to Placer Ranch Specific Plan). Without Tier 1 corridor preservation, difficult to condition development proposals to protect future corridor.	
		Requires substantially more time and cost than Current Approach or Option 2.	
		Would require analysis of Watt Ave. extension.	
		Reduces streamlining opportunities in Tier 2 (construction-level) environmental process by losing continuity with Resource Agencies & the Tier 1 modified NEPA/404 process.	