

Chapter 4 Comments and Coordination

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and appropriate public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process to determine the scope of environmental documentation, the level of analysis, potential impacts and mitigation measures, and related environmental requirements. Agency consultation and public participation for the proposed project have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including community workshops, project development team meetings, stakeholder focus group meetings, interagency coordination meetings, and a public scoping meeting. This chapter summarizes the results of PCPTA and Caltrans' efforts to fully identify, address, and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

4.1 Scoping Process for the EIR/EA

4.1.1 Notice of Preparation

On behalf of the CEQA Lead Agency (Caltrans), on January 2, 2013, PCTPA distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR to the following agencies. A copy of the NOP is included in Appendix F.

- California State Clearinghouse
- CDFW
- Central Valley RWQCB
- USFWS
- USACE
- FHWA
- City of Roseville
- City of Rocklin
- City of Lincoln
- County of Placer

Caltrans also sent a copy of the NOP to the California Transportation Commission (CTC), following intra-agency communication protocols.

The NOP requested comments from the responsible and trustee agencies regarding environmental issues, reasonable alternatives, and reasonable mitigation measures that should be discussed in the draft EIR to address each agency's specific concerns in their areas of responsibility. The NOP also invited agency representatives to attend a public scoping meeting held on January 15, 2013.

The 30-day comment period closed on January 31, 2013. Seven letters were received in response to the NOP, including letters from the California State Clearinghouse (Clearinghouse); CDFW; USACE; Central Valley RWQCB; Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB); City of Rocklin; and the CTC. Brief summaries of these letters are below. The letters in their entirety are included in Appendix F.

California State Clearinghouse

The letter from the Clearinghouse is the Lead Agency copy of the NOP cover letter sent by the Clearinghouse to reviewing agencies. The letter includes attachments indicating to which agencies the NOP was sent and confirms the 30-day comment period. According to the Document Details Report attachment, the Clearinghouse distributed the NOP to the Resources Agency; CVFPB; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; California Department of Water Resources, CDFW, Region 2; NAHC; Public Utilities Commission; State Lands Commission; California Highway Patrol; ARB, Transportation Projects; and Central Valley RWQCB, Region 5 (Sacramento).

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

The CDFW recommends that the draft EIR discuss and provide adequate mitigation for impacts on fish and wildlife and their habitat; impacts on significant habitat such as wetlands, valley oak woodlands, and riparian habitat and impacts on sensitive species; and growth-inducing and cumulative impacts on fish, wildlife, water quality, and vegetative resources. In addition, CDFW recommended that the draft EIR provide analysis of alternatives that reduce impacts on fish, wildlife, water quality, and vegetative resources; and an evaluation of the project's consistency with land use and species recovery plans. The CDFW letter also notes that an LSAA may be required and that assessment of fees under California PRC Section 21089 is necessary.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

In this letter, the USACE notes the agency's jurisdiction under Section 404 of the CWA for the discharge of dredge or fill material into waters of the United States. The USACE requires a wetland delineation to ascertain the extent of water on the project site and a range of alternatives that should include alternatives to avoid impacts on wetlands or other waters.

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

This letter describes the permits related to the RWQCB's responsibility to protect the quality of surface water and groundwater of the state: Construction Storm Water General Permit Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits; Industrial Storm Water General Permit; CWA Section 404 permit; CWA Section 401 permit – Water Quality Certification; and WDRs.

Central Valley Flood Protection Board

The CVFPB identifies Secret Ravine, Antelope Creek, Dry Creek, and Miners Ravine within their jurisdiction. The letter does not provide specific comments regarding the proposed alternatives but does describe the activities that require a permit from the CVFPB and the vegetation requirements, including accumulation and establishment of woody vegetation, according to Title 23, Section 131(c).

City of Rocklin

This letter indicates City support for Alternatives 1 and 2, but the City is not in favor of Alternative 3. The letter notes that the EIR should include evaluation of impacts on local roadways and that thresholds of significance should include the City of Rocklin's Level of Service policy "C." Analysis of Alternative 3 should include impacts on the Rocklin Road/I-80 interchange and local roadways, and should examine potential economic impacts and potential business closures. Finally, analysis of Alternative 3 should examine the likelihood of increased vehicle miles traveled and increases in emissions, including greenhouse gasses, and compare results to Alternatives 1 and 2.

California Transportation Commission

The CTC has no comments on the purpose and need, alternatives, impacts, or evaluation methods but recommends that Caltrans and its partners identify and secure the necessary funding to complete the project. The letter requests notifications as a responsible agency under CEQA if funds or other actions under the purview of the CTC are anticipated.

4.1.2 Public Scoping Meeting

A public scoping meeting/community workshop for the EIR/EA was held on January 15, 2013, from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at the Maidu Community Center, 1550 Maidu Drive, Roseville, California 95661. Twenty-three members of the public attended the workshop. The meeting was announced in the NOP and via a news release on December 12, 2012. The purpose of the scoping meeting was to identify concerns of both the public and agencies in order to clearly define the environmental issues and alternatives to be examined in the draft EIR/EA. Maps and other project information displays were available, and Caltrans staff were on hand to answer questions and receive comments regarding the scope and content of the EIR/EA.

More than 55 community members submitted comments on the project and the proposed alternatives. Comments were received through a variety of methods, including comment cards received at the scoping meeting/community workshop held on January 15, 2013; input received through the project website (www.8065interchange.org); and emails received through the dedicated PCTPA email (pctpa@pctpa.net). The 30-day comment period closed on January 31, 2013.

In general, commenters were pleased that the project will improve the transition from I-80 to SR 65 and noted that traffic backup and the high risk potential for major traffic accidents are an ongoing problem.

Many commenters expressed concern regarding continued Taylor Road access. Several commenters favored Alternative 1 (Taylor Road Full Access Interchange [Diamond-Shaped]) as it appeared to offer the easiest access to businesses on Taylor Road, as well as full access to I-80. Some commenters felt that local traffic also would benefit from this alternative as full access to Taylor Road is important as a parallel facility to I-80 that carries a lot of local traffic that otherwise would shift to I-80 and SR 65. Comments also noted that Alternative 1 could adversely affect the Secret Ravine riparian area.

Comments indicated that Alternative 2 (Taylor Road Full Access Interchange [Trumpet-Shaped]) was not as appealing as Alternative 1 because access to Taylor Road would be more complicated; however, Alternative 2 did not appear to not encroach on Secret Ravine as much as Alternative 1.

It also was noted that Alternative 3 (Taylor Road Interchange Eliminated) would improve flow along I-80, but the concern regarding elimination of Taylor Road remained and some comments state that elimination of Taylor Road would negatively affect businesses and increase congestion along nearby local interchanges.

Most comments expressed support for the various elements of Alternative 4 (Transportation System Management) but acknowledged that, by itself, it will not be enough to reduce traffic congestion and does not constitute a long-term solution.

Subsequent to the public scoping meeting, and through extensive coordination between Caltrans, FHWA, local agencies, and the design team, features from Alternatives 1 and 2 were combined to improve the spacing between interchanges and better address vehicle weaving on I-80 between the Eureka Road interchange and the I-80/SR 65 interchange, and a new alternative proposing a collector-distributor system in the eastbound direction was introduced. The three build alternatives described in Chapter 1 reflect these changes.

4.2 Consultation and Coordination with Public Agencies

During preparation of the technical studies for the proposed project, formal and informal coordination was conducted with the federal, state, and local agencies and the entities listed below.

4.2.1 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

A preliminary jurisdictional determination of wetlands and other waters of the United States has been prepared and was submitted by Caltrans to the USACE on March 4, 2015. An application for authorization under CWA Section 404 for fill of waters of the United States has not yet been initiated.

4.2.2 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

A species list was requested of USFWS and is included in Appendix F. Inter-agency consultation with USFWS under Section 7 of the ESA is required for potential effects of the proposed project on valley elderberry longhorn beetle and vernal pool fairy shrimp. A BA was submitted by Caltrans to USFWS on April 24, 2015, in order to initiate ESA consultation and request the agency's determination on the effects of the project.

4.2.3 National Marine Fisheries Service

Inter-agency consultation with NMFS under Section 7 of the ESA is required for potential effects of the proposed project on Central Valley steelhead (including designated critical habitat). In August of 2014, Caltrans began technical assistance and informal consultation with NMFS. Documentation addressing impacts on Central Valley steelhead was submitted by Caltrans to NMFS on April 24, 2015, in order to initiate ESA consultation and request the agency's determination on the effects of the project.

Federal Fisheries and Essential Fish Habitat consultation (informal or formal) with NMFS is required for potential effects of the project on Central Valley steelhead. An EFH assessment addressing Pacific salmon was included in the documentation submitted to NMFS.

4.2.4 Native American Heritage Commission and Coordination with Local Native American Tribes

The NAHC was contacted on March 13, 2013, to request a sacred lands database search and provide a list of Native American representatives who might have any information or concerns regarding the project. On March 22, 2013, the NAHC provided both sacred lands search results and a list of 11 Native American representatives, who were contacted by letter in April 5, 2013. Of those contacted, two representatives responded with letters. The letters are included in Appendix F.

Josh Stewart, a Native American monitor representing the UAIC, was present for Extended Phase I testing (XPI) and Phase II evaluation activities conducted between December 2014 and March 2015, including locating and recording shovel test probes.

4.2.5 North Central Information Center

The North Central Information Center was contacted in March 2013 to perform a records search of archaeological and historical resources for the project.

4.2.6 State Historic Preservation Officer

The SHPO was contacted to request concurrence with the findings of the XPI testing and Phase II Evaluation conducted at site P-31-1443. As a result of this testing, site P-31-1443 is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP. On May 4, 2015, the results of the evaluation were submitted to SHPO requesting concurrence on the eligibility determination. The SHPO responded in a letter dated July 2, 2015, concurring that site P-31-1443 is eligible for listing on the NRHP. In the same letter, the SHPO agreed to assume that two built environment resources, the former First Transcontinental Railroad and the Edwin Purdy House, are eligible for listing in the NRHP for the purposes of this undertaking, and concurred that the segment of the former Lincoln Highway within the project limits is not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of integrity. Subsequent research into the Edwin Purdy House history supported a conclusion that the stone

house is not eligible for listing in the NRHP. Caltrans provided the additional information to the SHPO and received concurrence with the revised determination on July 28, 2015. Both concurrence letters are included in Appendix F. Consultation will continue with the SHPO on project effects in accordance with Stipulations IX, X, and XI of the Section 106 PA.

4.2.7 City of Roseville

Written concurrence from the City of Roseville Parks, Recreation, and Libraries regarding the project's temporary occupancy of the two trails was requested to meet the requirements of Section 4(f) at 23 CFR 774.13(d). Caltrans determined that the proposed project would not trigger the provisions of Section 4(f) because it would involve only temporary occupancy of the Antelope Creek and Miners Ravine Trails. Caltrans requested concurrence from Dominick Casey, Director, City of Roseville Parks, Recreation, and Libraries. On November 5, 2013, Caltrans received the signed concurrence letter. The request and response letters are included in Appendix F.

4.3 Public Participation and Outreach

4.3.1 Community Workshops

A series of public workshops were hosted by PCTPA to encourage public participation. The purpose of the workshops was to introduce the overall interchange improvement project, the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) phase, and the proposed schedule; and to gather input from community members. Over 120 informational notices were sent via email and U.S. Postal Service to local jurisdictions (Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, and Placer County), interested agencies, vicinity organizations/businesses, and interested individuals. Notices also were posted to PCTPA's website (www.pctpa.net) and the project website (www.8065interchange.org). The details of the public workshops follow. Workshop #1 was held on April 14, 2011, from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at the Rocklin City Council Chambers, 3970 Rocklin Road, in Rocklin, California. Thirty-two members of the public attended this workshop. The workshop was organized as an open house with a series of information stations where the public could get information about the project, ask questions, and provide feedback. Information station topics included general project information, mapping, community input, and traffic patterns. Questions from attendees included those regarding the process of the PA&ED phase, how alternatives are selected, project limits, and how to create access to businesses on I-80/SR-65 corridors. Other key topics included the plans for Taylor Road as well as a general support for addressing congestion. A full summary of the workshop can be found at: <http://8065interchange.org/?p=111>.

Workshop #2 was held on January 25, 2012, at 9:00 a.m. at the Placer County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 175 Fulweiler Street, in Auburn, California. This meeting was held during a regularly scheduled PCPTA Board meeting and, therefore, no sign-in sheet was provided. Five people however did sign up to be included on the contact list. A staff presentation concluded with a series of 'Next Steps' (traffic analysis – summer 2012, alternatives selection –

spring 2012, and environmental technical studies – spring 2012). Questions from attendees included those regarding the traffic patterns near the Galleria (from Atlantic Street), whether the TSM would be considered a potential first phase of the project, and what would happen to Eureka and East Roseville Parkway if the Taylor Road ramps closed. Other topics raised included the suggestion of an auxiliary lane on westbound I-80 from Douglas Boulevard to Riverside Avenue and that concern about eliminating existing ramps to Taylor Road. A full summary of the workshop can be found at: <http://8065interchange.org/?p=220>.

Workshop #3 served as the public scoping meeting and was held on January 15, 2013, from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at the Maidu Community Center, Reception Hall, 1550 Maidu Drive, in Roseville, California. Twenty-three members of the public attended the workshop. The workshop was organized as an open house with a series of information stations where the attendees could get information about the project, ask questions, and provide feedback. Following the presentation, attendees were encouraged to visit the information stations where the project team was available to answer questions. Comments are included above in section 4.1.2. A full summary of the workshop can be found at: <http://8065interchange.org/?p=278>.

4.3.2 Stakeholder Focus Group Meetings

Approximately 40 representatives identified as key stakeholders were invited to attend stakeholder focus group meetings. The stakeholder group consisted of a cross section of project-vicinity property and business owners/tenants, residents, and other interested organizations/individuals that may be directly affected by the proposed project. The purpose of the meetings was to receive feedback from key stakeholders regarding current traffic patterns and land use, as well as the evaluation criteria for potential alternatives. Stakeholder focus group meetings took place on August 23, 2011; January 11, 2012; January 9, 2013; February 4, 2014, and March 12, 2015. Details are below.

Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting #1 was held on August 23, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. at 2000 Taylor Road, Roseville, California and at 4:00 p.m. at the Roseville Civic Center, Roseville, California. Nine stakeholders attended the meetings. During discussions regarding traffic data and modeling, stakeholders agreed that the traffic data accurately depicted congestion points along the I-80 and SR 65 corridors as well as local streets; including the heavy congestion in the morning and afternoon commute times, especially the bottleneck into Lincoln. They were also interested to know which traffic model was used to analyze traffic conditions for the proposed project.

There was general agreement among the attendees that Taylor Road is often used as a “parallel facility” in order to avoid traffic delays. The Hilton Garden Inn directs guests to take Taylor Road and not the freeway in the evening to avoid traffic. Stakeholders agreed that I-80/Taylor Road Interchange should not be closed in either direction (westbound I-80 on-ramp or eastbound I-80 off-ramp). Other questions and comments included concern for Taylor Road and if it must be closed, could it be combined with another interchange and how the proposed project fits into the larger transportation system. A full summary of the meeting can be found at: http://8065interchange.org/meetings/stakeholder/SRG_Notes_082311_FINAL.pdf.

Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting #2 was held on January 11, 2012 at 2000 Taylor Road, Roseville, California. Fourteen stakeholders attended the meeting. The main purpose of this meeting was to review the overall project and introduce the preliminary design concepts. Attendees commented on all five concepts presented. During these discussions, questions regarding the viability of implementing the TSM, LOS on Taylor Road, and the differences between design concepts were raised. A request was made for maps that include existing property lines in addition to the design. One commenter noted that for some, there is a feeling of resentment from Taylor Road business/property owners when Taylor Road is referred to as a partial interchange because the feeling is that lanes were given up for SR 65 and now the whole interchange could be lost. A full summary of the meeting can be found at: http://8065interchange.org/meetings/stakeholder/SRG_Notes_011112_FINAL.pdf.

Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting #3 was held on January 9, 2013, at 2000 Taylor Road, Roseville, California. Thirteen stakeholders attended the meeting. Discussion for this meeting focused on review of the project including constraints and considerations, and the current project phase, as well as address questions or concerns about the overall project. Questions addressed by the project team regarding Alternative 1 included a question asking why the current southbound SR 65 ramp to eastbound I-80 need to be reconstructed and whether or not the project would stay within existing right of way. For Alternative 2, a question was raised asking if Taylor Road can be mixed and matched with other alternatives. Regarding Alternative 3, one commenter expressed concern for the “already congested” Eureka Road and another if it was possible to remove underutilized HOV lanes in heavily congested areas. Some general comments included a concern for the salmon in Secret Ravine, funding and costs for the project, whether elements of the TSM can be incorporated into any alternative and additional safety benefits of the project. A full summary of the meeting can be found at: http://8065interchange.org/meetings/stakeholder/SRG_Notes_010913_FINAL.pdf.

Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting #4 was held on February 4, 2014, at 2000 Taylor Road, Roseville, California. Sixteen stakeholders attended the meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to present the current revised alternatives as well as gather additional feedback. One commenter expressed concern for Alternative 1 regarding property acquisitions and another noted that this alternative did not offer full Taylor Road access. Questions about Alternative 2 included several regarding what specific changes to Taylor Road would occur and whether or not there would be access to Taylor Road from westbound I-80. Questions and comments regarding Alternative 3 included a concern that jobs would be lost under this alternative, and was the project team was in communication with the environmental community, and if this alternative would create more traffic on local roads. A full summary of this meeting can be found at: http://8065interchange.org/meetings/stakeholder/SRG_Notes_020414_FINAL.pdf.

Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting #5 was held on March 12, 2015, at 2000 Taylor Road, Roseville, California. Twelve stakeholders attended the meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an overview of project status, a review of project alternatives and a presentation of planned next steps as the EIR/EA is prepared for public release in spring of 2015. Alternative 2 was presented as the preferred alternative, subject to public review. Questions about Alternative 2 included several regarding access to Cattlemens restaurant, left turn options on Taylor Road, and speed limit and ramp metering on the C-D ramps. Comments included consideration of flooding on Taylor Road, acceptance of Alternative 2, and positive feedback for

the C-D ramp system. Property and right-of-way acquisition questions included effects on businesses and business signage, the limits of Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way along Taylor Road, and heights of noise barriers on Rocklin Road. A full summary of this meeting can be found at: http://8065interchange.org/meetings/stakeholder/Stakeholder_Meeting5_summary.pdf.

