



Community Workshop #2 Summary

I-80 / SR 65 Interchange Improvements Project

**January 25, 2012 – Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) Board Meeting
Placer County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 175 Fulweiler Street, Auburn, CA**

Introduction

The I-80/SR-65 interchange is an integral connection and well-used by many people travelling along the I-80 and SR-65 corridors. Congestion created by those using the interchange causes traffic to back-up at points along these corridors. The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA), in collaboration with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the cities of Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, and the County of Placer, are looking for ways to improve the situation. The objectives are to reduce congestion and improve operations and safety in the project area, while maintaining access to local streets and businesses within the corridors. The project will be designed and built over several phases and depending on funding availability may take 20 years or more to complete.

Workshop #2 Purpose

This community workshop was the second in a series of public workshops and hearings being planned by PCTPA to involve the public and obtain input during the Public Approval and Environmental Documentation phase. The workshop took place during PCTPA's regularly scheduled Board meeting. The purpose of this workshop was to review the project's progress to date, share 7 preliminary design concepts and gather input from the PCTPA Board and community members.

Publicity & Noticing

Community workshop notification was made in a newsletter, which was sent via e-mail and USPS to local jurisdictions (Cities of Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville and Placer County); interested agencies; vicinity organizations/businesses, and interested individuals. The notice was also posted to PCTPA's web site (www.pctpa.net) and the project web site (www.8065interchange.org).

Display ads were published in the following newspapers:

- Placer Herald
- Lincoln News Messenger
- Roseville Press Tribune.

Press releases were sent via e-mail to the following publications:

- Lincoln News Messenger
- Placer Herald
- Roseville Press Tribune
- Auburn Journal
- Sacramento Bee (Tony Bizjak – Our Region – Transportation)
- Sacramento News & Review
- Sacramento Press
- Sacramento Business Journal
- Sun Senior News
- The Compass
- KFBK – 1530 AM
- KXSR (Capitol Public Radio) – 91.7 FM
- KCRA – NBC - Channel 3
- KOVR – CBS – Channel 13
- KXTV – ABC --Channel 10
- KTXL -- Fox -- Channel 40

The City of Lincoln E-newsletter advertised the meeting for a week prior.

Workshop #2 Format

The workshop took place during PCTPA's regularly scheduled January Board meeting. Celia McAdam, PCTPA's Executive Director, introduced the project to the Board with an overview of the project's purpose and goals, public outreach, schedule and progress to date. Leo Heuston, CH2M Hill's project manager, then provided background on the project's limits, traffic and several other issues (capacity, operations, safety, and local access) along the I-80 and SR 65 corridors and the interchange. He then described 7 concepts, developed to date, which address the traffic issues:

- #1 Taylor Road – Shift Ramps
- #2 Taylor Road – Full Access (Tight Diamond)
- #3 Taylor Road – Full Access (Trumpet)
- #4 Antelope Creek Drive Connection
- #5 Taylor Road – Eliminate Existing Ramps (the existing Taylor ramps access relocated to other existing vicinity interchanges)
- #6 Transportation System Management (TSM)
- #7 No Build (do nothing)

Common features for all design concepts were summarized including improved weaving, added capacity, high speed connections, High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV or carpool lanes), and local circulation improvements. An initial set of concerns and benefits were outlined for each concept during the Presentation. These concepts may potentially move forward for consideration as alternatives in the

environmental document. They will be subject to adjustments pending the results of the traffic study and further screening.

The staff presentation concluded with a series of 'Next Steps' (traffic analysis – summer 2012, alternatives selection – spring 2012, and environmental technical studies – spring 2012).

Board and public comments/questions followed: Staff responses are in *italics*.

1. Would #6 (TSM) be considered a potential first phase of the project?
 - *Maybe. More data must be collected to determine how various TSM measures could be applied. TSM measures are typically cheaper to do than construction improvements such as new bridges, traffic lanes, etc. Applicable TSM measures such as ramp metering will probably be applied to all alternative concepts.*
2. None of the concepts are acceptable because of construction costs. Is #2 (Taylor Road – Full Access with the Diamond-shaped Interchange) the least expensive option? Is cost a deciding factor?
 - *The concepts have been developed (to-date) based primarily on how well they address traffic problems. They will be adjusted based on the traffic study and additional screening, which will consider environmental issues and the ability to identify project phases, construction costs, and potential funding sources. For example, #2 (Full Access with the Tight Diamond-shaped Interchange) would require a tunnel under I-80 which could be expensive. #3 (Taylor Road – Full Access with the Trumpet-shaped Interchange) uses existing structures, which would be cheaper.*
3. Of all the concepts, #5 (Taylor Road – Eliminate existing ramps) is not an acceptable option.
 - *The 2009 Caltrans Project Study Report (PSR) identified the potential to close the Taylor Road ramps based on a subsequent traffic analysis and any future effects on downstream I-80 bottlenecks. This concept will probably be one of the alternatives analyzed in the environmental document to satisfy the need to create a reasonable range of alternatives.*
4. Is the decision to include # 6 (TSM) decided before concepts are approved or after?
 - *TSM measures are considered in the environmental document.*
5. Is there any consideration given to creating a better 'back way' into the Galleria (from Atlantic Street)? What would it do to traffic patterns?
 - *The detailed traffic study is being developed. It will consider potential connection points, which could result in more alternative concepts.*
6. Where the northbound SR 65 traffic merges with westbound I-80 (south of the Galleria connection) is only 2 lanes, is there room and weight accommodation on the ramp to allow for 3 lanes instead of

- 2? Would it be possible to restripe the lanes and see what happens? Couldn't this be done quickly with a Mitigated Negative Declaration instead of going through an environmental review process?
- *There may be the width on the viaduct for an auxiliary lane to avoid back-ups. This could be a potential 1st phase. Caltrans would have to be consulted. An environmental review process would still have to be carried out. A restriping project may even be split off as a separate project.*
 - The Board directed the staff to look into the viaduct restriping idea and report back at the February Board meeting.
7. What happens at Eureka and East Roseville Parkway if the Taylor Road ramps were closed and the Eureka Road ramp was re-signed as Eureka/Taylor? Roseville is improving Eureka to provide two lanes onto Taylor; the ramp would be relocated ½ mile back, providing additional capacity onto NB 65 without having to deal with the merge.
- *#5 (Taylor Road – Eliminate existing ramps) shifts traffic to existing vicinity interchanges such as the Eureka/Atlantic one. The impacts and resultant improvements will be examined in the traffic study.*
8. The auxiliary lane on WB I-80 from Douglas to Riverside was encouraged. Could it be done quickly and inexpensively?
- *This potential work would require an additional travel lane by requiring more right-of-way, which would be very expensive. Concept work will explore the potential of creating an additional lane by narrowing existing lanes and shoulders. This effort would require Caltrans to approve a design exception.*
9. Currently, traffic on the I-80 and SR-65 corridors is split 60/40 with 40% of traffic going onto SR65 while 60% continues onto I-80. Eventually the traffic patterns will shift, emphasizing the importance of improvements to allow for increased and changing traffic patterns. Roseville is in support of maintaining access to Taylor Road for local businesses. Concept #1 Taylor Road – Shift Ramps would maintain that; Roseville businesses are in support of increasing access to Taylor Road. The proposed Antelope Creek connection would be good for traffic and for the Galleria; however, the apartment complex located on Antelope Creek has a planned phase 2 that would expand into the concept area. The construction currently underway on Eureka Road will add additional NB lanes to Taylor Road, which will help traffic in the short term but will not account for future traffic into 2035. Most traffic is on WB 80 to NB 65, if feasible then restriping is a no brainer, however there are concerns about the width capacity. Roseville would support a potential phase 1, which would focus on WB 80 to NB 65.
10. There is a potential problem with the proposed HOV (carpool) flyover. Will NB SR 65 carpool lane traffic have enough distance to merge on to the Galleria Blvd. /Stanford Ranch Road interchange? There could be a weave concern. Please look at the traffic numbers in the proposed HOV (carpool

lane) going to the Galleria. It is important to look at weekend traffic as well as weekday traffic, separately for the traffic analysis. It is important to include TSM in all alternatives.

11. Does the bottleneck project include the bridge over Antelope Creek? WB-NB is the problem, do whatever is cheap, fast and furious.

- *Yes, the project will address this.*

Following the community workshop, attendees were encouraged to visit the information station maps where the project team was available to answer questions.

The stations included the following:

- Project Area Map Exhibit
- Concept Drawings Exhibits