



**PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION PROJECT**

**INTERVIEWS WITH COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS  
SUMMARY REPORT**

**September 2003**

**Prepared by Moore Iacofano Goltsman (MIG), Inc.  
In association with URS Corporation (URS)  
For Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA)**

## INTRODUCTION

As part of the public outreach effort for the Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Project, interviews with community stakeholders were undertaken to identify issues and concerns regarding the proposed Placer Parkway and gather relevant information on key issues early in the project planning process.

The project team conducted interviews with 30 community stakeholders between May and July 2003. Interviewees included representatives from public agencies, business, agriculture, environmental groups, and local government. Interviewees were asked to respond to twelve questions (listed below) that helped identify key issues, concerns, and benefits of the proposed project. Interviews were conducted in person or by telephone, and lasted 30–45 minutes.

The interviewed community stakeholders represent a wide range of interests and their comments are a reasonable sampling of perceptions and opinions across a broad spectrum of the community.

The identity of interviewees is not revealed to maintain confidentiality. Copies of the questionnaires (without interviewee identification) are available for review at PCTPA, 299 Nevada Street, Auburn, CA, 95603 (Ph: 530.823.4030; email: [pctpa@pctpa.org](mailto:pctpa@pctpa.org)).

### Interview Questions:

1. How familiar are you with the project?
2. How did you find out about the project?
3. How does the project impact you?
4. What do you think the project goals are (or should be)?
5. What are your main concerns and issues with the proposed project concept alternatives?
6. How do you want your concerns and issues addressed? What would be your preferred options for addressing your concerns and issues?
7. Do you envision potential benefits related to the project? What specific benefits do you see related to the proposed project concept alternatives?
8. Based on your knowledge of the project, what advantages and/or disadvantages do you perceive area related to the concept of limited access to the Central Segment of the proposed project?
9. What do you anticipate are the concerns of others regarding the project?
10. What roles do you want to play in the planning process?
11. What is the best way to keep you involved and how do we contact you in the future?
12. Can you identify other groups or individuals who should be involved in the planning process?

## **RESULTS**

The interviews touched on key concerns of this diverse group, and helped focus subsequent presentations to the public and discussions with local governments and resource agencies.

These interviews were only part of the scoping process. In addition to the interviews, written and verbal scoping comments were received from the general public (at public meetings and through newsletters), from meetings with jurisdictions and agencies, from responses to the Notice of Intent/Notice of Preparation, and from the Technical Advisory, Study Advisory and Policy Advisory Committees established for the project.

Some interviewees represented more than one constituency (e.g., an elected official was also a business person) and their comments are therefore categorized in multiple stakeholder group. Within a single stakeholder group there were often divergent opinions.

## **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS**

Table 1: Community Stakeholder Groups and Comments, encapsulates the main themes expressed by the community stakeholders. Comments in this section are organized under the following topics:

- Project Purpose and Goals
- Perceived Benefits of the Project
- General Issues and Concerns about the Project
- Planning Process

### **1.1 Project Purpose and Goals**

- Most of the interviewees feel the Parkway will improve regional mobility and connectivity by linking the area to regional highways and the Sacramento International Airport vicinity.
- Some interviewees expect the Parkway will help address some concerns regarding existing and planned growth in the area, including increases in population and traffic, and the long-term economic vitality of the region.

### **1.2 Perceived Benefits of the Project**

- Most of the interviewees feel the Parkway will improve access and mobility in the region by relieving congestion on highways and local roads.
- Some interviewees supported the limited-access buffer concept for its potential to protect open space.
- Some interviewees feel the Parkway will provide access to more affordable housing in the area.

### **1.3 General Issues and Concerns about the Project**

- Many interviewees were concerned about cumulative growth in the region and the potential for the Parkway to have growth-inducing impacts.
- Many interviewees were concerned about the loss of open space and potential negative impacts of the Parkway on the natural environment.
- Some interviewees were concerned about traffic impacts on local roads.
- Other issues cited by interviewees included impacts on farmland, private property, planned development, and access to housing in the region.

### **1.4 Planning Process**

- All interviewees requested more outreach activities and information on the project.
- Many interviewees supported the idea of greater coordination among local governments on existing development policies, such as the general plans.
- Some interviewees were concerned that the project timeline is too long to complete and construct the Parkway.

**Table 1: Community Stakeholder Groups and Comments**

Topic Areas:	Agriculture/Environmental	Business/Industrial	Community/Neighborhood	Developers	Federal Highway Administration	Metropolitan Planning Organization/SACOG	Local Govt./Advisory Committee
<p><b>Project Purpose and Goals</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Promotes strict urban limits in the project area.</li> <li>▪ Improves connections to SR-99/70, I-5, and the airport.</li> <li>▪ Provides alternate to I-80.</li> <li>▪ Balances community interests in defining constraints, opportunities, and cost-benefits.</li> <li>▪ Provides access to the planned industrial area in Sutter County.</li> <li>▪ Consider Bus Rapid Transit in the corridor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Connects people and commerce to commercial hubs.</li> <li>▪ Improves mobility and connectivity in the project area.</li> <li>▪ Provides an effective alternative to I-80 to facilitate the airport commute.</li> <li>▪ Attracts potential revenue to the project area.</li> <li>▪ Serves future growth and traffic needs of South Sutter County.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Addresses projected growth in Placer and Sutter Counties.</li> <li>▪ Provides a primary corridor between SR-99/70, I-80, and SR-65.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Preserves land to mitigate development and preserves open space.</li> <li>▪ Improves traffic flow at SR-99 and SR-65 interchanges.</li> <li>▪ Serves a larger mass transit function.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coordinate with Placer, Sutter and Sacramento Counties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Connects South Placer County to the airport.</li> <li>▪ Focus on creating a transportation corridor, not a development corridor.</li> <li>▪ Relieves congestion and supports long-term economy viability of the region.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improves mobility.</li> <li>▪ Provides alternative route between SR-99 and SR-65.</li> <li>▪ Relieves traffic on local streets and major highways.</li> <li>▪ Minimizes impacts on the environment, both human and natural; biggest environmental impact: growth inducement.</li> <li>▪ Promotes community stability.</li> <li>▪ Provides a benefit: to the environment, farmlands, economy, and local communities.</li> <li>▪ Aids long-term health of this region's economy.</li> <li>▪ Enhances quality of life: creating conditions that support flow of traffic, development of housing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Perceived Benefits of the Project</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Saves open space.</li> <li>▪ Limiting access has the positive benefit of preserving farmland, and addressing growth inducing elements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improves overall utility of the corridor.</li> <li>▪ Improves links to interchanges and airport.</li> <li>▪ Protects open space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Addresses traffic issues in South Placer County.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides access to planned uses and improves mobility within the corridor.</li> <li>▪ Provides congestion relief for South Placer County.</li> <li>▪ Preserves open space.</li> <li>▪ Potentially supports more affordable housing in the area.</li> <li>▪ Solves Baseline Road inadequacies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improves connectivity of freeway systems.</li> <li>▪ Relieves pressure on I-80.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improves access and congestion between Roseville and Sacramento, and to Lincoln, Rocklin, and the airport.</li> <li>▪ Improves local roads, regional highways and link to Sacramento Int'l Airport.</li> <li>▪ Improves access from Placer County - supports McClellan as major employment center.</li> </ul>

**Table 1: Community Stakeholder Groups and Comments (Contd.)**

<i>Topic Areas:</i>	Agriculture/Environmental	Business/Industrial	Community/Neighborhood	Developers	Federal Highway Administration	Metropolitan Planning Organization/SACOG	Local Govt./Advisory Committee
<b>General Issues and Concerns about the Project</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Potential fragmentation of valuable farmland parcels</li> <li>▪ Growth inducement.</li> <li>▪ Impacts on habitat, sensitive species, and natural resources, air and water quality.</li> <li>▪ Loss of productive farmland and impacts to open space in area.</li> <li>▪ Effectiveness of the proposed buffer.</li> <li>▪ Impact on access to housing.</li> <li>▪ Cumulative impacts of planned development on the corridor.</li> <li>▪ Impact of heat generated by the road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Connections to growing communities at the edges of the region.</li> <li>▪ Impact on housing availability in the area.</li> <li>▪ Balancing transit and road needs.</li> <li>▪ Impacts on the environment.</li> <li>▪ The long length of time required to complete and construct the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Potential growth inducing impacts.</li> <li>▪ Quality of life issues related to future traffic growth.</li> <li>▪ Funding for the project.</li> <li>▪ Balancing growth management with improved services in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Impact on local roadways.</li> <li>▪ Potential impact on zoning in Placer County; and property values.</li> <li>▪ Affects on the current and future plans for development.</li> <li>▪ Impacts on transportation corridors and access in the area.</li> <li>▪ Impact on De La Salle University campus.</li> <li>▪ Potential growth inducing impacts in the area.</li> <li>▪ Fragmentation of parcels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Impact on future growth and connectivity.</li> <li>▪ Impact of Tier 1 process on project schedule.</li> <li>▪ Accuracy of traffic data.</li> <li>▪ Preserving open space.</li> <li>▪ Coordination of land use decisions with this project</li> <li>▪ Environmental impacts including air quality, habitat, wetlands, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PCTPA and SACOG commitment to open space.</li> <li>▪ Growth management in the region.</li> <li>▪ Open space protection.</li> <li>▪ Preserving land between Fiddymont and Pleasant Grove Roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Connectivity, open space, and environmental impacts.</li> <li>▪ Need for a coordinated and proactive approach for open space, development and transportation.</li> <li>▪ Impacts on citizens, business, land use activities, and natural resources.</li> <li>▪ Project feasibility.</li> <li>▪ Impact on local roads due to limited access.</li> <li>▪ Growth impacts.</li> <li>▪ Traffic impacts of recently developed casino.</li> <li>▪ Opportunity cost of funding the Parkway.</li> <li>▪ Impact on private property.</li> </ul>
<b>Planning Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide full disclosure of technical information.</li> <li>▪ Examine existing policies on urban growth.</li> <li>▪ Address growth and traffic needs.</li> <li>▪ Proactively address transportation needs of development, and growth inducing impacts.</li> <li>▪ Work within the existing city general plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Look at the Airport Master Plan.</li> <li>▪ Provide more outreach and information.</li> <li>▪ Emphasize open space to sell the idea politically.</li> <li>▪ Consider growth and traffic projections for the region.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide more outreach and information.</li> <li>▪ Use open space to slow down development.</li> <li>▪ Consider Sunset Boulevard to move traffic out of Rocklin/Lincoln area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide more outreach and information.</li> <li>▪ Ensure an efficient and methodical process for choosing the final alternative.</li> <li>▪ Promote mixed land use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide more outreach and information.</li> <li>▪ Work with local governments to coordinate with general plans.</li> <li>▪ Develop a county-specific land use plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Develop a public relations plan and better communications with SACOG.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Buy easements on both sides of right-of-way to address development impacts.</li> <li>▪ Develop a Habitat Conservation Plan.</li> <li>▪ Provide more outreach and information.</li> <li>▪ Develop a coordinated planning approach.</li> <li>▪ Consider access to Parkway via a Watt Avenue extension.</li> <li>▪ Maintain limited access and 1,000-foot buffer; transfer easement to conservation group.</li> <li>▪ Design and build project to meet state standards.</li> </ul>