

# I-80 / SR-65 Interchange Improvements

Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting

**August 23, 2011**

9:00 a.m. - Cattlemen's, 2000 Taylor Road, Roseville

4:00 p.m. - Roseville Civic Center, Roseville

## PRESENT

### PROJECT TEAM REPRESENTATIVES

| Name              | Organization                                 |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Celia McAdam      | Placer County Transportation Planning Agency |
| Stan Tidman       | Placer County Transportation Planning Agency |
| Leo Heuston       | CH2M Hill                                    |
| Judy Matsui-Drury | CH2M Hill                                    |
| David Stanek      | Fehr & Peers                                 |
| Gladys Cornell    | AIM Consulting                               |
| Ciara Zanze       | AIM Consulting                               |

### STAKEHOLDER FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS

| Organizations Represented       |
|---------------------------------|
| Lund Construction               |
| Rocklin Chamber of Commerce     |
| Cattlemen's Restaurant          |
| Hilton Garden Inn               |
| Pan Pacific RV                  |
| Hewlett-Packard                 |
| Regal Cinemas UA Theater        |
| The Fountains                   |
| California Trucking Association |

### MEETING PURPOSE:

Of the more than 100 Stakeholders who have expressed an interest in the proposed I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvement project, approximately 40 representatives were identified as key stakeholders and invited to this first set of meetings. This key stakeholder group consists 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 future I-80 / SR 65 Interchange Improvements 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.

### MEETING OBJECTIVES:

- To review the overall project including its purpose and need, the study area, the current phase, and current traffic conditions.

# I-80 / SR-65 Interchange Improvements

Stakeholder Focus Group Meetings

August 23, 2011

- To introduce the evaluation process and initial criteria to screen and identify the project design alternatives.
- To receive stakeholder input on the alternatives screening and identification process/criteria.

**Handout Information (see [www.8065interchange.org](http://www.8065interchange.org))**

- Project Information brochure
- August 23, 2011 PowerPoint Presentation
- Sample Alternatives Screening – Preliminary Assessment

## STAKEHOLDER INPUT:

### **Discussion on traffic data and modeling:**

There was agreement 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.

Stakeholders were interested to know which traffic model was used to analyze traffic conditions for the proposed project.

Project Team Response: *The traffic model is being developed using Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) regional models adjusted to reflect local land use assumptions (such as the updated Rocklin General Plan) and project vicinity roadway improvements. The traffic model will account for existing and future (2035) conditions.*

### **Discussion of the use of Taylor Road and its I-80 Interchange:**

There was general agreement 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).

Question: If the I-80/Taylor Road Interchange had to be closed, could it be combined with another interchange such as Eureka Road / Atlantic Road?

Project Team Response: *A key project objective is to maintain (and possibly improve) I-80 corridor access. It is probable that a satisfactory solution to address this objective can be developed. However, as part of the alternatives screening and identification process, all potential design concepts should be explored including Taylor Road interchange closure, modification and relocation. Taylor Road Interchange closure needs to be balanced by potential*

# I-80 / SR-65 Interchange Improvements

Stakeholder Focus Group Meetings

August 23, 2011

*corridor and interchange effects at Eureka Rd, SR 65, and Rocklin Rd. as well as on the local circulation system.*

Stakeholders requested that the project team insert the word “from” into the purpose and need statement regarding Taylor Road on the Community Consideration. The statement now says: “Preserve access to and from Taylor Road.”

Comment: The public needs to keep up their concern for Taylor Road so it does not get lost in the paperwork.

## **Discussion regarding freeway capacity:**

Question: Will the current construction help the capacity issues within the corridor? Can improvements be made to avoid creating problems in other locations, such as Eureka Road / Atlantic Street and as far away as Pacific Street / Sunset Boulevard?

Project Team Response: *The two current I-80 Bottleneck improvement projects (additional carpool lanes and auxiliary lanes) will improve traffic operations and provide additional capacity. A Caltrans study, currently underway, will address future SR 65 improvements required to improve operations, reduce congestion, and enhance safety. Even with corridor improvements, the I-80/SR 65 interchange has problems, which must be addressed. The project's traffic analysis will identify interchange improvements and list mitigation measures to avoid or minimize potential transportation and traffic impacts further east.*

Question: This project is one cog in a larger system, how will this project account for effects on other vicinity transportation facilities?

Project Team Response: *Because of the current I-80 construction work, data collection tasks could not be performed at this time. Therefore, the project's traffic analysis is being phased into two steps. First, the alternatives screening and identification process will use SACOG's SACMET model to provide a reasonable traffic model. The SACMET model was refined by using updated land use assumptions from the local jurisdictions. The second step, for the environmental document's alternatives analyses, will incorporate SACOG's land use assumptions and future (2035) roadway network improvements for consistency with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) 2035 Update. This approach will account for project and vicinity effects. Caltrans concurred with this two-step approach.*

## **Questions and Comments about the alternatives screening matrix:**

Question: Is the screening matrix a standard one? Will a ‘weighing’ value be assigned to specific criteria?

Project Team Response: *The Alternatives Screening Matrix is a fairly standard template used to help screen potential highway project alternatives. However, the way in which*

# I-80 / SR-65 Interchange Improvements

Stakeholder Focus Group Meetings

August 23, 2011

*alternatives will be equally measured and evaluated is specifically scaled to recognize the important issues that need to be addressed on this project. It is based on applicable Caltrans, project-specific, and local jurisdiction criteria. The matrix is still being refined. It will reflect stakeholder focus group input. The ‘weighing’ of criteria is still being considered.*

**Question:** How do the project’s goals relate to the screening criteria? For example, the screening matrix cites community impacts as a right-of-way issue. Are there more community impact criteria?

**Project Team Response:** *The project goals and the alternatives screening criteria are based on the project’s draft Purpose and Need Statement (the transportation problem and its solution). The iterative process to develop a Purpose and Need Statement addresses all project objectives via broad statements. The matrix cites minimizing community impacts related to right-of-way and business/residential uses. There are also screening criteria which evaluate effects on the environment as well as local traffic circulation. Community impacts will also be addressed via the environmental review process, which will consider man-made and natural environments (consistency with local policies and regulations such as land use plans, population and housing, biological resources, etc.).*

**Question:** Will there be a “no build” option, how will negative impacts be weighed? It was suggested that a “no build” option should not receive zero points in the matrix.

**Project Team Response:** *Federal and state environmental regulations require that a ‘No Build’ alternative be analyzed in the project’s environmental document. Work on the final matrix and ‘weighing’ criteria is still being developed.*

**Question:** Will construction costs be considered in the alternatives screening process?

**Project Team Response:** *Estimated construction costs will be a part of the alternatives screening and identification process. How (or whether) it will be weighted is still being considered. The overall project is estimated to be approximately \$280 million (Caltrans 2009 PSR). Because of funding constraints, securing one-time funding for the ultimate project is not feasible. Therefore, an important screening component will be how an alternative can be phased for logical construction with corresponding funding.*

**Question:** Who makes the final decision regarding which alternative to use? Does Caltrans have the final OK on the selected alternative and does it have the authority to close the I-80 / Taylor Road Interchange?

**Project Team Response:** *Caltrans operates and maintains the I-80/SR 65 interchange and the I-80/SR 65 corridors. Local jurisdictions (cities of Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, and Placer County) own and maintain local transportation and traffic networks along these corridors. The project must comply with Federal Highway Administration, Caltrans, and local jurisdiction guidelines. A key project objective is to maintain corridor access. The project team is confident*

# I-80 / SR-65 Interchange Improvements

Stakeholder Focus Group Meetings

**August 23, 2011**

*there are alternatives to achieve this objective. Ultimately, in order to complete the PA&ED phase, progress to design/construction phases, and to secure funding, there must be agreement on a project alternative among Caltrans and the local jurisdictions.*

## **Discussion of concerns during construction:**

A comment was made that it is important to consider the holiday time frame (October – December) during construction to avoid negatively impacting the retail businesses. It was noted that the project's PA&ED phase (to be completed in 2015) does not involve construction. Once an overall interchange design is identified, a construction phasing plan will be developed based on available funding over what could potentially be a 20-year period. Maintaining traffic flow during construction activity will be a key objective of the design/construction phases.

Another comment emphasized the importance of freeway access for trucks. The California Trucking Association (CTA) has a number of member facilities within the project area that would be affected. Congestion and accessibility would be the biggest issues for the CTA. From a trucking perspective, the four most important points on the screening matrix are: improve freeway operations, reduce congestion, enhance safety, and preserve freeway access.

## **NEXT STEPS:**

- Take stakeholder input and integrate into alternatives screening and identification process.
- Screen and refine alternatives (initially 20 concepts) for further consideration with Caltrans and local jurisdictions (Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, and Placer County).
- Share potential alternatives with focused stakeholder group in late September/early October. Modify the potential alternatives, as necessary, based on stakeholder ideas.
- Present the potential alternatives at a Community Workshop in late October/early November for public comment. Modify the potential alternatives, as necessary, based on public input.
- Introduce the potential alternatives along with the No Build alternative to the PCTPA Board in December or January 2012.
- Start the project's formal environmental review in compliance with federal and state regulations.
- Attendees were asked to identify any additional stakeholders who may be interested in attending the next focus group meeting.