

PLACER PARKWAY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION PROJECT

PUBLIC MEETING

VETERANS MEMORIAL COMMUNITY BUILDING

Yuba City, CA

Monday, August 6, 2007

7:00 P.M.

Reported by: JILL R. MCLEOD, CSR #10071  
DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS  
1107 2nd Street, Suite 210  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 498-9288

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

1 MR. HILL: Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. We are  
2 going to get started with our public hearing, Placer Parkway,  
3 so if you would like to take your seats, we will get underway  
4 momentarily. Please make sure you have signed in at the  
5 door. We do have handout materials that you can take with  
6 you and refer to in the course of tonight's meeting and we  
7 will get underway once we get everybody signed in here.  
8 Thank you.

9 All right. My name is Peter Hill. I'm a member of the  
10 Rocklin City Council and the chairman of the South Placer  
11 Regional Transportation Authority, SPRTA. SPRTA sits over  
12 the cities of South Placer, the City of Lincoln, Rocklin,  
13 Roseville and the County of Placer; and now I would like to  
14 ask each of the authority members to introduce themselves and  
15 tell which jurisdiction they represent. Primo.

16 MR. SANTINI: My name is Primo Santini. I'm a council  
17 member with the City of Lincoln.

18 MR. UHLER: I am Kirk Uhler, member, Board of  
19 Supervisors.

20 MR. GRAY: My name is Jim Gray, mayor of Roseville.

21 MR. HILL: SPRTA's purpose is to coordinate planning,  
22 design, financing and construction of regional transportation  
23 improvements such as the Placer Parkway. The Placer County  
24 Transportation Planning Agency or PCTPA employs all the staff  
25 for the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority.

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

2

1 The purpose of this public hearing is to receive  
2 comments on the Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation,  
3 Draft Tier 1, EIS/EIR. And please note, this is a public  
4 hearing. It's an opportunity for the authority members to  
5 hear you. It's not a question and answer period, and neither  
6 the board nor the staff will be responding to questions or  
7 comments.

8 The sole objective is to listen to the comments on the  
9 draft EIR/EIS and we appreciate you being here and value your  
10 comments. Comments may be written or oral and both are  
11 treated the same. All comments received at the public  
12 hearing and within the formal comment period will be recorded  
13 and transcribed and they will become part of the formal  
14 record.

15 Following the comment period, staff will review all

16 information received and prepare responses to be included in  
17 the final EIS/EIR. If you want to know about future  
18 meetings, be sure to sign in.

19 For written comments, you can either use the form  
20 provided or you can send us a letter. Written comments that  
21 you turn in will become part of the official record and you  
22 can turn comments in today or mail them to us. The address  
23 is on the form. Comments are due by August the 20th, 2007.

24 A court reporter is here and will be recording the  
25 comments tonight, and you are encouraged to make comments on

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

3

1 any aspect or any part of the proposed corridor preservation  
2 project and the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR.

3 And I would like to now introduce Larry Montna, who's  
4 the vice-chair of the Sutter County Board of Supervisors, who  
5 will make some general comments and remarks about the project  
6 and Sutter County's role in the environmental review process.  
7 Larry.

8 MR. MONTNA: Thank you. I am glad that you came to  
9 beautiful Sutter County tonight to allow the citizens of  
10 Sutter County to tell us, good or bad, whatever way they  
11 happen to feel like.

12 I told you earlier that I liked the parkway thing a lot  
13 better, when I was on the Board 14 years ago, and it started  
14 at Newcastle and ended up about Dixon, to get some of the  
15 traffic out of Sacramento, but whatever we get in here will  
16 sure improve things for the people of your county and our

17 county both.

18 You know, with the population that has increased,  
19 especially in the Lincoln area, it's going to be detrimental  
20 to anybody trying to get up and down 65, up through there.

21 Again, I would like to thank you for coming to Sutter  
22 County, for our citizens to have input, and hope for the  
23 best, and maybe we can come to a conclusion that we can get  
24 this thing built before long.

25 Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen.

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

4

1 MR. HILL: Thanks, Larry. Now, I would like to  
2 introduce Daniel Iacofano and he will provide some more  
3 information. Go ahead.

4 MR. IACOFANO: Very good. Thank you, Chairman Hill. My  
5 name is Daniel Iacofano and I work with the firm of MIG. We  
6 are consultants to the team that is in charge of preparing  
7 the environmental documentation that you're here to comment  
8 on this evening.

9 My role tonight would be to moderate the session, make  
10 sure we are following proper procedure as is required under  
11 the federal guidelines for conducting this kind of public  
12 hearing for an environmental impact statement draft that has  
13 been prepared and we are very glad to see you here tonight.

14 This is an important part of our process and I can  
15 assure you we take each and every one of your comments very  
16 seriously and it will be added into the record and it will be

17 part of the record for this environmental document.

18         The agenda, you should have copies of, are on the yellow  
19 paper. We will, after a few brief remarks, provide you an  
20 overview of the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR, as we call it,  
21 environmental impact statement, environmental impact review,  
22 so we use those two sets of acronyms, referring to the  
23 federal document and the state document, EIS/EIR,  
24 respectively, so that brief presentation will allow you to  
25 understand the nature of the project, the various

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

5

1 alternatives that have been explored and give you information  
2 on what is contained in the EIR as more of a guide to that  
3 document.

4         We will then move right into public comments on the  
5 Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR and you will have a chance to make your  
6 comments here before the Board members and we will go through  
7 each of the speakers in turn.

8         I will say a little bit more about the procedures here  
9 and also as we get to that part of the agenda, and then the  
10 Board members, SPRTA, will have a few closing remarks. We  
11 hope to conclude by 9 p.m. this evening, and just gauging the  
12 number of people here, we should be well within the time  
13 frame for tonight's meeting.

14         So if you do wish to make a comment here to the Board  
15 and for the official record, we'd ask that you fill out a  
16 speaker card, and you should have a copy of this. If not,  
17 there are plenty of those by the door, and this just asks for

18 your name and address. We are asking that you limit your  
19 remarks here this evening to three minutes. We are going to  
20 make sure everybody has the exact same amount of time. We  
21 want to make sure that everyone here does have a chance to  
22 speak. If we get a big rush of people at the door, we will  
23 stay as long as necessary to make sure that we have heard  
24 from every person, and we are asking that you be signed up or  
25 registered with your speaker cards submitted by 8:45, so we

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

6

1 can be sure to get everybody into the program this evening,  
2 and we will ask that you speak only one time here so that we  
3 can make sure we get done in a timely fashion.

4       It's also possible for you to submit comment cards by  
5 mail or e-mail and we will have information as to how you can  
6 do that up on the slide screen at the end of the  
7 presentation. You can also see information on the documents  
8 there by the door that gives you the address and the e-mail  
9 address locations, if you want to send in any written  
10 comments or more extensive comments than you would like to  
11 make this evening. That is entirely your choice and we are  
12 very happy to receive those written comments in whatever form  
13 you would like to provide them.

14       So that is essentially the agenda for this evening. One  
15 other item of housekeeping, there is a comment card. If for  
16 some reason you want to write out written comments to add to  
17 the record, you may do so with this green comment card. We

18 will collect those at the end of the session, or if you have  
19 to leave early, then you can send -- you can hand them in to  
20 us before then.

21 Also we are making a complete stenographic record of the  
22 proceedings, as is required, so we have a very accurate  
23 transcription of all the points made here this evening. We  
24 are also tape-recording the session, and again, it's for the  
25 purpose of getting an accurate documentation and record of

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

7

1 the meeting, so the stenographer record, the tape-recorder  
2 record will help us do that.

3 So once again, I do thank you very much for attending  
4 the meeting, the public hearing this evening, and I would now  
5 like to introduce the two staff members that are critical in  
6 the preparation of this. One of whom will be speaking to you  
7 before the comments this evening. Celia McAdam, who's the  
8 executive director of the Placer County Transportation  
9 Planning Agency; and Stan Tidman, who will be making a  
10 presentation this evening on an overview of the draft  
11 EIS/EIR. Stan is the project manager for PCTPA and he will  
12 be a resource for you following tonight's meeting, if any  
13 questions should arise or you have any questions following  
14 tonight's meeting that we might be able to answer for you.  
15 But please be aware that, in the course of tonight's meeting,  
16 as Chairman Hill indicated, we are not here to engage in a  
17 dialog or discussion. Unfortunately, our rules of procedure  
18 don't allow for that. This is to receive and obtain from you

19 comments, questions that then can be taken up and studied in  
20 detail following today's session, so other matters that you  
21 may wish to follow-up on with any of the staff people, you  
22 can do so by calling the agencies that are responsible for  
23 preparing these materials.

24           So with that, let me introduce Stan Tidman, who will  
25 take us through an overview of the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

8

1 document, and please pay attention here to the screen up  
2 front. Let's see if we can dim the lights. It might make  
3 the screen easier to read, if that is okay in the back, and I  
4 will turn it over to Stan here.

5           MR. TIDMAN: Daniel, thank you very much. Can  
6 everybody hear me with this thing? Again, my name is  
7 Stan Tidman. I work with the Placer County Transportation  
8 Planning Agency, and what I would like to do is quickly, yet  
9 as comprehensively as possible, give you an overview of the  
10 project, a little bit about its background and a little bit  
11 about the Draft Tier 1 EIS/EIR, and I will refer to that  
12 Tier 1 document as a draft, just to try to speed things up,  
13 and then I will finish up with a very brief next step,  
14 basically one slide that will help you understand about what  
15 we hope to do as we finish up the project.

16           From a project background perspective, I think everybody  
17 is aware that the Placer Parkway is a high priority regional  
18 transportation facility that connects State Route 70/99 to

19 State Route 65.

20 The concept for a parkway began back in, I want to say  
21 1994, with a Placer County General Plan. In its circulation  
22 element, this transportation facility actually shows up as a  
23 plan line. In the late '90's, we started actually working on  
24 some preliminary planning documents. That concept plan was  
25 completed in the year 2000 and a project study report or PSR

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

9

1 was concluded in 2001.

2 What both of these documents did was provide a little  
3 bit more detail to the concept of this connector route,  
4 actually outline some very specific goals and policies from  
5 which to measure progress on actually implementing the  
6 project. I have the series of conceptual corridor  
7 alignments. We did a little bit of environmental work and  
8 actually developed some funding strategies of which is  
9 helping to pay for the actual preparation of this document.

10 The need or the problem that we are trying to address is  
11 to carve out or preserve a corridor for a future  
12 right-of-way. In the study area, around the study area, we  
13 have some of the fastest growing communities in the SACOG  
14 region. With that, there is a fair amount of population  
15 growth. SACOG is actually saying that population in western  
16 Placer County and South Sutter County will be doubling  
17 between the years 2000 and 2025, and so with that population  
18 growth comes a fair amount of job growth. With job growth,  
19 there is folks trying to get to and from jobs as well as

20 moving of goods.

21 The solution or the purpose of the project, again, is to  
22 actually preserve a corridor, and again, you're going to hear  
23 a lot about corridors tonight, so that we can actually then  
24 figure out an alignment for a roadway in the future, so  
25 again, we are just trying to identify a corridor through this

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

10

1 environmental review process.

2 We are also hoping to respond to both existing and  
3 anticipated travel, that is the congestion, trying to make  
4 things a little better in Western Placer and South Sutter  
5 Counties, and all of this then will help to provide access to  
6 the Regional Transportation Network that will help support  
7 the planned growth. In other words, the growth that is  
8 identified in the Sutter County general plan as well as the  
9 Placer County general plan as well as then moving goods and  
10 services for projected growth, which we will talk a little  
11 bit more about in just a minute.

12 The players in the environmental review, the Federal  
13 Highway Administration or FHWA is the federal lead. They are  
14 being assisted by CalTrans as we work through this process,  
15 and then as the chair indicated, SPRTA, South Placer County  
16 Regional Transportation Authority is the local project  
17 sponsor, and we are addressing the state requirements.  
18 PCTPA, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency provides  
19 the staffing for SPRTA.

20           The project location -- I am going to have to try to  
21 work this wand here real quick. Let me go back to project  
22 locations. It basically shows the regional perspective here,  
23 the general six city SACOG area. We are here in Yuba City,  
24 Sacramento, Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln area, State Route 65,  
25 State Route 70/99, I-5, I-80.

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

11

1           The shaded area is basically the approximate 55 square  
2 mile project study area, which you can get a better feel for  
3 in this next slide, and again, for orientation purposes, on  
4 the west, State Route 70/99, on the east, State Route 65,  
5 general project boundaries, North and South Baseline and  
6 Riego to the south, Sunset Boulevard West and Howsley here to  
7 the north.

8           Again, in the document, you will see a lot of reference  
9 to three segment areas, the western, central and eastern  
10 segments. In the western segment, from State Route 70/99 to  
11 Pleasant Grove Road, we are looking at a corridor width of  
12 500 feet, and that would be like basically the same here in  
13 the east, generally from Fiddymment, east from State Route 65;  
14 and then in the 7-mile segment between Pleasant Grove and  
15 Fiddymment, we are looking at a 1,000-foot wide corridor, so  
16 it's a barium corridor, 500 feet on either edge and a 1,000  
17 feet in the central area.

18           We are also going to be talking about limited access,  
19 minimizing or avoiding growth inducement, and one of the  
20 underlying principles is this 7-mile segment between Pleasant

21 Grove Road and Fiddymment where we are not proposing to have  
22 any interchange at all, and again, the hope there is to  
23 maintain a free flow of traffic as well as avoiding any  
24 growth-inducing sort of impacts associated with the parkway,  
25 so that is a little bit about the study area.

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

12

1 I should mention that, again, it does take in just a  
2 small sliver of northern Sacramento County here, north of  
3 Riego Road and immediately east of 70/99.

4 Throughout the project, we have had a number of  
5 recurring project challenges. In fact, we had a scoping  
6 meeting in 2003 and a public meeting and a lot of feedback  
7 that we got from property owners asking, "Why has this taken  
8 so long? Why can't you select one?" I think we are getting  
9 closer with this. We are about a year away.

10 Another concept or issue that we have had to deal with,  
11 and I have a separate slide on this, is the tiering process.  
12 This is an environmental review process that will help  
13 streamline large projects, like the Placer Parkway, that have  
14 a number of phases or stages, and again, I have a separate  
15 slide to go into that a little bit more.

16 Again, as we kicked off this project in 2003, there was  
17 a fair amount of skepticism or concern about, again, the  
18 interchange spacing, lack of an interchange and that 7-mile  
19 segment between Pleasant Grove and Fiddymment Road as well as  
20 something called the no development buffer area within that,

21 where we would be limiting or restricting urban development.

22 We had some selected officials, we had some developer  
23 folks, we had some environmental groups that were very  
24 concerned about the feasibility of actually implementing  
25 these two principles.

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

13

1 We went back, worked over the course of a year with  
2 three advisory groups, and basically the direction we got  
3 after that one-year period was to continue to move on. We  
4 did clarify the text in some of the policies to eliminate  
5 some of the ambiguity, but again, the general direction was  
6 to continue on with the project.

7 We have also been doing a fair amount of work with the  
8 federal and state resource agencies. These are groups like  
9 the U.S. Army Corp. of Engineers, USEPA, State Department of  
10 Fish and Game, on addressing various provisions of the Clean  
11 Water Act, and again, these are specifically aquatic resource  
12 concerns, wetlands and things of that nature.

13 Because the project doesn't require any construction,  
14 there is actually no federal permit involved in the project,  
15 but we did want to do our due diligence, so we had early  
16 consultation with these groups, and that first meeting in  
17 August of 2003, I think it was, has now turned into, I think  
18 we have had 16 or 17 meetings. We actually have a formal  
19 modified process that we are working through, to work  
20 together with these groups to actually agree on purpose and  
21 need. That is what we talked a little bit earlier about, by

22 criteria for selecting alternatives and the range of  
23 alternatives, the ranges that we have talked about today.

24 And then finally, again, I have a separate slide that  
25 addresses some of the concurrent, both planning and urban

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

14

1 development proposals that are taking place within the  
2 project vicinity, and immediately around it as it affects the  
3 parkway project.

4 I want to tell you a little bit more about this tiering  
5 concept. Again, as I said, this is a streamlining tool for  
6 large environmental reviews like the Placer Parkway. You are  
7 going -- in the document, you will see a lot of reference to  
8 Tier 1, Tier 2.

9 Tier 1 is the stage we are at right now. We are trying  
10 to do a very broad-based developmental analysis to compare  
11 the relative differences among five alternatives and the  
12 no-build.

13 Contrast that with the Tier 2 or more traditional design  
14 and construction type of project where you're analyzing the  
15 impacts of a specific roadway. Again, that is the subject of  
16 a separate environmental analysis, once the Tier 1 project is  
17 complete.

18 Key features of this tiering project. In our minds, we  
19 felt like this would be the faster way of actually  
20 identifying and selecting a corridor rather than going  
21 through the traditional route adoption, design and then

22 construction level environmental document.

23 Again, you will see in the next slide, the amount of  
24 urban development that is being proposed in the area, so to  
25 identify that corridor as quickly as possible so we are not

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

15

1 precluding any viable alternative from consideration.

2 The flip side of this is a concept that has not been  
3 used, that I know of, very much in Northern California at  
4 this time, so we have had to work quite closely with our  
5 federal partners, with CalTrans as well as some of the  
6 federal resource strategies and the public to kind of  
7 reenforce the idea that that is a general, broad-based level  
8 of review.

9 Again, the proposed and planned development -- I am  
10 going to try to use this wand here again. For orientation,  
11 here on the west, State Route 70/99, on the east, 65, once  
12 again on the south, Baseline and Riego, Sunset Boulevard West  
13 and Howsley here to the north.

14 The red is basically those projects that are either  
15 included in our current plans or being proposed. For  
16 example, back in April, there was actually a scoping meeting  
17 for the proposed Sutter Point specific plan area here. When  
18 you cross the county line into Placer County, there are a  
19 number of specific development proposals in one form or  
20 another. Curry Creek, Sierra Vista, Creek View, Regional  
21 University, Brookfield specific plan, Placer Ranch specific  
22 plan, and even including the comprehensive update that the

23 City of Lincoln is doing with their general plan.

24 As you know, SACOG has spent a lot of time on its  
25 blueprint project, which is a fair amount of urban

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

16

1 development in the south Sutter area, and Placer County is  
2 working on a conservation plan with the resource agency, of  
3 which SPRTA would intend to be a participating agency and  
4 have the parkway as a covered activity, so generally 10 to 15  
5 planning and urban development proposals, all going on at the  
6 same time, all with different objectives, different scopes  
7 and different processes.

8 What a lot of them do have in common is that they are  
9 going to get their approvals before we do. They are going to  
10 be approved before the Tier 1 process is done and certainly  
11 before the subsequent Tier 2 work is done, so that has raised  
12 significant challenges for us to address some of those. We  
13 have actually included a number of developers on one of our  
14 advisory committees, the study advisory committee. We have  
15 shared information with them as well as they with us, and  
16 it's been a good forum to share these concerns.

17 Have we resolved all the issues? No, we haven't, but it  
18 is something that we are working on on a fairly constant  
19 basis.

20 So that gives you a little bit of a background of the  
21 project. Now, I would like to summarize a little bit about  
22 the information that is in the actual draft itself and we do

23 have copies in the back for you to flip through. We also  
24 have copies of the executive summary, which I think we do a  
25 pretty fair job of giving you the who, what, where, when, why

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

17

1 of the project. These are basically the general steps in the  
2 process that we are addressing. We have talked about purpose  
3 and need. We will talk in a minute a little bit about the  
4 alternatives themselves.

5       There are 14 technical reports in the studies that we  
6 completed that actually became the foundation of the draft  
7 document. We prepared the document, circulated it for  
8 review. That, I believe, was July 2nd, when the formal  
9 comment period began, and we are basically at the point now  
10 where we are looking for public comments, so this is about  
11 where we are in the process.

12       Once the comment period is over, we will go back to work  
13 with our consultant group with the federal, state and local  
14 jurisdictions as well as the agencies to kind of process the  
15 information that you're sharing with us tonight. That will  
16 all be wrapped up in the final environmental document as well  
17 as the preferred alternative.

18       Once that is done, we have to perform two administrative  
19 actions. The Federal Highway Administration will complete  
20 the preparation of a Record of Decision and the SPRTA board  
21 will complete a Notice of Determination. Basically what  
22 those two documents do is indicate that we have gone through  
23 the process and complied with the appropriate federal and

24 state laws.

25 Again, Daniel, I think opened up the session here

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

18

1 talking a little bit about NEPA, National Environmental  
2 Policy Act, and CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act.

3 The reason why we are doing the combined document is  
4 basically three reasons. We got federal money to help in the  
5 preparation of the document. We are working very closely  
6 with federal resource agencies on, again, the Clean Water Act  
7 and Endangered Species Act provisions, and by getting a  
8 federal clearance, it always keeps the door open for  
9 potential future funding for design and construction work.  
10 We are not holding our breath on that, but it's certainly  
11 something that could happen.

12 I want to say that there is probably more similarities  
13 between the two laws than differences, but for this project,  
14 there are two, I think, very key differences that we want to  
15 disclose. First, from a NEPA perspective, the law discloses  
16 impact but NEPA does not compel us to categorize those  
17 impacts into any kind of level or degree of significance.

18 CEQA is just the opposite. CEQA does say we have to  
19 disclose and analyze any potential significant impact. CEQA  
20 also requires that we identify the environmental superior  
21 alternative from the analysis framework, and I think this  
22 first bullet and subtopics are key.

23 What the draft actually does is analyze the impacts of

24 identification and selection and ultimate acquisition of a  
25 corridor, and again, that corridor is that 500-foot to

1 1,000-foot wide corridor between 65 and 70/99.

2       The mound of impact for actually selecting a corridor  
3 and then buying that property or acquiring it is probably not  
4 an awful lot, so what the draft does is it takes it one step  
5 further and analyzes foreseeable general impacts of building  
6 and operating a 4 to 6-lane roadway in each one of the  
7 proposed build alternatives, so I think it's key that we are  
8 not only looking at the corridor selection and acquisition  
9 part of this but we are also trying to do our homework for  
10 Tier 2 and start calling out potential impacts as it's  
11 related to the actual facility itself.

12       We have analyzed this basically in three different time  
13 frames. First, existing conditions, that is the year 2004,  
14 for the purposes of the environmental document. Also from  
15 the year 2020, we have assumed that 2020 opening date, just  
16 for analysis purposes. One of the key assumptions in that  
17 2020 opening year scenario is residential build-out of the  
18 general plans in Sutter County, Placer County, Roseville,  
19 Rocklin, Lincoln. Again, we try to gauge the current level  
20 of environmental review with those general plans. We also  
21 look at a condition, 2040, 20 years after the opening of the  
22 project.

23       This is something the Federal Highway Administration is  
24 very interested in, and one of the key points of that

25 scenario is also residential development, basically west of

1 Sierra College Boulevard, as it shows in all the current  
2 general plans, plus the majority of those proposed  
3 developments that I just showed you on the slide that had all  
4 the red, South Sutter Point, Placer Ranch, Regional  
5 University. All of those are wrapped up into this 2040  
6 scenario.

7 The draft also analyzes various types of impacts. The  
8 first one, direct impacts, kind of easy. Those are impacts  
9 directly caused by the project, at the same time as the  
10 project and very near the project.

11 I am also going to talk about secondary, indirect  
12 impacts, but cumulative. These are ones that involve two or  
13 more impacts, that when considered together, increase the  
14 severity of an impact on a resource.

15 From a secondary and indirect impact perspective, I want  
16 to show you this map. Secondary and indirect impacts are  
17 ones that are caused by the project. Typically, either later  
18 in time or much further away from the project area, and this  
19 is an example of, again, sorry, it's another different scale  
20 map, but here is generally the 55-mile area, square mile area  
21 of the project study area.

22 For this particular series of impact analysis, which  
23 included growth inducement analysis, we actually expanded the  
24 project area, and again, from generally Sierra College

1 River all the way up to Nicholas Road and to the proposed New  
2 Spirit Influence, as reflected in the city of Lincoln's plan.  
3 Again, the document, depending on the type of impact, wasn't  
4 confined to analysis just within the study area. In this  
5 case, we went well beyond those project boundaries.

6 A little bit about the alternative selection process.  
7 Again, this is something we worked on from 2003 to 2005. It  
8 involved a very comprehensive, extensive, technical and  
9 public review process that focused on basically environmental  
10 and transportation screening along with ways to avoid any  
11 fatal flaws, something that would likely stop the project.  
12 Again, something we couldn't permit or to avoid or minimize  
13 impacts to specific resource areas and existing development.  
14 All of this, with trying to compare it back to the purpose  
15 and need to make sure we are in the ball park with the  
16 purpose and need.

17 We ran this through a number of steps. We started -- I  
18 mentioned the project study report, or PSR and the conceptual  
19 alignments back from 2001. We ran this thing through, again,  
20 the environmental and transportation screening, again trying  
21 to avoid the impacts on the screen there. We refined these.  
22 We rescreened them. We worked with the local jurisdictions  
23 and public in seeing if there was something we missed. We  
24 actually went through a separate process with the federal and  
25 state resource groups on a series of avoidance alternatives,

1 and basically what they are interested in is seeing -- they  
2 don't want to see a new transportation facility, so we looked  
3 at ways of, could we meet purpose and need without building a  
4 parkway or if we built a shorter parkway? And again, the  
5 document goes into great detail and analysis that we  
6 completed for that.

7 And then toward the end of the process, we actually --  
8 the direction of the SPRTA board went back and looked at  
9 several landowner alignments. One that has become one of the  
10 build alternatives.

11 So again, and I can't emphasize this enough, there was a  
12 fair amount of public as well as agency participation over  
13 this two-year period. I think we had 15 or 16 advisory  
14 committee meetings. We had two environmental scoping  
15 meetings. One down at Pleasant Grove School. We had two  
16 public meetings in 2004. Again, down at Pleasant Grove on  
17 the Sutter side, to develop basically what has now resulted  
18 in five build alternatives; and the draft also will take a  
19 look at the no build, and again, this is, I think, the last  
20 map that I will ask you to jump from one scale to another.

21 It's an aerial, but State Route 70/99 on the west, 65  
22 here on the east, Baseline, Riego to the south and to the  
23 north, Sunset Boulevard West and Howsley. Again, can you see  
24 the three segment areas here? And again, before I jump into  
25 a little more about the alternatives, depending on the

1 segment you are in, you will see these wow-outs here. These  
2 are conceptual interchanges that we have analyzed in the  
3 documents, and depending upon your connection of 70/99 here  
4 at Sankey, we have looked at one right here on the highway.  
5 If you are north of Riego, there could be up to three, and  
6 again, a lot of that will depend upon Sutter County and its  
7 work with the Sutter Point Group as to how these conceptual  
8 interchanges will work.

9       Once again, the 7-mile segment from basically Pleasant  
10 Grove over here to Fiddymment, we are proposing no  
11 interchanges, and again, that is to, again, try to maintain  
12 this high speed facility that will help to minimize  
13 growth-inducing impacts adjacent to the roadway.

14       In the eastern segment, there will be three. One here  
15 at Fiddymment, another at Foothills, and then again  
16 terminating here at State Route 65 adjacent to the City of  
17 Rocklin.

18       I would like to run through the alternatives themselves  
19 very quickly and I will start with the three that basically  
20 connect here north of Riego Road. Alternative 1, the red  
21 alternative is actually the longest distance. It's  
22 approximately 16.2 miles in length. The orange takes a  
23 diagonal run through the better part of the central segment  
24 here before terminating at 65. The blue is this area right  
25 here that follows Locust Road or the Placer/Sutter County

1 line before terminating at 65, and then the two proposed  
2 alternatives here at Sankey, first, the yellow, or Number 4,  
3 and then finally, the last one, Alternative 5, the green.

4 Those are basically the five build alternatives that the  
5 draft environment document analyzes along with the no-build,  
6 and the no-build basically means no parkway.

7 A little bit about the environmental analysis, and I am  
8 not going to get into the 14 specific issues, areas that the  
9 draft addresses, but I put this slide up here indicating --  
10 basically indicating the comprehensiveness of the  
11 environmental analysis. Again, it's a tier level, level of  
12 detail for data collection analysis of those three  
13 conditional years that I talked about, existing, 2020 and  
14 2040 conditions, as well as outlining fairly, I think,  
15 comprehensive series of mitigation strategies.

16 The document basically says that implementing any one of  
17 the five build alternatives will result in some environmental  
18 impacts.

19 I have got nine examples here, and I would like to run  
20 through those just as quick as I can here, to give you an  
21 idea about what some of these are; and beginning with land  
22 use, Alternative 1, you will remember that was the red  
23 alternative, the southernmost build corridor, which would  
24 basically involve converting the most amount of land, and  
25 that is about 1,900 acres, compared with Alternative 4, the

1 yellow alternative, which would have the least impact at  
2 1,600 acres.

3         From a farmland perspective, the red alternative,  
4 Alternative 1, again, would affect the greatest amount of  
5 farmland, converting a 1,000 acres total, compared with  
6 alternative 4, again, the yellow alternative, at about 800  
7 acres. All of the proposed alternatives would change the  
8 visual character of the study area. The draft calls out that  
9 Alternatives 1 and 2, the red and the orange would have the  
10 greatest amount of impacts. Alternatives 4 and 5, yellow and  
11 green, the least.

12         From a cultural resource perspective, each one of those  
13 alternatives would affect the historic resource. That is  
14 Reclamation District 1000. Again, you will remember in the  
15 western district, all five of those build corridors actually  
16 traverse that historic resource.

17         Traffic and transportation, probably the longest section  
18 in the analysis portion of the draft, basically says that all  
19 build alternatives, compared to the no-build -- let me  
20 emphasize. All of the build alternatives will help to reduce  
21 congestion and delay on various arterials and collectives  
22 within the study area.

23         On the flip side of that, all the build alternatives  
24 will affect State Route 70/99 south of its connection point,  
25 whether that's at Sankey Road or north of Riego Road as well

1 as State Route 65, generally between I-80 and the proposed  
2 Lincoln bypass, and again, the project would result in  
3 greater transportation on those two state highways.

4 From an air quality perspective, all five build  
5 alternatives will exceed air quality thresholds. Same holds  
6 for noise. All five build alternatives would exceed federal,  
7 state as well as Placer and Sutter County noise thresholds.

8 Biological resources. All five build alternatives would  
9 have the potential to affect seven special species, special  
10 habitat. Specifically from a pool complex, Alternative 3,  
11 the blue alternative, the one that moved up along the county  
12 line would have involved about 127 acres. Alternative 4,  
13 again, the yellow would affect the least, at about 106; and  
14 the last sample that I have got for impacts has to do with  
15 growth inducement, and again, the draft spends a great deal  
16 of time in dealing with that. Basically what it concludes is  
17 that all five build corridor alternatives would be one of  
18 many factors, and again, I would refer you back to the red  
19 stated development proposal map.

20 The parkway would be one of many factors that would  
21 encourage growth in and near the project study area because  
22 it is actually expanding the regional transportation system.

23 So as you can imagine, if you have had the chance to  
24 take a look at the draft, it makes a lot of conclusions, but  
25 what I would like to do is leave you with three tonight.

1           The first has to do with impact. I mentioned the  
2 executive summary. That is available for your pickup back  
3 there. There is a fairly extensive table in it of 11 x 16  
4 sheets. That basically summarizes all the impacts of all the  
5 build alternatives and the no-build, for existing, 2020, 2040  
6 conditions. If you take a look at it, you will see, for some  
7 resources, there is not a great variation about the number of  
8 impacts. In fact, the ranges are fairly close and I think  
9 that is something that is real important to consider as you  
10 go through the draft.

11           Also, again from the CEQA perspective, the draft  
12 concludes that the no-build alternative is the environmental  
13 superior alternative at this point. And again, that is  
14 probably pretty easy to understand. If you are not building,  
15 if you are not identifying, selecting, acquiring and then  
16 eventually building a roadway, you are not going to have a  
17 lot of impacts, except there would be a major impact on  
18 traffic congestion and delay without the project. It also  
19 would not meet the purpose and need.

20           If you are considering only the build alternatives,  
21 Alternative 4, again, that yellow corridor alternative from  
22 the map winds up being the environmental superior  
23 alternative, and that is primarily because it has the least  
24 amount of impact on biological resources and farmlands; and  
25 then finally, the preferred alternative, and I think we have

1 shared that the preferred alternative, once we have had an  
2 opportunity to go through the comments that you make tonight,  
3 or written, along with a fair amount of consultation with our  
4 federal and regional partners, will actually be called out in  
5 the final Environmental Impact Statement, a report which we  
6 are to have out by this time next summer.

7       So that is a very quick overview of the draft itself.  
8 One slide left. Basically what we are going to be trying to  
9 do over the course of the next year is to continue that NEPA  
10 process that I talked about, continue that with folks from  
11 EPA, Army Corp. of Engineers, the California Department of  
12 Fish and Game. We are going to be looking and trying to  
13 identify what the least environmental damaging report is, as  
14 well as the mitigation strategies that are called out in the  
15 draft. We talked about the comments. With identifying the  
16 preferred corridor, all rolled into the final Tier 1 EIS/EIR  
17 to acquire key pieces of that, starting Tier 2 process, which  
18 again, will analyze the impact of road alignment within that  
19 selected corridor.

20       So Daniel, that is about as quick as I can do and I hope  
21 it made some kind of sense here. Thank you.

22       MR. IACOFANO: Thank you very much, Stan. We are going  
23 to turn the lights back on. Now, we would like to, once  
24 again, review our procedures for the evening. We have a  
25 number of speaker cards turned in. There is still plenty of

1 time for you to turn those in and we will have staff walking  
2 through the aisles, if you do wish to speak and we encourage  
3 you to do so. We just ask that you fill in the card and  
4 follow our 3-minute time limit.

5 We want to mention a few other things. We do have a  
6 public hearing scheduled for this Wednesday night at the  
7 Roseville City Hall, also starting at 7 p.m., so if you know  
8 of neighbors or colleagues or other individuals that are  
9 interested in this project, please let them know. You don't  
10 have to live in that general area. You can attend any one of  
11 these public hearings, so we welcome you to attend that, or  
12 others that you may know that are interested in the project.

13 Back at the table in the back of the room, we have  
14 envelopes, just to make it easier for you to send in written  
15 documents already pre-addressed. You do have to add the  
16 postage. That will go right to our project team for  
17 inclusion in the impact statement and EIR documentation, so  
18 if you do have a desire to submit written comments following  
19 tonight's meeting, you can do so by picking up one of these  
20 envelopes and then the comment cards. There is information  
21 there as to where you can send your comments back in.

22 There is also material in the back. The executive  
23 summary that Stan referred to, there are copies of the  
24 environmental document drafts there for you to look at. They  
25 also exist at various public libraries and those locations

1 are available and listed in the newsletter that we have also  
2 by the door, so again, help yourself to that.

3 So we do have three speaker cards. We would ask that  
4 you come forward here to the lectern and we have the  
5 microphone. We will make a record of your comments and I  
6 will just start with the first speaker here. Ben Field,  
7 Pleasant Grove, and he is to be followed by Leo Trombatore.  
8 So Ben Field? Oh, Bev Field. I'm sorry. We have Denise  
9 keeping time over here just to make sure we are keeping up  
10 with that. Thank you very much.

11 MS. FIELD: I would like to bring your attention to the  
12 word "impact." You spoke a great deal about the word impact.  
13 About 30 years ago, there was a ranch in Pleasant Grove that  
14 was divided for people to buy parcels in that branch, and it  
15 was an old sheep ranch.

16 My family have been sheepherders for a long, long while  
17 and we moved to one of the parcels in this ranch and we have  
18 been there since 1975, along with five other families who  
19 moved at the same time and bought the property.

20 As you can notice, I am an elderly lady now, as are all  
21 the other people that moved there. Of those parcels, there  
22 are five hardship parcels in a row between Country Acres and  
23 Brewer Road, and if you choose the red line route, that will  
24 disturb people who have made their lives and developed their  
25 time and their children have come home to build to stay, so

1 that they can stay there.

2 And that is the one comment I would like to make.  
3 Impact comes a long way, and I understand the need for the  
4 transportation but understand the need for those of us who  
5 have lived there that long and fought everything, all the  
6 flooding water, everything, and worked to develop our  
7 acreages. It's been our life and you're taking it if you  
8 take that route.

9 MR. HILL: Thank you, Ms. Field.

10 MS. IACOFANO: Very good. Thank you. Leo Trombatore.  
11 Let's go to our next speaker. If you could just state and  
12 spell your name for the record.

13 MR. TROMBATORE: Leo Trombatore, T-r-o-m-b-a-t-o-r-e. I  
14 was the State Director of Transportation under the Deukmejian  
15 administration for five years and I also was the director out  
16 at the Marysville office for 11, and the county for eight  
17 years prior to that. I was transferred here in 1975 and I  
18 live in Yuba City.

19 I want to complement the staff for the excellent work  
20 and presentation that they have made. It's a real tough job  
21 to get anything done these days, but one of the things you  
22 will notice, I have white hair, I am 81 years old. I had 41  
23 years with CalTrans, and many years after that with  
24 consulting engineers, but gentlemen, think big. Don't think  
25 small. We have a tendency to think small. We have a

1 tendency to think that 20 years from now is an eternity. It  
2 isn't. You have to think of a life span.

3 This area is very, very poor in transportation. It  
4 always has been. All of the money that California has has  
5 gone to the metropolitan areas. You have an opportunity to  
6 do something here. I have always thought we should have a  
7 connection with 65 to 99.

8 In 1976-77, I worked with Assemblyman Chappie. We  
9 defined streets and highway codes and it's still there, so  
10 you have some history that you can go to, if you have to.  
11 Albeit, it was down in the Yuba City area, but one of the  
12 things that I think we have got to think about today, since  
13 I've been here now these many years, I've been through two  
14 floods. There is a hell of a lot more people here now than  
15 the first flood and the second flood. This will give you an  
16 opportunity to move people, if you have to, in different  
17 directions. You never know in this flatland where you're  
18 going to have a problem.

19 The last flood we had, we came within that many seconds  
20 of closing every road to Sacramento completely. Yuba City  
21 was blocked off, and I keep telling people, you have to think  
22 about how you're going to handle this. Well, all they think  
23 about is, "Well, we will have a police department handle  
24 that." That is not going to do it. You have got to have  
25 some road space and I think you have a chance to do something

1 here.

2 I think my three minutes are up, so thank you.

3 MR. HILL: Thank you.

4 MR. IACOFANO: Thank you very much. We appreciate that.  
5 George Carpenter is the next speaker and those are the only  
6 cards I have. If anyone does wish to speak, we will take  
7 your cards here and staff have additional cards, so please  
8 feel free. Go ahead, sir.

9 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you. I am George Carpenter.  
10 Mr. Chairman and Directors. I am happy to be here tonight.  
11 I represent the Sutter Point Specific Planned Owners Group  
12 and that is a group of developers that has approximately  
13 6,000 acres of the 7,500 acres, specific planned area in  
14 South Sutter County, and this planning effort is a result of  
15 an advisory measure voted on by Sutter County voters in  
16 November of 2004. It was passed by a 60/40 vote that advised  
17 the Board of Supervisors to plan a misuse community in south  
18 Sutter County, and since that time we have submitted a  
19 general plan and are working on a land plan for about the  
20 last two and a half years in this area.

21 As part of our planning effort, we have always known the  
22 Placer Parkway was a potential, and so in our planning  
23 effort, we have reserved rights of way and we have reflected  
24 the potential for Placer Parkway to come through our planning  
25 area, but we have done so only using the Sankey Road

1 alignment, and that is the alignment that I would urge the

2 Board of Directors to adopt as part of their Tier 1 proposal,  
3 and in our planning effort, we had to look at what made the  
4 most sense for the location of the Placer Parkway facility,  
5 and it was clear to us that the Sankey Road alignment was the  
6 better alternative.

7       When you look at the environmental review documents,  
8 like Mr. Tidman said, it's the environmentally superior  
9 alternative. It also -- from an environmental standpoint, it  
10 conflicts least with proposed land use plans and that is  
11 least impacted on existing transportation facilities or  
12 planned transportation facilities.

13       Right now we are looking into getting a Riego, 99  
14 interchange built and a Riego Road alignment, which would be,  
15 I think, Alignments 1, 2 and 3. It would probably be  
16 significantly conflicted with the Riego, 99 interchange that  
17 we are working on getting down there now. That is an  
18 existing facility that is needed to help South Placer traffic  
19 get down to Sacramento and Sacramento get to South Placer for  
20 jobs.

21       So with that, I would urge your Board, when looking at  
22 the best environmental alternative, and evaluating the  
23 document, to look at that Alignment 4 or Alignment 5 that  
24 uses Sankey Road.

25       There will be a couple of minor technical issues that we

1 will point out and comment on, but I won't bring those issues  
2 up to you tonight.

3           So thank you.

4           MR. HILL: Thank you, George.

5           MR. IACOFANO: Thank you very much. I don't have any  
6 additional speaker cards, so we are going to start to wrap up  
7 the meeting tonight. We will be here following the official  
8 close of the public hearing, if you wish to meet with staff  
9 or talk to them about any specific questions. At the easels  
10 in the back of the room are the materials back there.

11           I did want to turn it back over to Chairman Peter Hill  
12 of the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority and see  
13 if there are any closing comments here from the chair or from  
14 your colleagues on the Board.

15           MR. HILL: I wanted to make sure there is nobody in the  
16 audience that just has something to say because this is the  
17 last opportunity. Okay then. We will officially close the  
18 public hearing. Do any of the Board members have any  
19 comments?

20           MR. GRAY: I want to thank everybody for coming tonight  
21 and look forward to our next meeting Wednesday night.

22           MR. HILL: Thank you very much for coming.

23           MR. IACOFANO: We look forward to seeing you Wednesday  
24 night. If you would like to attend, that would be 7 o'clock  
25 at the Roseville City Hall. Have a good evening.

1           (The meeting concluded at 8:00 p.m.)

2

3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

37

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
2 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO ) ss.  
3

4 I, JILL R. MCLEOD, a Certified Shorthand Reporter,  
License No. 10071, duly certified by the State of California,  
5 do hereby certify:

6 That the foregoing statement was taken before me at the  
time and place first herein set forth;

7  
8 That the foregoing transcript is a true and correct  
record of the testimony given by counsel and all proceedings  
9 had at the time and place of examination, as recorded by me  
stenographically, to the best of my ability, and thereafter  
10 prepared into transcript form via computer-aided  
transcription;

11 I further certify that I am a disinterested person, and  
that I am in no way interested in the outcome of said action.

12 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2007.

13

14

15

\_\_\_\_\_  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
State of California

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25