Chapter 2 Comments and Responses on the Jepson Parkway Project

Letter 1
FEMA

RECEIVED

JUN 20 2008

SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
FEMA Region IX
1111 Broadway, Suite 1200
Oakland, CA. 94607-4052

FEMA

June 19, 2008

Janet Adams, Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, California 94585

Dear Ms. Adams:

This is in response to your request for comments on the Jepson Parkway Project Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Section 4 (f) Evaluation dated May 2008.

Please review the current effective Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for the Cities of Fairfield (Community Number 060370), Map revised September 15, 1993; Suisun City (Community Number 060372), Map revised June 1, 1982; Vacaville (Community Number 060373), Map revised May 7, 2001; and the County of Solano (Community Number 060631) Map revised May 7, 2001. Please note that the Cities of Fairfield, Suisun City, and Vacaville, Solano County, California are participants in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The minimum, basic NFIP floodplain management building requirements are described in Vol. 44 Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR), Sections 59 through 65.

The Flood Insurance Rate Maps for Solano County are currently being revised. The Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) is anticipated to expand at the intersection of New Alamo Creek and Leisure Tow Road as shown on the attached preliminary panel, 06095C0283E. This expansion has the potential to impact your project as shown of Figure 3.9-3 of your report. 1-1

A summary of these NFIP floodplain management building requirements are as follows:

- All buildings constructed within a riverine floodplain, (i.e., Flood Zones A, AO, AH, AE, and A1 through A30 as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated so that the lowest floor is at or above the Base Flood Elevation level in accordance with the effective Flood Insurance Rate Map. 1-2

www.fema.gov

- If the area of construction is located within a Regulatory Floodway as delineated on the FIRM, any ***development*** must not increase base flood elevation levels. **The term *development* means any man-made change to improved or unimproved real estate, including but not limited to buildings, other structures, mining, dredging, filling, grading, paving, excavation or drilling operations, and storage of equipment or materials.** A hydrologic and hydraulic analysis must be performed *prior* to the start of development, and must demonstrate that the development would not cause any rise in base flood levels. No rise is permitted within regulatory floodways.

- All buildings constructed within a coastal high hazard area, (any of the "V" Flood Zones as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated on pilings and columns, so that the lowest horizontal structural member, (excluding the pilings and columns), is elevated to or above the base flood elevation level. In addition, the posts and pilings foundation and the structure attached thereto, is anchored to resist flotation, collapse and lateral movement due to the effects of wind and water loads acting simultaneously on all building components.

- Upon completion of any development that changes existing Special Flood Hazard Areas, the NFIP directs all participating communities to submit the appropriate hydrologic and hydraulic data to FEMA for a FIRM revision. In accordance with 44 CFR, Section 65.3, as soon as practicable, but not later than six months after such data becomes available, a community shall notify FEMA of the changes by submitting technical data for a flood map revision. To obtain copies of FEMA's Flood Map Revision Application Packages, please refer to the FEMA website at http://www.fema.gov/business/nfip/forms.shtm.

1-2
Cont'd

Please Note:

Many NFIP participating communities have adopted floodplain management building requirements which are more restrictive than the minimum federal standards described in 44 CFR. Please contact the local community's floodplain manager for more information on local floodplain management building requirements. The Solano County floodplain manager can be reached by calling David Cliché, Building Official, at (707) 784-6765. The City of Fairfield floodplain manager can be reached by calling Gene Cortright, Director of Public Works, at (707) 428-7485. The Suisun City floodplain manager can be reached by calling Gary Cullen, Director, Department of Public Works, at (707) 421-7340. The City of Vacaville floodplain manager can be reached by calling Kevin Vankatwyk, City Engineer, at (707) 449-5172.

Janet Adams
Page 3
June 19, 2008

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call Marshall Marik of the Mitigation staff at (510) 627-7057.

Sincerely,

Gregor Blackburn, CFM, Branch Chief
Floodplain Management and Insurance Branch

cc:
David Cliché, Building Official, Solano County
Gene Cortright, Director of Public Works, City of Fairfield
Gary Cullen, Director of Public Works, City of Suisun City
Kevin Vankatwyk, City Engineer, City of Vacaville
Ray Lee, State of California, Department of Water Resources, Central District
Marshall Marik, Floodplanner, CFM, DHS/FEMA Region IX
Alessandro Amaglio, Environmental Officer, DHS/FEMA Region IX

NOTES TO USERS

This map is for use in administering the National Flood Insurance Program. It does not necessarily identify all areas subject to flooding, particularly from local drainage sources of small size. The community map repository should be consulted for possible updated or additional flood hazard information.

To obtain more detailed information in areas where Base Flood Elevations (BFEs) and/or floodways have been determined, users are encouraged to consult the Flood Profiles and Floodway Data and/or Summary of Stillwater Elevations tables contained within the Flood Insurance Study (FIS) report that accompanies this FIRM. Users should be aware that BFEs shown on the FIRM represent rounded whole-foot elevations. These BFEs are intended for flood insurance rating purposes only and should not be used as the sole source of flood elevation information. Accordingly, flood elevation data presented in the FIS report should be utilized in conjunction with the FIRM for purposes of construction and/or floodplain management.

Coastal Base Flood Elevations shown on this map apply only landward of 0.0' North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD 88). Users of the FIRM should be aware that coastal flood elevations are also provided in the Summary of Stillwater Elevations tables in the Flood Insurance Study report for this jurisdiction. Elevations shown in the Summary of Stillwater Elevations tables should be used for construction and/or floodplain management purposes when they are higher than the elevations shown on this FIRM.

Boundaries of the floodways were computed at cross sections and interpolated between cross sections. The floodways were based on hydraulic considerations with regard to requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program. Floodway widths and other pertinent floodway data are provided in the Flood Insurance Study report for this jurisdiction.

Certain areas not in Special Flood Hazard Areas may be protected by flood control structures. Refer to Section 2.4 "Flood Protection Measures" of the Flood Insurance Study report for information on flood control structures for this jurisdiction.

The projection used in the preparation of this map was Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) zone 10N. The horizontal datum was NAD 83, GRS80 spheroid. Differences in datum, spheroid, projection or UTM zones used in the production of FIRMs for adjacent jurisdictions may result in slight positional differences in map features across jurisdiction boundaries. These differences do not affect the accuracy of the FIRM.

Flood elevations on this map are referenced to the North American Vertical Datum of 1988. These flood elevations must be compared to structure and ground elevations referenced to the same vertical datum. For information regarding conversion between the National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 and the North American Vertical Datum of 1988, visit the National Geodetic Survey website at http://www.ngs.noaa.gov or contact the National Geodetic Survey at the following address:

NGS Information Services
NOAA, N/NGS12
National Geodetic Survey
SSMC-3, #9202
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3282
(301) 713-3242

To obtain current elevation, description, and/or location information for bench marks shown on this map, please contact the Information Services Branch of the National Geodetic Survey at (301) 713-3242, or visit its website at http://www.ngs.noaa.gov.

Base map information shown on this FIRM was derived from U.S. Geological Survey Digital Orthophoto Quadrangles produced at a scale of 1:12,000 from photography dated 1993 or later.

This map reflects more detailed and updated stream channel configurations than those shown on the previous FIRM for this jurisdiction. The floodplains and floodways that were transferred from the previous FIRM may have been adjusted to conform to these new stream channel configurations. As a result, the Flood Profiles and Floodway Data tables in the Flood Insurance Study Report (which contains authoritative hydraulic data) may reflect stream channel distances that differ from what is shown on this map.

Corporate limits shown on this map are based on the best data available at the time of publication. Because changes due to annexations or disannexations may have occurred after this map was published, map users should contact appropriate community officials to verify current corporate limit locations.

Please refer to the separately printed Map Index for an overview map of the county showing the layout of map panels; community map repository addresses; and a Listing of Communities table containing National Flood Insurance Program dates for each community as well as a listing of the panels on which each community is located.

Contact the FEMA Map Service Center at 1-800-358-9616 for information on available products associated with this FIRM. Available products may include previously issued Letters of Map Change, a Flood Insurance Study report, and/or digital versions of this map. The FEMA Map Service Center may also be reached by Fax at 1-800-358-9620 and its website at http://www.fema.gov.

If you have questions about this map or questions concerning the National Flood Insurance Program in general, please call 1-877-FEMA MAP (1-877-336-2627) or visit the FEMA website at http://www.fema.gov.



LEGEND

SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREAS SUBJECT TO INUNDATION BY THE 1% ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD

The 1% annual flood (100 year flood), also known as the base flood, is the flood that has a 1% chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. The Special Flood Hazard Area is the area subject to flooding by the 1% annual chance flood. Areas of Special Flood Hazard include Zones A, AO, AH, AE, AR, A99, V, and VE. The Base Flood Elevation is the water-surface elevation of the 1% annual chance flood.

ZONE A	No Base Flood Elevations determined.
ZONE AE	Base Flood Elevations determined.
ZONE AH	Flood depths of 1 to 3 feet (usually areas of ponding); Base Flood Elevations determined.
ZONE AO	Flood depths of 1 to 3 feet (usually sheet flow on sloping terrain); average depths determined. For areas of alluvial fan flooding, velocities also determined.
ZONE AR	Special Flood Hazard Area formerly protected from the 1% annual chance flood by a flood control system that was subsequently decertified. Zone AR indicates that the former flood control system is being restored to provide protection from the 1% annual chance or greater flood.
ZONE A99	Area to be protected from 1% annual chance flood by a Federal flood protection system under construction; no Base Flood Elevations determined.
ZONE V	Coastal flood zone with velocity hazard (wave action); no Base Flood Elevations determined.
ZONE VE	Coastal flood zone with velocity hazard (wave action); Base Flood Elevations determined.

FLOODWAY AREAS IN ZONE AE

The floodway is the channel of a stream plus any adjacent floodplain areas that must be kept free of encroachment so that the 1% annual chance flood can be carried without substantial increases in flood heights.

OTHER FLOOD AREAS

ZONE X — Areas of 0.2% annual chance flood; areas of 1% annual chance flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile; and areas protected by levees from 1% annual chance flood.

OTHER AREAS

ZONE X — Areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain.

ZONE D — Areas in which flood hazards are undetermined, but possible.

COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM (CBRS) AREAS

OTHERWISE PROTECTED AREAS (OPAs)

CBRS areas and OPAs are generally located within or adjacent to Special Flood Hazard Areas.

1% annual chance floodplain boundary

0.2% annual chance floodplain boundary

Floodway boundary

Zone D boundary

CBRS and OPA boundary

Boundary dividing Special Flood Hazard Areas (zones and subzones), alluvial fan flood hazard areas, areas of 0.2% annual chance flood; flood depths or flood velocities.

513 — Base Flood Elevation line and value; elevation in feet*

(EL 987) — Base Flood Elevation value where uniform within zone; elevation in feet*

* Referenced to the North American Vertical Datum of 1988

W S — Cross section line

W S — Transect line

47°07'45", 30°22'30" — Geographic coordinates referenced to the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 83), western hemisphere

7278000 FT — 1000-meter Universal Transverse Mercator grid values, zone 10N

600000 FT — 5000-foot grid ticks: California State Plane coordinate system, zone II (FIPSZONE 0402), Lambert Conformal Conic projection

DX5510 ▫ — Bench mark (see explanation in Notes to Users section of this FIRM panel)

• M1.5 — River Mile

MAP REPOSITORY
Refer to listing of Map Repositories on Map Index

EFFECTIVE DATE OF COUNTYWIDE
FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP

EFFECTIVE DATE(S) OF REVISION(S) TO THIS PANEL

For community map revision history prior to countywide mapping, refer to the Community Map History table located in the Flood Insurance Study report for this jurisdiction.

To determine if flood insurance is available in this community, contact your insurance agent or call the National Flood Insurance Program at 1-800-638-6620.

MAP SCALE 1" = 500'

250 0 250 500 FEET

125 0 125 250 METERS

NFIP NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

PANEL 0283E

FIRM
FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP

SOLANO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
AND INCORPORATED AREAS

PANEL 283 OF 730
(SEE MAP INDEX FOR FIRM PANEL LAYOUT)

CONTAINS:

COMMUNITY	NUMBER	PANEL	SUFFIX
SOLANO COUNTY	060631	0283	E
VACAVILLE, CITY OF	060374	0283	E

DRAFT REVISED PRELIMINARY

Notice to User: The Map Number shown below should be used when placing map orders; the Community Number shown above should be used on insurance applications for the subject community.

MAP NUMBER
06095C0283E

EFFECTIVE DATE

Federal Emergency Management Agency

Responses

1-1. Thank you for the comment. The Special Flood Hazard Area for this area will be reviewed and accounted for during the final design phase of the project. A detailed hydraulic analysis of New Alamo Creek will be completed as part of the final design.

1.2. Detailed hydraulic analysis will be completed at all crossings of the regulatory floodplain to ensure that the base floodplain is not raised as part of the project. The proposed roadway elevation will be elevated above the base floodplain in all locations where the roadway is currently overtopped. It is anticipated that the current design including proposed creek crossings will not raise the floodplain. The project does not encroach on any "V" Flood Zones.

Letter 2
United States Air Force, Travis AFB

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS 60TH AIR MOBILITY WING (AMC)

Colonel Mark C. Dillon
Commander
400 Brennan Circle
Travis AFB CA 94535-5049

Ms. Janet Adams, P.E.
Director of Projects
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

Dear Ms. Adams,

Thank you for considering Travis AFB in the review of the Jepson Parkway Project Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). We are excited to see the local community's future planning and development efforts, and we appreciate the concern you show for impacts to our base during that process.

In the review of the five alternatives listed in the Draft EIR, we found a few items that we would like you to consider when choosing a preferred alternative. First of all, we have some concerns regarding impact to environmentally sensitive habitat on about 40 acres of the base surrounding the old Aero Club just south of Air Base Parkway, near the intersection with Peabody Road. The area contains Lasthenia Conjugens, a listed plant species, and vernal pool habitat that we are required by federal law and mitigation agreements with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to protect. Any alternative or design that would impact that habitat would conflict with our requirements to protect this area. 2-1

Second, we have a concern regarding the impacts that a "flyover ramp" at the intersection of Air Base Parkway and Peabody Road, as discussed in both Alternatives C and E, might have on the security of our base. Our concern is that by elevating the traffic to a significantly higher level than the existing road, the general public would be allowed a vantage point for viewing the base from above. It is important for the protection of the base that we be able to control all types of access, including visual. 2-2

Finally, we may have an aviation safety concern that we would like to be considered when choosing an alternative and progressing through design. While our old Aero Club has been closed to fixed-wing aircraft, it is now used as a helipad for helicopters transporting patients to and from David Grant Medical Center. The helicopters often fly over the intersection of Air Base Parkway and Peabody Road as they are approaching or departing, and their flight patterns are often determined largely by wind direction. A "flyover ramp" at that intersection, depending on the height and final layout, could begin to penetrate our approach departure surfaces. 2-3

Based on these concerns, our preference is that one of the alternatives that does not include "flyover ramp" at the intersection of Air Base Parkway and Peabody Road receive a higher priority than Alternative C or E. Also, any improvements to the section of Air Base Parkway north of our old Aero Club should be considered in light of the mitigation agreements in place to protect that area. 2-4

We realize that you have many complex and sometimes competing concerns when planning a project of this size, and Travis AFB very much appreciates your consideration of our input in that process. Thank you again for ensuring we are included.

If you have further questions, please contact our community planner, Sara Underwood, at (707) 424-0872.

Sincerely,

MARK C. DILLON, Colonel, USAF
Commander

Responses

2-1. The potential for Alternatives C and E to affect Contra Costa goldfield and other listed and special status plant mitigation areas agreed to be dedicated to preservation was an important consideration in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

2-2. The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) met with Air Force Base staff to discuss concerns related to homeland defense and the flyover ramp proposed with Alternatives C and E. This concern was an important factor weighing against these alternatives in identifying the Preferred Alternative. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

2-3. Based on discussions with Air Force Base staff, it appeared that Alternatives C and E would not interfere with helicopter flight paths since the flyover ramp would have been aligned roughly in parallel with the landing strip. Other considerations weighed in the balance against these alternatives, however. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

2-4. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative.

Letter 3
United States Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605
Sacramento, California 95825-1846

In reply refer to:
81420-2008-TA-1791-1

AUG 5 2008

Ms. Janet Adams
Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, California 94585

Subject: Review of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement for the Jepson Parkway Project, Solano County, California

Dear Ms. Adams:

This letter represents the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (Service) review of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement for the Jepson Parkway Project (proposed project) in Solano County, California. The Service received your request for review on June 4, 2008. The proposed Jepson Parkway Project proposes involves roadway improvements in mid-Solano County between Interstate 80 in Vacaville in the north and State Route 12 in Suisun City in the south. The proposed 12-mile project would upgrade and link a series of two and four lane roadways (as well as construct an extension of an existing roadway under one alternative) and include safety improvements such as the provision of roadway medians, traffic signals, shoulders, separate turn lanes, railroad grade separations, and separate bike lanes.

At issue are the potential effects of the proposed project on the federally-threatened California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), threatened California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*), threatened vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*), endangered vernal pool tadpole shrimp (*Lepidurus packardi*), endangered Conservancy fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta conservatio*) (listed crustaceans), threatened valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*), threatened Delta green ground beetle (*Elaphrus viridis*), endangered Contra Costa goldfields (*Lasthenia conjugens*) (goldfields), threatened giant garter snake (*Thamnophis gigas*), threatened delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*), threatened Colusa grass (*Neostapfia colusana*), endangered Solano grass (*Tuctoria mucronata*), endangered Suisun thistle (*Cirsium hydrophilum* var. *hydrophilum*), endangered soft bird's beak (*Cordylanthus mollis* ssp. *Mollis*), and the endangered California clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris obsoletus*). Our comments are provided in accordance with the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) (Act).

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The Service has reviewed the following information: (1) the May 2008, *Jepson Parkway Project Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation* (report), (2) various meetings and phone conversations to discuss the proposed project; and (3) other information available to the Service.

The Service has the following comments on the proposed project:

1. The report indicates on page 3.15-1, that the impact area for the proposed project includes the existing right of way and a 25-foot buffer on either side of the existing right of way. In general, the Service requests that applicants consider localized indirect effects to a minimum of 250 feet from the edge of the project footprint, going out further if appropriate habitat for species exists. Additionally, if any part of a wetland feature is directly affected, the entire feature is typically considered impacted. Please revise your report and maps to discuss/depict impacts out at least 250 feet from the edge of construction, instead of from the centerline, and farther than 250 feet (to edge of habitat feature) if suitable habitat for listed species is present. Staging areas or any areas where the ground will be disturbed should also be considered in this impact analysis. 3-1

2. On page 3.15-22, the report indicates that work in saturated or ponded features work will generally be prohibited but may not be avoidable. Before the project description is finalized, the Service requests a draft to evaluate areas that have the potential for wet season work to occur. The Service requests that work in wetted areas be avoided due to the sensitive nature of listed species in the project area. 3-2

3. The report mentions in multiple places that the proposed project is needed to accommodate traffic associated with future planned growth; however, the report does not analyze the indirect effects of the proposed project on growth within the surrounding area. Please provide an analysis of the indirect effects of the proposed project on the habitats of listed species in the surrounding area as a result of facilitating population growth. 3-3

4. The report indicates that there is designated critical habitat for several different species within the proposed project area. Yet there is no discussion of impacts or potential impacts to any critical habitat. Please address potential impacts including quantity and quality of the habitat, to the species' critical habitat. 3-4

5. Botanical surveys if performed following Service guidelines (*Guidelines for Conducting and Reporting Botanical Inventories for Federally Listed, Proposed and Candidate Plants, 1996)* are generally valid for 2 - 3 years. The report indicated that there are some alkali wetlands in the project area. The Service recommends rare plant surveys be conducted up to 250 feet from the edge of proposed development. The Service also recommends updating the Contra Costa goldfields plant survey report. 3-5

6. Valley elderberry longhorn beetle surveys if performed following Service guidelines are valid for 2 years. The report indicated that surveys for the beetle were conducted in October 2005. The October 2005 survey is outdated and the Service recommends an updated survey. 3-6

7 The report indicates that many culverts will need to be replaced or built for the proposed project. The Service requests that any culverts replaced not be any smaller than original culverts as to facilitate wildlife undercrossings. If new culverts are to be constructed, please provide an analysis on how installation of new culverts will not have any negative effects on existing hydrology. 3-7

8. The report indicates that there is no suitable habitat for Conservancy fairy shrimp in the proposed project area. The Service requests that you provide a rationale for the determination that Conservancy fairy shrimp and suitable habitat for this species are not present. The Service will review the rationale and other available information to determine if we concur with your assessment. 3-8

9. The report indicates that there is marginally suitable habitat for the Delta green ground beetle in the proposed project area. The report indicates that potentially suitable habitat for this species exists in northwestern Fairfield, along Leisure Town Road, Vanden Road, and Walters Road. The Service requests that you provide a rationale for the determination that Delta green ground beetle and suitable habitat for this species are not present. The Service will review the rationale and other available information to determine if we concur with your assessment. 3-9

10. The applicant has chosen to assume presence of the vernal pool tadpole shrimp and vernal pool fairy shrimp in the action area due to nearby documented occurrences of these species and the presence of suitable habitat in the action area. The proposed avoidance and minimization measures are consistent with those measures outlined in the Services' February 28, 1996, *Programmatic Formal Endangered Species Act Consultation on Issuance of 404 Permits for Projects with Relatively Small Effects on Listed Vernal Pool Crustaceans Within the Jurisdiction of the Sacramento Field Office, California* (programmatic consultation) (Service File number 1-1-96-F-0001). However, the programmatic consultation is meant to address relatively small effects to the listed crustaceans and effects to less than one acre of habitat for these species. Therefore, the Service considers the proposed avoidance and minimization measures inadequate the potential acres of impacts being between 1 and 6 acres. Please revise the report to include additional avoidance and minimization measures for the vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp. 3-10

11. The Service needs more detailed information on potential breeding sites for the California tiger salamander in the proposed project area. All potential suitable breeding habitat needs to be identified. The Service recommends using the salamander site assessment guidelines from our website (http://www.fws.gov/sacramento). 3-11

Ms. Janet Adams 4

12. The Service has concerns over the proposed Walters Road extension in alternative B. The proposed extension will run directly through a core population of Contra Costa goldfields and could potentially fragment the population on site. Please address in detail the potential impacts of bisecting this population. Also include any alternatives this alignment. 3-12

13. It is indicated in the report, on page 3.15-57, that compensation for temporary loss (areas indirectly affected) will be preserved at a 3:1 ratio. Temporary and indirect effects are not the same. We recommend that all areas that are indirectly affected will be at a 9:1 ratio for Contra Costa goldfields, the same as direct effects. Indirect effects are caused by or result from the proposed action, are later in time, and are reasonably certain to occur. 3-13

The Service believes that segments of the action area contain very important and sensitive habitat for a number of rare, federally-listed species. The Service encourages the applicant to continue to work with the resource agencies to minimize potential effects to listed species. Please contact Michelle Tovar or the Sacramento Valley Branch Chief of my staff at (916) 414-6645, if you have questions regarding this comment on proposed Project.

Sincerely,

Peter A. Cross
Deputy Assistant Field Supervisor

cc:
Sam Bacchini, PBS&J, Sacramento, California
Melanie Brent, Caltrans, San Francisco, California
Peter Straub, Corps, San Francisco, California
Carolyn Mulvihill, EPA, San Francisco, California
Melissa Escaron, CDFG, Napa, California
Jolanta Uchman, RQWCB, Oakland, California

RESPONSES

3-1. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative. Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) was consulted regarding an appropriate study area for the determination of impacts associated with implementation of the Preferred Alternative. As such, and as described under heading 3.15.5, in Section 3.15, Biological Environment of the Final EIS, indirect impacts on listed vernal pool crustacean habitat included those pools outside of the project footprint but within 250 feet of the right-of-way, except on the bridged section of the Walters Road extension where the USFWS has agreed to a 150 foot area of indirect effect. This study area is reflected in the impact and mitigation acreages included in the Biological Assessment completed for the Preferred Alternative. This was confirmed by the issuance of the Biological Opinion on May 27, 2010.

3-2. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative. Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, the USFWS was consulted regarding the incorporation of avoidance and minimization measures in the design of the Preferred Alternative. This information is included in the Biological Assessment completed for the Preferred Alternative, as well as Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS. This was confirmed by the issuance of the Biological Opinion on May 27, 2010.

STA will continue to work with USFWS during final design and during the Corps permitting process to ensure that the concerns of the USFWS are accommodated.

3-3. Please see the Essay Response 6: Potential Growth Inducing Effects of the Jepson Parkway Project.

Alternative B (the Preferred Alternative) would have permanent and temporary impacts to listed plant and animal species as reported in Table 3.15-7 in Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Draft EIR/EIS. Impacts to seasonal wetlands occupied by Contra Costa goldfields would occur along existing Walters Road and the proposed Walters Road extension; impacts to vernal pool invertebrate habitat would occur adjacent to Leisure Town Road and Vanden Road, between Cement Hill Road and Air Base Parkway, and along the eastern side of Walters Road.

Various development projects are currently planned or in process for areas adjacent to the Jepson Parkway project. Additional impacts to habitat areas from these adjacent developments may occur, but these projects do not constitute unplanned growth induced by the Jepson Parkway project and therefore their impacts would be independent of the Jepson Parkway project. These future land uses are included in the travel demand models and traffic projections for the project as part of no-build conditions; these are the traffic generators the Jepson Parkway project is needed to serve. Each of these developments will undergo its own environmental review, including quantification of impacts to habitat for listed species and associated minimization and mitigation measures as appropriate.

The Jepson Parkway project is consistent with the various general plan land use designations and policies, zoning restrictions, urban limit lines, inter-jurisdictional agreements and voter initiatives that are in place to prevent unplanned growth in the greater project area. It also complies with the Draft Solano County Multi Species Habitat Conservation Plan. These policies and restrictions will ensure that development impacts to habitat for listed species are minimized and quantified as well as fully disclosed and mitigated.

3-4. The commenter is correct that Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Draft EIR/EIS states that critical habitat for vernal pool species could be affected by the proposed project. For the purposes of the analysis, no distinction was made between habitat versus critical habitat. Both types of habitat were afforded the same consideration in the discussion of impacts and mitigation measures. Impacts on critical habitat were addressed in the Biological Assessment completed for the Preferred Alternative and were confirmed by the issuance of the Biological Opinion on May 27, 2010.

3-5. As described in Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, botanists conducted special-status plant and floristic surveys of the study area as recently as March and April 2007. The results of these surveys are summarized in the appropriate chapters of the Final EIS.

An additional survey was conducted during July of 2008 that focused on a segment of Alternative B known as the Walters Road Extension. (Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.) This survey was conducted at the request of the USFWS, and focused on Suisun thistle (*Cirsium hydrophilum* var. *hydrophilum*) and soft bird's-beak (*Cordylanthus mollis* ssp. *mollis*) in alkaline portions of the study area. Suisun thistle and soft bird's-beak were not found in the July 2008 surveys. Conversations with Julia King, an independent consulting botanist who has conducted extensive surveys in the study area for an unrelated project, indicated that these species have not been observed in the alkaline portions of the study area.

The results of the July 2008 plant survey have been incorporated into Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS.

3-6. A valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB) survey was conducted on September 23, 2008 using the USFWS July 9, 1999 "Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle." Data were recorded using a Trimble GeoXT GPS receiver and converted to GIS format using Trimble Pathfinder Office's export feature for mapping purposes. The survey area covered a 100-foot radius along the proposed project alignments (i.e., 100 feet from the edge of ground disturbance). Elderberry shrubs with stems greater than one inch in diameter at ground level were found at two locations along the proposed alignments. These include the crossing of Old Alamo Creek at Leisure Town Road (Alternatives B, C, and D), and the crossing of Old Alamo Creek at Peabody Road (Alternative E). No other elderberry shrubs were observed in the project area (i.e., within 100 feet of all alignments).

At the crossing of Old Alamo Creek and Leisure Town Road, six shrubs with a total of 20 stems greater than one inch at ground level were found within the study area. One of these stems had an apparent VELB exit hole. An additional 28 stems were found that had a diameter at ground level of less than one inch. These less than one inch stems are not considered habitat for VELB due to their size.

At the crossing of Old Alamo Creek and Peabody Road, eight elderberry shrubs were found with a total of 26 stems greater than one inch at ground level. None of these stems had VELB exit holes. No stems less than one inch at ground level were found at this location.

The results of the survey have been summarized in Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS.

3-7. The Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS includes mitigation measures (including Mitigation Measure BR-1 and BR- 2, BR-4 thru BR-13, and BR-15, in Section 3.15, Biological Environment, as well as WQ-1 to WQ-3 in Section 3.10, Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff) to ensure compliance with the conditions of all Clean Water Act permits and Streambed Alteration Agreements before any construction activities are initiated. In addition, design of all new and expanded culverts will maintain

existing hydrologic conditions. Final details regarding the design of all new and expanded culverts will be provided as part of the permit application process. In addition, since the southern end of the project site is within the jurisdiction of the Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District (FSSD) the project would be required to comply with FSSD regulations.

3-8. Information regarding Conservancy fairy shrimp is included in the Biological Assessment completed for the Preferred Alternative, as well as Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS. This information states that Conservancy fairy shrimp occur in large, deep playa vernal pools, none of which occur in the project area.

3-9. Information regarding the suitable habitat and presence of the Delta green ground beetle is included in the Biological Assessment completed for the Preferred Alternative, as well as Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS. This information indicates that habitat for Delta green ground beetle includes large playa pools with sparsely vegetated margins located on Pescadero Clay soils, none of which is found in the project area. Additionally, extensive surveys have been conducted in the project area for this species and none have been found. This was confirmed by the issuance of the Biological Opinion on May 27, 2010.

3-10. Revised avoidance and minimization measures regarding potential vernal pool tadpole shrimp and vernal pool fairy shrimp is included in the Biological Assessment completed for the Preferred Alternative, as well as Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS. These measures include an increased mitigation ratio of 4:1 preservation (4 acres preserved for every acre impacted) and 2:1 creation (2 acres created for every acre impacted). This was confirmed by the issuance of the Biological Opinion on May 27, 2010.

3-11. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative. Pursuant to requests from USFWS, additional research regarding potential California tiger salamander breeding sites was included in the Biological Assessment completed for the Preferred Alternative. All potential breeding ponds in the study area and within 1.24 miles have been identified. This was confirmed by the issuance of the Biological Opinion on May 27, 2010. This information has also been included in Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS.

3-12. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative. Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, a Biological Assessment of the Preferred Alternative was completed for review by the USFWS. This Biological Assessment included a complete analysis of impacts associated with Alternative B, including the Walters Road extension. To mitigate for impacts on Contra Costa goldfields, STA has agreed to preserve additional habitat that supports this species at a 9:1 ratio (9 acres of preservation for each acre impacted) for populations directly or indirectly impacted. Additionally, STA will ensure the creation of habitat at a 3:1 ratio (3 acres created for each acre impacted) for habitat directly impacted. In addition to this mitigation, STA will modify the proposed project, as described under Mitigation Measure BR-20, to reduce impacts on Contra Costa goldfields. This was confirmed by the issuance of the Biological Opinion on May 27, 2010.

3-13. As described above, the Biological Assessment for Alternative B included compensatory mitigation for Contra Costa goldfield habitat. Formal consultation with USFWS was concluded and a Biological Opinion was signed on May 27, 2010 (see Appendix J). The USFWS's no jeopardy Biological Opinion identifies the required minimization and compensatory mitigation measures following the completion of formal Section 7 consultation. Compensatory mitigation will be provided in accordance with the ratios included in the Biological Opinion. This information has also been included in Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS.

Letter 4
United States Environmental Protection Agency

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

RECEIVED
JUL 22 2008
SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

July 18, 2008

Ms. Janet Adams
Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Jepson Parkway Project, Solano County, California (CEQ #20080220)

Dear Ms. Adams:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the above-referenced document pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. EPA has previously provided feedback on this project through the *National Environmental Policy Act and Clean Water Action Section 404 Integration Process for Surface Transportation Projects Memorandum of Understanding* (NEPA/404 MOU). The NEPA/404 MOU was updated in 2006, since the last concurrence point for the project, and we have enclosed a copy of the updated document. Our detailed comments are also enclosed.

The State of California has assumed responsibilities under NEPA for this project pursuant to the *Memorandum of Understanding Between the Federal Highway Administration and the California Department of Transportation Concerning the State of California's Participation in the Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program.*

EPA appreciates the efforts made by the project development team to coordinate through the NEPA/404 MOU process. However, we have some concerns about impacts to wetlands and waters of the United States and growth inducement. We also have recommendations regarding air quality, wildlife and habitat, multimodal features, and stormwater management. EPA has rated this document EC-2, *Environmental Concerns, Insufficient Information*. Please see the enclosed *Rating Factors* for a description of our rating system.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this Draft Environmental Impact Statement and look forward to future coordination on the project. The next steps in the NEPA/404 MOU process are agreement on the 1) Least Environmentally Damaging

Printed on Recycled Paper

Practicable Alternative (LEDPA), the only alternative that is permittable pursuant to the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, and 2) the conceptual mitigation plan. We look forward to receiving future information from the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) and Caltrans regarding the LEDPA and conceptual mitigation plan. We encourage STA and Caltrans to schedule a meeting with the NEPA/404 MOU agencies to discuss next steps in the process. Also, when the Final Environmental Impact Statement is released for public review, please send two hard copies to the address above (mail code: CED-2) at the same time the document is filed with our EPA Headquarters office.

If you have any questions, please contact Carolyn Mulvihill of my staff at 415-947-3554 or mulvihill.carolyn@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

for Connell Dunning

Nova Blazej, Manager
Environmental Review Office

Enclosures:
Summary of EPA Rating Definitions
EPA's Detailed Comments
National Environmental Policy Act/Clean Water Act Section 404 Integration Process Memorandum of Understanding, 2006 (NEPA/404 MOU)

cc: Melanie Brent, Caltrans
Michelle Tovar, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Doug Hampton, NOAA Fisheries
Peter Straub, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

2

Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States

EPA has participated in this project as outlined in the *National Environmental Policy Act and Clean Water Action Section 404 Integration Process for Surface Transportation Projects Memorandum of Understanding* (NEPA/404 MOU). The next steps in the NEPA/404 MOU process are agreement on the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) and the conceptual mitigation plan (Checkpoint 3). More information is needed to inform an alternatives analysis and to justify selection of the LEDPA. This information should be provided in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) if the FEIS will be used to justify selection of a LEDPA. At a minimum the information should be included in the future request for agreement on the LEDPA and the conceptual mitigation plan. EPA provides the following recommendations to assist in identification of the LEDPA and conceptual mitigation plan:

Recommendations:

- Engage EPA, the Army Corps of Engineers, and other resource agencies in the identification of the LEDPA before publication of the FEIS, as outlined in the NEPA/404 MOU. 4-1
- The FEIS should include an explicit discussion of the various trade-offs between the alternatives in terms of impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S. and other resources. For example, it appears that Alternative B has the highest impacts, in terms of acreage of wetlands and waters of the U.S., and may have more floodplain impacts than the other build alternatives. Alternative B would also cut through a High Value Conservation Area, as identified by the Draft Solano County Multi Species Habitat Conservation Plan. Alternative E appears to have the lowest acreage of wetland impacts; however, it would also impact 4(f) properties and would result in residential relocations. Since the project is not water-dependent, practicable alternatives to filling wetlands are presumed to exist, and the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) should provide a detailed argument to justify the statement that no practicable alternatives exist. 4-2
- The FEIS, and the request for agreement on the LEDPA prior to release of the FEIS, should include a discussion of the functional values of the wetland and other habitat resources that would be impacted by the various alternatives. 4-3
- The FEIS should identify that the alternative that is ultimately chosen as the preferred alternative avoids and minimizes impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S. to the maximum extent practicable. Where impacts exist, the FEIS should include a discussion of why avoidance is not practicable, with regard to cost, logistics, and technology. 4-4

1

- The analysis of cumulative impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S. should include quantitative information about the impacts of other projects in the vicinity of the proposed Jepson Parkway. The FEIS should include any data that is available regarding these impacts. 4-5

- The discussion of Executive Order 11990 should be expanded in the FEIS. The statement that "avoidance alternatives to minimize harm to wetlands in compliance with Executive Order 11990 have been determined to be infeasible" should be justified. 4-6

- The FEIS should include more specific information about compensatory mitigation, which should be discussed with EPA and the other agencies involved in the NEPA/404 MOU process, prior to Checkpoint 3. 4-7

Growth Inducement

EPA has concerns that the proposed project may lead to induced growth. Specifically, the statements that "there is little opportunity for infill development within the existing city limits of Vacaville" and that "this suggests that future growth will occur on the city's edges, including the areas east and southeast of the city, in the vicinity of the corridor" imply that there is a high probability of induced growth in unincorporated county areas east of Leisure Town Road and in the vicinity of Vanden Road. This area is also characterized as Prime Farmland.

The DEIS describes various city and county planning mechanisms which could limit growth induced by the project. However, EPA is concerned that the Solano County Orderly Growth Initiative (Proposition A) is only in effect until 2010. As stated above, the unincorporated county areas east of Leisure Town Road and in the vicinity of Vanden Road are dominated by Prime Farmland and development pressure in this area would likely increase due to improved access provided by the project.

Recommendations:

- The FEIS should discuss the implications of Proposition A no longer being in effect and whether there are efforts to extend its protections for agriculture and open space in the county.

- The FEIS should include a more detailed analysis of growth-related impacts. EPA recommends using the May 2006 *Guidance for Preparers of Growth-related, Indirect Impact Analyses* (Guidance) [http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/Growth-related_IndirectImpactAnalysis/gri_guidance.htm] developed jointly by Caltrans, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and EPA. EPA recommends following the Step-by-Step Approach for Conducting the Analysis in Chapter 6 of the Guidance. The Guidance recommends that an analysis of growth-related impacts: 4-8
    - Identify if the project will affect the location and/or timing of planned growth in the area;

2

- Identify the potential resources that may be affected by the increased "zone of influence" associated with interchanges; and
- Include a discussion of mitigation strategies to reduce impacts if adverse impacts cannot be avoided or minimized. Section 6.3 of the Guidance provides an approach to address mitigation for growth-related impacts.

4-8 Cont'd

- Use the results of the analysis to inform transit options, road design, and recommendations for future zoning near the proposed alternatives as well as mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts.

Air Quality

Construction Emissions

The DEIS states that the Yolo Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) requires quantification of construction emissions, while the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) does not. Instead, BAAQMD recommends that significance be based on a consideration of the control measures to be implemented.

Recommendation:

- Given the YSAQMD requirement and the fact that a quantification of emissions would inform the type of control measures necessary to mitigate impacts, EPA recommends that a quantification of construction emissions be included in the FEIS. This analysis should include the timeframe of construction activities, the types of equipment that will be used, hours of operation, and specific emissions that will result from each type of construction equipment. Mitigation measures to reduce these impacts should also be presented.

4-9

Mobile Source Air Toxics

The DEIS states that "available technical tools do not enable us to predict the project-specific health impacts of the [mobile source air toxics (MSAT)] emission changes associated with the alternatives under the proposed project." EPA and FHWA have an ongoing dialogue regarding the technical tools available for analysis of MSAT impacts. Tools for evaluating project-specific health impacts from MSATs do exist and EPA would be happy to work with Caltrans and STA to identify appropriate and available methods for evaluating MSAT impacts to include in the FEIS.

The DEIS states that "under each build alternative there may be localized areas where ambient concentrations of MSATs could be higher under certain build alternatives than Alternative A." Specifically, the DEIS states that "the additional travel lanes contemplated as part of the build alternatives would have the effect of moving some traffic closer to nearby homes and businesses." MSAT impacts would differ based on the proximity of the various alternatives to current and future development. Since no locational analysis has been performed, these impacts are unknown; however the DEIS lists specific locations where MSAT concentrations would most likely increase. The DEIS also states that these increased concentrations could be offset due to increases in travel speeds and reductions in congestion.

3

Recommendations:

- Technical tools are available to analyze the MSAT impacts of the various alternatives at specific locations and EPA recommends their use to determine impacts on sensitive receptors near the proposed project. However, if this analysis is not performed, we recommend that Table 3.13-3, Summary of Air Quality Impacts, be amended to remove the statements that Alternatives B-E will have "no impact" with regard to MSATs. This conclusion is not justified based on the information included in the DEIS. 4-10
- Identify in the FEIS specific mitigation measures that can be adopted to reduce MSAT impacts, including any design changes that would move the roadway away from sensitive receptors.

Wildlife and Habitat

The DEIS includes information from wildlife and habitat surveys that have taken place during various phases of project planning, ranging from 1999 through 2007. It is unclear whether all necessary studies have been verified as containing current information. The DEIS also does not indicate the status of Section 7 consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or consultation with other resource agencies on impacts to wildlife and habitat.

Recommendations:

- The FEIS should include verification from the USFWS, National Marine Fisheries Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and any other relevant agencies, that the data collected in wildlife and habitat surveys is still current and applicable. 4-11
- The FEIS should also include a discussion of Section 7 consultation and the final compensatory mitigation commitments for impacts to wildlife and habitat, as determined in the Biological Opinion by the USFWS and in consultation with other regulatory agencies. 4-12

Multimodal Features

EPA commends STA for including multimodal features in the project, including bicycle and pedestrian amenities. EPA encourages STA to coordinate with local transit agencies, as well as those responsible for improvements to the Future Multimodal Train Station, to determine whether additional improvements, such as bus shelters or other features to facilitate transit service, can be provided during construction of the project.

Recommendations:

- STA should coordinate with local transit agencies and those responsible for improvements to the Future Multimodal Train Station to determine whether additional transit improvements can be provided during construction of the project. 4-13
- Include detailed information in the FEIS about future bus routes on the proposed corridor.

4

- Provide consistent bicycle and pedestrian facilities along the entire length of the proposed project corridor to provide safe and efficient multimodal travel options. 4-14

Green Infrastructure and Stormwater Management

The project will result in both an encroachment into the 100-year floodplain and an increase in impervious surface, which may alter local stormwater drainage patterns. In order to mitigate these impacts, EPA recommends that the project integrate green infrastructure approaches to protect water quality.

Recommendation:

- Integrate green infrastructure approaches into the stormwater management plans for the project and include a discussion of the proposed strategies in the FEIS. Examples of green infrastructure that should be considered for the project include constructed wetlands and vegetated swales or filter strips. Detailed information about these and other green infrastructure approaches is available at http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/greeninfrastructure/technology.cfm. 4-15

Enclosures were voluminous and are not reproduced here.

Responses

4-1. As reported in Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS, "trade-off" analysis, practicability constraints, and proposed mitigation and minimization measures were presented to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)-404 Integration process signatory agencies on November 20, 2008 as a basis for identifying Alternative B as the least environmentally damaging, practicable alternative (LEDPA). The NEPA-404 Integration process requires these agencies to concur in writing in the identification of the LEDPA and in the conceptual mitigation plan. Preliminary concurrence of Alternative B as the LEDPA was granted at the November 20, 2008 meeting; formal concurrence letters are included in Appendix B of the Final EIS. Concurrence in the LEDPA is a critical consideration in the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative for this project.

4-2. Alternatives analysis consistent with Clean Water Act Section 404 (b)(1) Guidelines has been added to Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS. This analysis describes the impacts of all Jepson Parkway build alternatives in terms of their adverse impacts on the aquatic ecosystem and other adverse environmental consequences, and provides detail to explain why alternatives with lesser impacts on wetlands and other waters are not practicable.

4-3. Discussion of the vegetation and wildlife habitat functional values of the seasonal wetland, freshwater marsh, seasonal drainage, perennial drainage, and perennial pond areas of the project corridor is provided in Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS. This text has been augmented with details regarding water storage, flood control and water quality functions. These functions were considered in the alternatives analysis referenced previously.

4-4. The above-referenced alternatives analysis pursuant to Section 404(b)(1) guidelines and the Wetlands Only Practicable Alternative Finding prepared pursuant to Executive Order 11990 (see

Section 3.15, Biological Environment and Appendix I of the Final EIS) report the avoidance and minimization measures taken to reduce impacts to the maximum extent practicable. These measures include widening to the other side of the roadway, shifting the roadway alignment, reducing design standards, and incorporating bridges to cross over resource areas and maintain drainage connections.

4-5. Cumulative effects include the combined effects of past, present and foreseeable future projects that are reasonably expected to occur in the project vicinity. Future federal projects that are not related to the proposed project are not considered for cumulative effects with the present project, since these actions will be subject to consultation or permits requirements from federal resource agencies that will minimize and mitigate their impacts. Due to the presence of jurisdictional wetlands and waters and federally listed species such as Contra Costa goldfields, vernal pool crustaceans, and California tiger salamander in the greater project area, any private sector project applicants also would be required to consult regarding impacts to such resources. Such projects include developments already planned or in process for much of the developable land area along the west side of Leisure Town Road, along Vanden Road east of Peabody Road, along Peabody Road north of Cement Hill Road, and along Walters Road between East Tabor Avenue and Bella Vista Drive. Additionally, the Fairfield-Vacaville Multimodal Train Station and associated transit-oriented development planned to occur near the Peabody Road/Vanden Road intersection, and the Hawthorne Mill Project, a proposed mixed residential and commercial development that would be located south of Cement Hill Road and west of Peabody Road, are in closest proximity to the wetlands/waters resources potentially affected by the Jepson Parkway Project. Neither project has an environmental document available for public review at this time, however, both also are subject to these same federal requirements. Required resource agency consultations and permit conditions will assure that applicants projects adopt the least impacting, practicable alternatives, that impacts are minimized, and that compensatory mitigation is provided. Under these conditions, there should not be substantial contributions to cumulative effects to wetlands and waters of the U.S.

4-6. The above-referenced alternatives analysis pursuant to Section 404(b)(1) guidelines and the Wetlands Only Practicable Alternative Finding prepared pursuant to Executive Order 11990 (see Appendix I of the Final EIS) present the alternatives analysis performed to identify the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative and explain why alternatives with lesser impacts on wetlands and other waters are not practicable.

4-7. Please refer to Appendix B, Volume I of the Final EIS. Caltrans has completed all the requirements of the NEPA/404 MOU process for Checkpoint 3 including obtaining recommended concurrence from other federal signatory agencies.

4-8. The Solano County Orderly Growth Initiative (Proposition A) was passed by voters in 1984, adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in 1994, and is in effect through 2010. It amended the Solano County General Plan to prevent redesignations of lands designated for agriculture or open space and to limit the density of residential and other development on lands designated for agriculture and open space, preventing large-scale residential or mixed-use developments outside municipal areas. The initiative requires that any development proposal for land designated as agriculture or open space must

be approved by the voters unless the land is first annexed to a city. In essence, the initiative restricts the amount of growth that is likely to occur outside areas that are planned for future annexation by Vacaville, Suisun City, or Fairfield in the unincorporated portions of the corridor.

On August 5, 2008, the Solano County Board of Supervisors voted to place a measure (Measure T) on the November 2008 ballot that would make changes to the county's General Plan and extend the Orderly Growth Initiative until 2028. Measure T was passed by the voters, confirming the approval of the new General Plan and an ordinance to amend the Orderly Growth Initiative and extend it until December 31, 2028.[1] Analysis of the implications of the initiative no longer being in effect appears unwarranted.

The Jepson Parkway project does not meet the cited Guidance criteria for a more detailed, quantitative growth inducement analysis. "First-cut" screening in accordance with the Guidance validates this conclusion. The local travel serving nature of the Jepson Parkway project greatly reduces its potential to produce changes in travel times or travel costs of sufficient magnitude to change patterns of planned land use or induce growth. The Jepson Parkway project has been planned in concert with planning for local residential and commercial developments since about 1990. It would expand existing local roadway facilities rather than create new facilities. While it would facilitate the use of local roadways for local trips and thus would reduce peak-hour congestion on I-80 to some extent, it would not create new access or open new areas to development.

Although the local development projects planned in and around the Jepson Parkway corridor may occur later in time and adjacent to or beyond the immediate project corridor, they would not be caused by the project. These future developments are included in the future land uses and employment projections of the project travel demand models as part of no-build conditions. These developments would not be stimulated by the Jepson Parkway project; they are the generators of the traffic the project is designed to serve. Finally, various mechanisms, including general plan policies, zoning designations, urban limit lines, inter-jurisdictional agreements, and voter initiatives, are in place in the cities of Fairfield, Suisun City, and Vacaville and unincorporated Solano County to withstand growth pressures and limit unplanned growth.

Also, please see Essay Response 6: Potential Growth Inducing Effects of the Jepson Parkway Project.

4-9. Federal conformity regulations [40 CFR 93.123 (c) (5)] only require analysis of construction impacts for construction activities that will last for more than five years. The proposed project's construction activities are expected to last less than five years; therefore the project impacts are considered temporary (see Volume I, Section 3.13, Air Quality).

4-10. As stated in the Draft EIS/EIR under Impact AQ-4 in Section 3.13, Air Quality, the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA's) Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs) guidance considers projects like the Jepson Parkway project to have low potential for MSAT effects because it would improve

---

[1] Solano County, Solano County General Plan, accessed at http://www.solanocountygeneralplan.net/on December 10, 2008.

roadway operations without adding substantial new capacity or generating additional emissions compared to no-build conditions. The Jepson Parkway project is designed to provide a safe alternative route to using I-80 and SR 12 for north-south oriented trips between local origins and destinations. By reducing diversions of local traffic to the freeway system, the parkway project is expected to reduce vehicle miles and vehicle hours of travel (VMT and VHT) within the project vicinity. Additionally, by reducing diversions of local trips to the freeway system, the Jepson Parkway project would be expected to contribute to reduced congestion and improved operations along I-80 and SR 12. These VMT/VHT reductions and operational improvements on I-80 would result in reduced emissions within the region and therefore, reduced emissions of MSATs. Finally, and regardless of alternative, MSAT emissions are expected to be lower in the design year than at present as a result of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) national pollutant control programs that are expected to reduce MSAT emissions by 57 to 87 percent over the next 20 years or so. This magnitude of emissions reduction would generally outweigh predictable growth in corridor VMT over the same time period.

Nonetheless, locational analysis has been performed in response to EPA's request and is reported herein to identify if there are locations where the project would result in higher concentrations of MSATs at segments along the project corridor where the traffic would be closer to homes and businesses as a result of the potential roadway widening. Table II-1 provides information by roadway segment to describe whether and where widening under the project alternatives would shift the edge of the roadway closer to existing development, compared to no-build conditions. The table also provides information on VMT in both AM and PM peak hours by segment for each alternative. Where VMT would increase along any segment relative to the no-build alternative (Alternative A) and/or where the edge of the traveled way of the widened roadway would be closer to homes and businesses, exposure to vehicle emissions, including MSATs, would potentially be greater compared to the no-build alternative. The information in the table is provided at a summary level; sub-segment locational analysis and discussion is provided in the following paragraphs to provide detail by specific location.

Table II-1
MSATs Locational Analysis for Build Alternatives by Roadway Segment

	Alternatives				
	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
Walters Road Extension					
Segment Length	0	1540	N/A	N/A	N/A
VMT (per 1,000 mi) AM Peak Hour	1.96	1.91	N/A	N/A	N/A
VMT (per 1,000 mi) PM Peak Hour	2.23	2.17	N/A	N/A	N/A
Distance Closer (feet)	0	(10 to 30)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cement Hill Road					
Segment Length	0	1880	N/A	N/A	N/A
VMT (per 1,000 mi) AM Peak Hour	1.96	4.53	N/A	N/A	N/A
VMT (per 1,000 mi) PM Peak Hour	2.23	4.99	N/A	N/A	N/A
Distance Closer (feet)	0	(9 to 59)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vanden Road					
Segment Length	0	3160	3160	3160	N/A
VMT (per 1,000 mi) AM Peak Hour	5.17	6.26	6.31	6.47	N/A

Table II-1
MSATs Locational Analysis for Build Alternatives by Roadway Segment

	Alternatives				
	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
VMT (per 1,000 mi) PM Peak Hour	3.82	5.47	5.47	5.47	N/A
Distance Closer (feet)	0	(2 to 70)	(2 to 70)	(2 to 70)	N/A
Leisure Town Road					
Segment Length	0	4820	4820	4820	N/A
VMT (per 1,000 mi) AM Peak Hour	2.51	2.96	2.99	2.86	N/A
VMT (per 1,000 mi) PM Peak Hour	4.10	5.23	5.32	5.42	N/A
Distance Closer (feet)	0	(6 to 62)	(6 to 62)	(6 to 62)	N/A
Air Base Parkway					
Segment Length	0	N/A	1960	N/A	1960
VMT (per 1,000 mi) AM Peak Hour	3.85	N/A	5.07	N/A	4.79
VMT (per 1,000 mi) PM Peak Hour	6.33	N/A	7.93	N/A	8.24
Distance Closer (feet)	0	N/A	(13 to 16)	N/A	(13 to 16)
Peabody Road					
Segment Length	0	N/A	3330	0	25600
VMT (per 1,000 mi) AM Peak Hour	5.40	N/A	1.60	1.45	7.61
VMT (per 1,000 mi) PM Peak Hour	7.86	N/A	2.26	2.02	10.91
Distance Closer (feet)		N/A	(32 to 50)	(32 to 50)	(3 to 50)
Huntington Drive					
Segment Length	0	N/A	N/A	9130	N/A
VMT (per 1,000 mi) AM Peak Hour	0.64	N/A	N/A	1.38	N/A
VMT (per 1,000 mi) PM Peak Hour	0.87	N/A	N/A	1.90	N/A
Distance Closer (feet)	0	N/A	N/A	(12 to 210)	N/A

Notes:

1. There are no encroachments on Walters Road
2. Huntington Drive has a high distance closer because of the realignment approaching Air Base Parkway

The relative numbers of homes and businesses potentially affected are critical and these were assessed based on aerial photography for the project corridor. In many locations, widening would be accomplished to one or the other side of the existing road to avoid or reduce impacts to development or sensitive environmental resources. That is, the roadway centerline is shifted to retain the edge of the traveled way at or about its present location on one side. In nearly all cases where there is existing development on both sides of the proposed widening, widening is accomplished primarily on the side away from the majority of homes.

The following discussion provides explanation for areas where the travel lanes would be widened closer to the homes and business or would result in an increase in VMTs along a segment of the corridor. This discussion proceeds generally from south to north within the project corridor.

No widening is proposed south of East Tabor Avenue along existing Walters Road, a segment that is common to all build alternatives. Widening is proposed along Walters Road between East Tabor Avenue and Air Base Parkway; this is accomplished generally within the existing roadway right-of-way

and entirely to the east, away from all existing development. Along the segment shared by Alternatives C and E, Air Base Parkway between Walters and Peabody is proposed to be widened generally symmetrically and generally into undeveloped areas along both sides of Air Base Parkway. The nearest Travis Air Force Base facilities are at least 120 feet from the roadway in this segment, however, the widening would bring the travel lanes 13 to 16 feet closer to the large glass manufacturing facility at Air Base Parkway and Peabody Road. VMT estimated along this segment would be roughly 32 percent higher for the morning peak period and 25 percent higher for the evening peak period than under no-build conditions. The projected 57 to 87 percent drop in MSAT emissions from EPA's national control programs would far outweigh this VMT increase so that no adverse impact would be anticipated. The proposed "flyover ramp" at Air Base Parkway and Peabody Road under Alternatives C and E would not be close to sensitive receptors.

The segment of Peabody Road between Air Base Parkway and Cement Hill Road, which is common to Alternatives C and E, and in part to Alternative D for the portion between Huntington Drive and Cement Hill would be widened to six lanes. The widening for this portion of Peabody Road would generally be accomplished to the west to avoid encroaching on existing residential development to the east of Peabody Road between Dobe Lane and south of Markley Lane. Although the northbound edge of the traveled way would be moved closer to these developments (by less than 10 feet), this side of the widened roadway would remain within the existing roadway right-of-way. Alternative E would result in increases in VMT of up to 41 percent in the morning peak period and up to 39 percent in the evening peak period compared to the no-build alternative. These increases would be entirely off-set by the anticipated 57 to 87 percent drop in MSAT emissions from EPA's national control programs, and no adverse impact would result.

The segment of Peabody Road from Cement Hill Road northward to the Vacaville City limit would be widened to four lanes for Alternative E. Widening would be to the west to avoid encroaching on existing commercial and industrial development south of McCoy Creek, and to the east to avoid residential development around Huber Drive and Joseph Gerevas Drive. The edge of traveled way would be pushed out as much as 10 feet. Even assuming the maximum increase in VMT as presented in the preceding paragraph, the increase in MSAT emissions would be off-set by expected decreases in MSATs from EPA's national controls.

North of the Putah South Canal, Peabody Road would be widened under Alternative E primarily to the west through undeveloped lands. Westward widening would continue to avoid encroaching on residential development around Foxboro Parkway, Morning Glory Drive, Caldwell Drive, and California Drive. The edge of traveled way and proposed right of way would shift as much as 10 feet, but MSAT concentrations would not be expected to increase given the offsetting effect of EPA national control programs as presented in the preceding paragraphs.

North of California Drive to Marshall Road, there is development along both sides of Peabody Road, which would be widened generally symmetrically to provide full roadway standards and the bicycle/pedestrian path (on the west). Residential development is concentrated to the east between Marshall Road and Berryessa Drive, with the Will C. Wood High School to the west north of Marshall Road. Commercial/industrial lands are located on both sides of Peabody Road north of Berryessa

Drive to Elmira Road. New right-of-way would be required on both sides, with slightly greater widening to the west for the bicycle/ pedestrian path; this would not locate vehicular emissions closer to the residences. In general, the same analysis and conclusions would apply regarding no adverse impacts of MSAT concentrations where the edge of the traveled way would be as much as 10 feet closer to receptors.

From the intersection of Walters Road and Air Base Parkway, Alternative D would travel along Huntington Drive to Peabody Road, and widening would occur primarily to the northwest side, resulting in right-of-way acquisitions and encroaching on parking areas of large-scale commercial/industrial uses. The VMTs are projected to double along this segment of Huntington Drive in both the morning and evening peak hours, producing MSATs emissions outweighing EPA controls. Alternative D is not selected as preferred, however, since it would require relocation of a large commercial/industrial facility and the loss of about 224 jobs. This alternative also would require new right-of-way from the gas station in the southwest corner of the Huntington Drive/Peabody Road intersection.

Widening along Vanden Road from Peabody Road to Leisure Town Road, which is common to Alternatives B, C, and D, would be from two to four lanes and would shift the roadway centerline primarily to the northwest. The widening would be directed away from the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks, where there is no development except in the southwest segment. Widening of the southwest segment would require right-of-way acquisition of several commercial and industrial properties. The traveled way would be shifted from as little as two feet to as much as 70 feet closer to these developments. Given the potential right-of-way acquisition, these properties were assumed to be acquired for purposes of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS. Adverse impacts would be avoided even if these installations were to remain in operation in a reconfigured layout, however, since VMT would increase only 25 to 43 percent compared to no-build conditions, which would be offset by the anticipated 57 to 87 percent drop in MSAT emissions from EPA's national control programs. There would be no change in proximity of the roadway to existing development in the vicinity of the Vanden Road/Leisure Town Road intersection.

Leisure Town Road would be widened entirely to the west from the Vanden Road intersection to south of Purple Martin Drive; no existing development would be affected. The edge of the traveled way would not be shifted closer to residences within the Alamo Place Neighborhood; the roadway would remain entirely within the existing right of way. The area north and south of the Fry Road/Elmira Road intersection would be widened to the east to avoid residential development on the west side. The proposed right-of-way line would be as much as 25 feet closer to several residential properties on the east side of Leisure Town Road to the north and south of the Leisure Town Road/Elmira Road intersection. STA and Vacaville would enter into discussions with the property owners about this property impact. Two northbound travel lanes would be as much as 15 feet closer to these properties. VMT would increase from 14 to 32 percent and again, this potential increase in MSAT emissions would be outweighed by the expected decrease in emissions from EPA's national control programs.

North of Elmira Road to the crossings of new and old Ulatis Creeks, Leisure Town Road would be widened to the east, away from existing development on the west side. No additional widening would

occur near the residences on the east side of the roadway at White Pine Street and along Maple Road; the existing right-of-way line would not move. North of Maple Road to Orange Drive, however, there would be widening toward the east that would shift the right–of-way boundary and the edge of traveled way up to 12 to 15 feet closer to the homes between Poplar Road and Horse Creek. Assuming the VMT increases reported in the previous paragraph, no adverse impacts would be anticipated from MSAT emissions based on offsets from the expected decrease in emissions from EPA's national control programs.

4-11. Additional field work has been completed to update or verify the previous data, as appropriate. Results are reported with appropriate revisions in the relevant subsections of Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS. Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, a wetlands Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination was obtained from the Corps. In addition, a No-Jeopardy Biological Opinion was provided by the USFWS following the completion of Section 7 consultation.

4-12. Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, meetings were held with the USFWS to determine the mitigation ratios that would be required for the project. These ratios have been included in Section 3.15 of the Final EIS.

4-13. Please see Essay Response 1: Transit Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion.

Coordination with local transit agencies and planners of the future Fairfield-Vacaville Multimodal Train Station has been ongoing since conceptual planning for the Jepson Parkway project began. The proposed project incorporates future transit services, including an express and a local route, which would run between the Fairfield Transportation Center and the Downtown Vacaville Transfer Center. The Jepson Parkway Concept Plan establishes primary route components to elicit local provider commitments, but plans for detailed route segments and stops would be determined once the multi-modal station and other planned developments are in place to create the transit ridership demand. Additional transit improvements implemented during construction would not be cost-effective until there is sufficient near-term potential transit ridership, but the widening and other improvements focus on the Jepson Parkway as a multi-modal corridor for future transit routes when ridership warrants.

4-14. As described in Section 2, Project Alternatives, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, all four of the proposed build alternatives include a 10-foot-wide meandering bicycle/pedestrian path set back from the edge of the roadway at least five feet and separated by a planted strip where possible given right-of-way constraints. Alternative B, which has been identified as the Preferred Alternative, includes this bicycle/pedestrian facility on one side of the proposed roadway with standard shoulders and sidewalks contiguous to residential developments along the opposite side, for the entire length of the parkway. This facility would include pedestrian crossings at intersections. The project provides continuous bicycle and pedestrian facilities that will provide a link between Vacaville and Fairfield. A less than five-foot-wide separation between the bicycle/pedestrian path and the roadway along the Walters Road extension to minimize right-of-way impacts to biological resources would require an exception to Caltrans Design Manual criteria.

4-15. The project proposes to use vegetated swales and strips to treat storm runoff as part of the implementation of permanent best management practices (BMPs). Additional green infrastructure approaches, particularly related to storm water runoff will continue to be explored during final design.

Letter 5
California Department of Fish and Game

From: Melissa Escaron [mailto:MESCARON@dfg.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2008 2:03 PM
To: melanie_brent@dot.ca.gov; SJBacchini@pbsj.com; jadams@sta-snci.com
Cc: Melissa Escaron
Subject: Jepson Parkway CEQA comments

Hello Janet. I have a couple of comments on the DEIR for the Jepson Parkway
Project:

On page I-22 of the MMRR it says that work in riparian areas will be conducted between April 15 and October 15. Work will actually be limited to occur between June 15 and October 15 in the 1602 Agreement. **5-1**

On page I-23 it says, "Funds will be contributed to CDFG for riparian restoration activities." It is my understanding that the Department does not accept such funds. **5-2**

On page I-35 the burrowing owl avoidance and mitigation measures are detailed. I wrote an email to Steve Bacchini and your project team on January 1, 2008 saying the following:

A protocol survey will be needed during breeding season (4 visits) in addition to a pre-construction survey. Pre-construction surveys should be conducted before breeding season to allow time for eviction if active burrows are found. If evidence of presence is found, subsequent pre-construction surveys will need to be a series of visits to keep the owls off the site. **5-3**

Conducting protocol level pre-construction surveys well in advance of the construction minimizes the need for providing 6.5 acres of mitigation.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I am available to work through avoidance details with your staff or consultants to avoid the need to mitigate- Melissa

Melissa Escaron
Staff Environmental Scientist
California Department of Fish and Game
707.944.5577
mescaron@dfg.ca.gov

RESPONSES

5-1. Mitigation Measure BR-1 in the Final EIS and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) have been revised as requested.

5-2. Mitigation Measure BR-2 in the Final EIS and the MMRP have been revised to state that funds will be contributed to an approved mitigation bank for riparian restoration rather than to CDFG.

5-3. Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS included mitigation measures to minimize impacts to burrowing owls. A full (four-visit) protocol survey was completed for burrowing owl along all four build alternatives in the corridor. The surveys were conducted on April 30, May 5, May, 6, and May 7, 2008. Owls were observed nesting near the north end of Leisure Town Road (segment included in Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D) with nest burrows located between 250 and 500 feet of the edge of proposed construction. Specific details are included in the survey report, which was submitted to the Department of Fish and Game. In addition, the results of the survey are summarized in the Final EIS.

Mitigation Measure BR-17, included in Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, includes a requirement for preconstruction surveys and avoidance measures regarding burrowing owl. If all nests would be avoided during construction, no further mitigation would be necessary.

Letter 6
Solano County Department of Resource Management

SOLANO COUNTY
Department of Resource Management
Public Works Engineering
675 Texas Street, Suite 5500
Fairfield, CA 94533
www.solanocounty.com

Telephone No.: (707) 784-6765
Fax No.: (707) 784-2894

Birgitta Corsello, Director
Cliff Covey, Assistant Director

August 5, 2008

Janet Adams, Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

RE: Jepson Parkway Project EIR

Dear Janet:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Jepson Parkway Project EIR. The Jepson Parkway is an important project that provides local traffic with a good route for intercity travel in Solano County without the need to use Interstate 80. Solano County supports this project.

I have the following comments on the Jepson Parkway Project draft EIR, dated May 2008.

Figure 2-2B

Section 5 should include 2 foot paved shoulders on both inside lanes. This will require 149 feet of right-of-way.

Section 6 should show a 20 foot landscaped area adjacent to the UPRR, rather than 5 feet. Also, a note should be added that through the industrial area from Peabody Road to about 3200 feet north the section will more closely resemble the urban section, with some curbs, a sidewalk and turn pockets in some areas. 6-1

Figure 2-3B and 2-4B

Same comments as for Figure 2-2B.

Building & Safety
David Cliche,
Chief Building Official

Planning Services
Mike Yankovich
Program Manager

Environmental Health
Terry Schmidtbauer
Program Manager

Administrative Services
Daniel Bellem
Staff Analyst

Public Works Engineering
Paul Wiese
Engineering Manager

Public Works Operations
Rick O'Neill
Operations Manager

Figure 2-5A

Sections 2 and 4 should have two foot paved shoulders on both inside lanes. The sidewalk should be shown as 10 feet wide within a 30 foot landscaped area. This will increase the total right-of-way width to 124 feet. Also, note that much of Section 2 is located in rolling hills. In those areas, the right-of-way width may need to be substantially wider to accommodate cut and fill slopes. A note should be added to Section 2 that in most areas the center median will be used for turn pockets for use by local businesses. 6-2

Page 2-19 6-3

The reference to Fairfield should be deleted from the description of Segments E2 and E3.

Section 2.2.2.1, Segment B5 6-4

The description should include two foot paved shoulders on the inside lanes, which would increase the right-of-way width to 149 feet.

Section 2.2.5.1, Segments E2 and E4 6-5

The description should be revised to show the 10 foot path located within a 30 foot landscaped area. The right-of-way width should be 124 feet.

Section 2.2.5.2, Proposed Landscaping 6-6

This section should not limit the use of shrubs in the rural areas to the median only.

General Comments

The Jepson Parkway runs through several jurisdictions, beginning at SR12 in Suisun City, then passing through Fairfield and unincorporated Solano County before ending at I-80 in Vacaville. Because of this, it is a cooperative project, involving not only Caltrans and the STA, but Solano County and the cities of Vacaville, Fairfield and Suisun City as well. The segments of the Jepson Parkway located in unincorporated Solano County consist of portions of Leisure Town Road, Vanden Road and Peabody Road.

Previous Jepson Parkway projects have made improvements to the north end of the parkway in Vacaville, and to the south end of the parkway in Suisun City and Fairfield. These improvements have accommodated the growing traffic demands in the area resulting from residential and commercial development. However, the central (Vanden Road) section of the parkway within the County has seen no adjacent development that would increase traffic volume on the road. The traffic on Vanden Road has increased steadily for many years, yet it remains a narrow, two lane rural road with minimal shoulders that was not designed or constructed to handle the higher volumes of traffic coming from the three municipalities located along the project. From a safety and capacity perspective therefore, it is important that the central segment (Vanden Road) should be the next improvements funded and constructed on the Jepson Parkway. 6-7

The Jepson Parkway has the purpose of serving as a reliever route, offering local traffic an alternative to utilizing I-80 and SR12. The unincorporated area along Vanden Road has very few 6-8

2

driveways, and neither the current nor the proposed County general plan anticipate additional development along the road. The County has no existing mechanism in place to generate or collect revenues for the local cost share (50 percent) of the project, although it is currently exploring the establishment of a Public Facilities Fee for Transportation which could provide a source of funding. In any event, in order to fund the improvements to Vanden Road a partnership between the STA and the four participating agencies with land use authority is needed, and together the partners will need to work cooperatively to find funding solutions for the project. 6-8 Cont'd

Please call me at (707) 784-6072 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Paul Wiese
Engineering Manager

U:users\pwiese\data\word\Vanden Road – Jepson Parkway\EIR Comment Letter 8-5-08.doc

Responses

6-1. Thank you for the comments, Alternative B has been identified as the preferred alternative. Section 5 on Figure 2-2B has inside lane dimensions consistent with all other sections on Leisure Town Road. In this area of Leisure Town Road the adjacent land uses will be transferring from rural agricultural to developed residential frontages. To provide a consistent corridor for the Jepson Parkway, it is important the roadway cross section elements be consistent where possible.

The five-foot dimension adjacent to the UPRR is the minimum spacing along the Vanden Road segment. During final design the available landscaped buffer area between the roadway and the railroad will be investigated. There are several factors such as fill slope and drainages that might affect how this buffer area is landscaped.

Chapter 2, Project Alternatives, of the Final EIS has been revised to indicate that urban landscaping within this segment will be implemented from the intersection of Peabody Road and Cement Hill Road/Vanden Road to approximately 3,000 feet north along Peabody Road. Rural landscaping would be implemented in the remainder of the segment

6-2. Thank you for the comment. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative. Improvements to Peabody Road are no longer under consideration.

6-3. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative. Improvements to Peabody Road are no longer under consideration. Nevertheless, references to Fairfield in the description of Segments E2 and E3 have been deleted from the Final EIS.

6-4. Please see response to comment 6.1.

6-5. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative. Improvements to Peabody Road are no longer under consideration.

6-6. Thank you for the comment, Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative.

6-7. STA and its project partner agencies are in the process of finalizing an implementation plan for the Jepson Parkway Project. As discussed in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, the rural section (Vanden Road) would be constructed first.

6-8. To date, the only specific discussions on funding relates to the 50/50 cost split between the local agencies and STA. STA recognizes that no specific funding mechanism is in place to make up the 50 percent match. STA will continue to work cooperatively with Solano County, as well as the Cities of Vacaville, Fairfield, and Suisun City, on an equitable resolution of funding issues.

Letter 7
Solano Irrigation District

DIRECTORS
ROBERT HANSEN
PRESIDENT - DIV. #5
GUIDO E. COLLA
VICE PRESIDENT - DIV. #4
ROBERT S. CURREY
DIV. #1
BOB BISHOP
DIV. #2
GLEN GRANT
DIV. #3

OFFICERS
DAVID M. MANSFIELD
SECRETARY / MANAGER
TREASURER
JAMES S. DANIELS, P.E.
DISTRICT ENGINEER
MINASIAN, SPRUANCE MEITH, SOARES & SEXTON, LLP
ATTORNEYS

July 24, 2008

Janet Adams
Jepson Parkway Project
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

Subject: ***Jepson Parkway Project Solano Irrigation District Impacts***

Dear Mrs. Adams:

Our staff has done a preliminary review of STA's proposed Jepson Parkway Project which runs from Suisun City to Vacaville as shown in the EIR/EIS for the project. The Solano Irrigation District (District) has several facilities that will be impacted by the proposed project.

The proposed project includes major impacts to District Facilities. Generally, District facilities in the area may include canals, pipelines, and associated appurtenances, some or all of which may not be sufficient to handle urban or roadway loads. Construction that impacts District facilities (relocation, replacement, etc.) must be performed outside of the District's irrigation season as to not impact deliveries to District customers. The typical irrigation season is March 1 through October 15, and is weather dependent. Any modifications to District facilities will be at the project's expense.

The following is a list of facilities impacted by the proposed project according to the proposed alternatives including additional comments relating to the preliminary alignment and design. Additional requirements may be necessary upon review of the improvement plans for the proposed project.

Alternatives B, C, D

1. The District's Peabody Lateral 1-A, a 3" Poly Vinyl Chloride (PVC) pipe crosses under Vanden Rd at the southern end before it intersects Peabody Rd. and becomes Cement Hill Rd. The pipe may need to be extended or relocated with the proposed road expansion.
2. The District has a potable water service on the north side of Vanden Rd located approximately 920 feet east of Peabody Road which provides service to the Syar properties. The proposed road expansion this service to be relocated. 7-1
3. The District has a potable water service on the north side of Vanden Rd located approximately 15 feet east of Peabody Road which provides service to the Bus Inc. (APN 167-301-110). The proposed road expansion may require this service to be relocated.

508 ELMIRA ROAD, VACAVILLE, CA 95687-4999 · TELEPHONE (707) 448-6847 · (800) 675-3833 · FAX (707) 448-7347

4. The District's Dally Lateral D-1, a 36" Class III Rubber Gasketed Reinforced Concrete Irrigation Pipe (RGRCP), crosses under the Union Pacific Railroad and Vanden Rd. South of Leisure Town Rd. The pipeline runs from Sta. 69+69.02 to Sta. 71+92.33. The section of RGRCP may need to be extended or replaced with the proposed road expansion.

5. The District's Dally Canal Pipeline Lateral D-1-B, a 12" Precast Concrete Pipe (PCP), crosses under Vanden Rd and Leisure Town Road with 12" RGRCP. The section crossing Vanden Rd. runs from Sta. 6+01.50 to Sta. 6+6_69.50 and feeds and irrigation service (Turnout 1). After crossing under Vanden Rd, the pipeline bends and runs north parallel to the east side of the road. At the Vanden Rd and Leisure Town Road intersection the pipeline then crosses under Leisure Town Rd to feed another irrigation service (Turnout 4). The proposed road expansion may require the RGRCP section to be expanded and the two services and section of 12" PCP may need to be relocated.

6. A section of the District's Dally Canal runs parallel to Leisure Town Rd and crosses under the road at the New Alamo Canal with 60" RGRCP with bends of 16° -35° at Sta. 102+70.16 and 45° at Sta 103+49.81 from Sta. 102+35.05 to Sta. 103+61.66. The proposed road expansion may require the RGRCP to be extended and the canal section running parallel to the road may need to be undergrounded or relocated.

7. The District's Frost Canal, a 30" RGRCP, crosses under Leisure Town Rd north of Fry Rd and south of Elmira Rd. beginning at Sta. 65+35 from east to west and then runs north directly under Leisure Town Rd and crosses back under the road with an 18" RGRCP at Sta. 3+75(N). The proposed road expansion may require the RGRCP sections to be expanded and/or the section of pipe running parallel to Leisure Town Rd. may need to be relocated or replaced.

8. The District's Frost Lateral 1, an 18" PVC pipeline, extends from the southern end of the Frost Canal into Turnout 1 running parallel to the eastern side of Leisure Town Rd and crossing under Fry Rd. The proposed road expansion may require this pipeline to be relocated or replaced.

9. The District's Byrnes Pipeline, a 96' section of 60" RGRCP, crosses under Leisure Town Rd north of Elmira Rd. and south of Hawkins Rd. The pipe runs from Sta. 84+79.44 to Sta. 85+75.44. The pipeline becomes a canal and runs north; parallel to Leisure Town Rd from Sta. 85+82.91 to Sta. 103+37.23/=Sta. 1+00 Lat B-B. The proposed road expansion may require the RGRCP section to be expanded and the canal may need to be relocated or under grounded.

10. The District's Byrnes Pipeline B-A, a 12" PVC Irrigation pipe, runs under Ulatis Dr. and into the Byrnes Canal crossing under Leisure Town Road. The proposed road expansion may require the PVC pipe to be extended.

11. The District's Byrnes Lateral B-B, an agricultural irrigation canal, runs parallel to Leisure Town Road north of Hawkins Road from Sta. 1+11.80 to Sta. 26+85. The canal goes into a pipeline and passes under the New Ulatis Channel and continues to run parallel to Leisure Town Road. The proposed road expansion may require the canal to be under grounded or relocated.

12. The District's Lateral 4-2, a 30" Monolithic Concrete Pipe (MCP) with a 24" High Density Polyethylene Pipe (HDPE) lining, runs parallel to Leisure Town Rd. from the Horse Creek Channel to Poplar Rd. From Poplar Rd. to Maple Rd. the lateral runs as a 30" MCP without the HDPE lining. The proposed road expansion may require the pipeline to be replaced or relocated.

7-1 Cont'd

13. Alternative B suggest having the parkway run north/south from Cement Hill Rd through the McCoy Detention Basin and meet with Walters Rd. This alternative may impact the USBR drainage easement and all crossings or impacts of the USBR must be reviewed and approved by the USBR.

14. Alternative B may require that turnout 9; located approximately 1030 ft west from the Cement Hill Rd, Peabody Rd, and Vanden Rd intersection; be relocated.

15. Alternative B may require that turnout 8; located approximately 1600 ft west from the Cement Hill Rd, Peabody Rd, and Vanden Rd intersection; be relocated.

16. Alternative B may require that turnout 4; located approximately 2800 ft west from the Cement Hill Rd, Peabody Rd, and Vanden Rd intersection; be relocated.

17. Alternative B would cross an abandoned 14" PVC pipeline with 8" air release, blowoff and pipeline valves that runs north approximately 5000 ft west from the Cement Hill Rd, Peabody Rd, and Vanden Rd intersection that may need to be relocated.

Alternative E

7-1 Cont'd

18. The District's Peabody Lateral, an 18" Asbestos Cement Pipe (ACP), runs parallel to Peabody Rd from the Putah South Canal to Sta. 35+76.46. The proposed road expansion may require this pipeline to be relocated from Water Works south.

19. The United States Bureau of Reclamation's Solano Project Putah South Canal crosses under Peabody Rd at Station 919+58.9 PSC (2-64). The proposed road expansion will require the construction of a new bridge crossing the Canal. All work within the USBR property will need to be reviewed and approved by the Bureau of Reclamation.

20. The District has a potable water service located on west side of Peabody Rd approximately 1400 ft from the north corner of Cement Hill Rd and provides service to the Yarbrough (APN167-210-260) property. The proposed road expansion may require this service to be relocated.

21. The District has a potable water service on the north side of Cement Hill Rd located approximately 230 feet east of Peabody Road providing water to the Hudson property (APN167-210-270). The proposed road expansion may require this service to be relocated.

22. The District has a potable water service on the north side of Vanden Rd located approximately 920 feet east of Peabody Road which provides service to the Syar properties. The proposed road expansion may require this service to be relocated.

23. The District has a potable water service on the north side of Vanden Rd located approximately 460 feet east of Peabody Road which provides service to the Bus Inc. (APN 167-301-110). The proposed road expansion may require this service to be relocated.

24. The District has a potable water line that runs north along the east side of Peabody Rd for about 2750' from the northeast corner of the intersection of Vanden Rd and Peabody Road to the Cassil property (APN 167-270-050). The proposed road expansion may require this line to be relocated.

25. The District has an air release valve located approximately 450' north of the intersection of Vanden Rd and Peabody Road on the eastern side of Peabody Rd. The proposed road expansion May require this valve to be relocated.

26. The District has a potable water service to the Bates (APN 167-270-010) property which is located approximately 1601' north of the intersection of Vanden Rd and Peabody Road on the eastern side of Peabody Rd. The proposed road expansion may require this service to be relocated.

27. The District has a blowoff valve and air release valve located approximately 2500' north of the intersection of Vanden Rd and Peabody Road on the eastern side of Peabody Rd. The proposed road expansion may require these valves to be relocated.

28. The District has two water services 2750' north of the intersection of Vanden Rd and Peabody Road on the western side of Peabody Rd that cross Peabody Rd. which provide service to the Peabody LLC and Ewing properties (APN's 167-210-410, -390). The proposed road expansion may require these services to be relocated.

7-1 Cont'd

The Districts Approval Certificate must be added to the Improvement Plans of this Project and the District must review and approve and sign said plans.

The County must enter into a District Standard Relocation, Reconstruction, and Protection of Facilities Agreement.

The District will also require the County to sign a Work Order to cover all costs (staff, legal, inspection, etc.) associated with the review and mitigation of the impact(s) the proposed project has on District facilities.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Uriel Romero
Junior Engineer
(707)455-4045

Response

7-1. Thank you for the comment. Please see Essay Response 5: Utility Impacts Associated with the Preferred Alternative, which identifies existing utilities, reports any anticipated conflicts, and explains how utility relocations will be accomplished. A traffic operations analysis was performed to identify intersections where adverse traffic impacts would occur so that modifications such as restriping for turn lanes and signalization could be incorporated into the project to address such effects. As described in Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Access to the office at 1980 Huntington Court would be maintained.

Letter 8
City of Fairfield
Department of Community Development

CITY OF FAIRFIELD

Founded 1856 — Incorporated December 12, 1903

Home of Travis Air Force Base

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

RECEIVED
AUG - 6 2008
SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

COUNCIL
Mayor
Harry T. Price
707.428.7395
Vice-Mayor
John Mraz
707.429.6298
Councilmembers
707.429.6298
Frank Kardos
Chuck Timm
Matt Garcia

City Manager
Sean Quinn
707.428.7400

City Attorney
Greg Stepanicich
707.428.7419

City Clerk
Arletta Cortright
707.428.7384

City Treasurer
Oscar G. Reyes, Jr.
707.428.7496

DEPARTMENTS
Community Services
707.428.7465
Finance
707.428.7496
Fire
707.428.7375
Human Resources
707.428.7394
Community Development
707.428.7461
Police
707.428.7551
Public Works
707.428.7485

August 6, 2008

Janet Adams, P.E., Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

Re: Jepson Parkway EIR/EIS

Dear Janet:

The City of Fairfield thanks you for the opportunity to review and comment upon the Jepson Parkway EIR/EIS. The City has thoroughly reviewed the document and finds that the document fully addresses the potential impacts of the proposed project. The City concludes that the proposed mitigation measures will adequately off-set any of the potential impacts.

The City of Fairfield believes that the proposed project, specifically Alternative B, will greatly benefit Solano County residents and looks forward to the project moving forward. Should there be anything else the City can do to help in assisting this important project, please feel free to contact either Erin Beavers, Assistant Director of Community Development, at 428-7649 or Wayne Lewis, Assistant Director of Public Works/Transportation, at 428-7632. 8-1

Sincerely,

EVE SOMJEN
Director

ESS:ELB:ccs

cc: Sean Quinn, City Manager
Fairfield City Council
Gene Cortright, Director of Public Works

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ▪ HOUSING ▪ NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION ▪ PLANNING ▪ REDEVELOPMENT

CITY OF FAIRFIELD ••• 1000 WEBSTER STREET ••• FAIRFIELD, CALIFORNIA 94533-4883 ••• www.ci.fairfield.ca.us

S:\erin\Jepson.doc

Response

8-1. Thank you for your comment.

Letter 9
City of Suisun City
Community Development

CITY COUNCIL

Pedro "Pete" M. Sanchez, Mayor
Jane Day, Mayor Pro-Tem
Sam Derting
Michael J. Hudson
Michael A. Segala

CITY COUNCIL MEETING

First and Third Tuesday
Every Month

CITY OF SUISUN CITY

701 Civic Center Blvd.
Suisun City, California 94585
Incorporated October 9, 1868

July 29, 2008

Solano Transportation Authority
Attn: Janet Adams, P.E.,
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement for Jespon Parkway, dated May 2008 and offer the following comments:

1. Update the land use map if Solano County General Plan is adopted prior to final EIR. Specifically noted is the Travis Reserve Area. 9-1
2. Figure 3.1-indicates the property directly north of Peterson Road and east of Walters Road as Industrial. The land use and zoning of these properties is commercial. 9-2
3. Figure 3.31, shows the triangular piece as grazing land. The property is not grazed and has an approved commercial development, which is slated to begin construction in 2008. The NE corner of Peterson/Walters Road is shown as grazing land, but approximately ½ is now developed. 9-3
4. Not sure if economic characteristics reflect post housing market crisis and related job loss? 9-4
5. Based on current legislation and case law on climate change it's my understanding that this project does need to be addressed for potential impacts to GHG's, etc…The Attorney General's office has weighed in on other environment documents requiring an analysis. http://opr.ca.gov/index.php?a=ceqa/index.html 9-5
6. Page 3.1-8, Suisun City, update to reflect approved developed on triangular piece 9-6
7. We are not sure of the NOP date to the state clearinghouse, but should note that the Walters Road Commercial development project located on the southwest corner of Walters Road and Peterson Road has been approved. The certified EIR does require certain mitigation measures along Walters Road, most listed as a fair share proportionality. 9-7

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions, at (707) 421-7396 or hmccollister@suisun.com.

Sincerely,

Heather McCollister
Community Development Director, Suisun City

cc: Dan Kasperson, Acting Public Works Director

DEPARTMENTS: AREA CODE (707)
ADMINISTRATION 421-7300 ■ PLANNING 421-7335 ■ BUILDING 421-7310 ■ FINANCE 421-7320
FIRE 425-9133 ■ RECREATION & COMMUNITY SERVICES 421-7200 ■ POLICE 421-7373 ■ PUBLIC WORKS 421-7340
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY 421-7309 FAX 421-7366

Responses

9-1. Minor changes in land use information have been updated in Figure 3.1-1. STA and Caltrans have coordinated closely with Travis Air Force Base officials to avoid impacts to Air Base lands and operations. Development projects planned or already in process for the greater project area are included in the travel demand models used to forecast traffic for the Jepson Parkway Project alternatives. These are the local projects the Jepson Parkway Project is designed to serve.

9-2. Thank you for your comment. The requested change to the Draft EIR/EIS is reflected in the Final EIS.

9-3. (Assume the commenter means Figure 3.3-1) Thank you for your comment. The requested change to the Draft EIR/EIS is reflected in the Final EIS.

9-4. The text in Section 3.4, Community Impacts, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS reflects conditions as of Summer 2007.

9-5. This comment related to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements was responded to in the Final EIR prepared by STA for the project.

9-6. Thank you for your comment. The requested change to the Draft EIR/EIS is reflected in the Final EIS.

9-7. The current status of this property is reflected in Section 3.6, Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, of the Final EIS.

Letter 10
California Native Plant Society

Willis L. Jepson Chapter
P.O. Box 2212
Benicia, CA 94510

June 30, 2008

Ms. Janet Adams, P.E. Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

SUBJECT: Comments on Draft EIR/EIS for the Jepson Parkway Project

Dear Ms. Adams:

Thank you for allowing the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) to comment on the Jepson Parkway Project. Naming the project after Willis Jepson, a revered botanist in California's history is an interesting choice. We wonder what Willis would have thought of a project that widens roads to six lanes through vernal pool and native riparian habitat named after him!

CNPS does understand the need for traffic flow in Fairfield and Vacaville to a planned multi-modal train station to be located in the eastern portion of Fairfield. The very placement of this station far from downtown Vacaville will require expanded transportation access. CNPS asks the question: "Was the alternative of one of the lanes used exclusively for bus/light rail or other forms of mass transit considered?" There is a slim likelihood of this project getting single drivers out of their cars and on to mass transit to get around Fairfield and Vacaville locally. The four to six-lane highway makes it too easy for people to travel by single car. We do realize the train station holds promise of getting people to other areas of the region, but the project does not complete the loop of getting people from their homes to this station or other local destinations. 10-1

The proposed bike lanes have promise for those who wish to commute by bicycle and we applaud them being in the plan. We hope that as a mitigation measure, that education and publicity be part of the plan to get people to walk, use a bicycle or mass transit to get to the station and other local destinations. We also hope that STA considers the use of a manned bicycle storage area at the new station or other major destinations, such as that present at the Fruitvale BART station. This will allow bicyclers a safe area for bike storage. 10-2

The project, as stated in the DEIR/EIS has impacts to agricultural lands, sensitive plant species and wildlife, particularly Swainson Hawk, Burrowing Owls and California Tiger Salamander. This letter only comments on the sensitive plant habitat. The project goes through or is near to vernal pool habitat, which this area of Solano County is renowned. It is a shame that projects such as this one, pick away at the habitat bit by bit. The total acres impacted by the project is not great, however the project is growth inducing and the cumulative impacts of future projects along this route will likely be large. We urge you to pick an alternative that has the least impact to the sensitive vernal pool environment and that drainage off the roadways do not impact the hydrology of nearby pools. As you know, vernal pool hydrology extends beyond the pool itself. Figure 3.15-1 shows adjacent vernal pool habitat along Walters Road and Vanden Road. The proposed detailed stormwater plans should be reviewed by a vernal pool hydrologist and biologist to assure that hydrologist and water quality impacts do not extend beyond the project. Please re-consider measures HYD-1 and 2. Bridges and elevated roadways over flood-prone and wet areas are preferred to enlarging culverts. On page 3.10.12 the term "economically feasible" measure to be implemented is distressing. Table 3.10-2 shows some BMPs for water quality that include porous pavement, dry wells, etc that hold promise, but there is no promise which of the BMP will actually be implemented. With a project of this size and magnitude, the extra expense of designing and implementing BMPs that are "best known for the environment" are preferred.

10-3

10-4

10-5

Our final comment has to do with the landscaping and drainage. The new project sketches show a median of trees with traditional landscaping along pathways and roadsides. While native tree replacement in rural areas is mentioned, the remainder of the project area appears to continue a high maintenance high water using scenario with traditional drainage from impervious surfaces into culverts. We suggest that the newer Best Management Practices proposed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board to include drainage swales with low-growing native species be incorporated into the project. We take issue with the traditional weed management of reactionary spraying invasive weeds rather than a design of native species that will be have water conserving feature as well as weed reducing effects. Could the swale design with natives be part of the stormwater management plans? Check out the Hedgerow Farm (Winters) for alternatives. Could your workers be trained to avoid spraying as much as possible using an IPM approach? (The project only mentions training construction workers- not the maintenance folks). The RWQCB offers assistance with this type of planning and we suggest that the STA engage their services.

10-6

In summary, this project will allow people to travel more efficiently by car throughout this region and may provide access to a proposed train station. CNPS would like STA to consider a project with minimal plant and wildlife impacts and to consider more forward thinking drainage and landscaping in both the urban and rural areas. While this project is growth inducing as planned, a dedicated lane for mass transit vehicles and public education could counter that negative feature and get people out of their cars and onto mass transit locally.

Sincerely,

California Native Plant Society
Willis L. Jepson Chapter
Signed by Rebecca Mannion, Board member

Cc: RWQCB- Yolanta Uchman.

Responses

10-1. Please see the Essay Response 1: Transit Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion.

A Mass Transit Alternative was considered that would have dedicated one lane in the peak direction for the exclusive use of high occupancy vehicles during peak commute periods. It was withdrawn from further consideration because it could not meet the project purpose and need. Projected transit ridership would not reduce vehicular demand enough to address existing and anticipated future traffic congestion. Roadway widening would still have been required to meet projected travel demand, alleviate congestion along I-80 through the project limits by providing a safe alternative route for local travel, and support planned development.

The Jepson Parkway project incorporates future transit services as envisioned in the Jepson Parkway Concept Plan. An express bus and a local bus route, running between the Fairfield Transportation Center and the Downtown Vacaville Transfer Center are forecast, with implementation anticipated after the Fairfield-Vacaville Multi-modal Station and other future developments are in place to generate transit rider demand within the corridor.

10-2. Thank you for your comment. The final design of the pedestrian/bicycle path may include appropriate signage. However, it would be inappropriate to include a mitigation measure in the Final EIS regarding education and publicity to encourage the use of the pedestrian/bicycle path. No adverse impact has been identified for which such a mitigation measure would be appropriate.

10-3. Please see the Essay Response 6: Potential Growth Inducing Effects of the Jepson Parkway Project, and the response to comment 3-3.

Various development projects are currently planned or in process for areas adjacent to the proposed Jepson Parkway project. Additional impacts to habitat areas from these adjacent developments may occur, but these projects do not constitute unplanned growth induced by the Jepson Parkway project. These future land uses were included in the travel demand models and traffic projections for the parkway project as part of no-build conditions; these are the traffic generators the parkway project is designed to serve.

Each of these developments will undergo its own environmental review, including quantification of impacts to habitat for listed species and associated minimization and mitigation measures as appropriate.

The Jepson Parkway project is consistent with the various jurisdictional policies and mechanisms that are in place to prevent unplanned growth in the greater project area. It also complies with the Solano County Orderly Growth Initiative (originally passed in 1984 and adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in 1994), which was on the November 2008 ballot as Measure T and was passed to extend through 2028, as well as the Draft Solano County Multi Species Habitat Conservation Plan. These policies and restrictions will ensure that development impacts to habitat for listed species are minimized and quantified as well as fully disclosed and mitigated.

10-4. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

More than one build alternative had potential to affect vernal pools in the project vicinity, and there were other impact issues, such as use of recreational property protected by Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, potential loss of a large number of jobs, potential loss of homes, and homeland defense concerns, that factored into the identification of the preferred alternative.

Caltrans and STA have worked closely with USFWS to ensure that the design of Preferred Alternative roadway improvements minimizes impacts (both direct and indirect) to natural communities, wetlands and other waters (including vernal pools), native plant and wildlife species, and threatened and endangered species along the corridor. Design measures include spanning wetland and sensitive habitats rather than the construction of culverts, the use of retaining walls rather than fill, and the realignment of roadways to avoid sensitive areas.

10-5. As described in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Floodplains, and Section 3.10, Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, construction of the project is subject to a number of federal, State, and local regulations designed to minimize impacts to floodways, flood control systems, and water quality.

Prior to the start of construction, the project sponsor will be required to complete a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that identifies construction activities that will occur and describes BMPs that will be used to prevent soil erosion and discharge of other construction-related contaminants, such as sediment, fuels, oil, grease, solvents, paints, and cement that could contaminate nearby water resources. BMPs shall be incorporated such that impacts to the existing water quality of downstream receiving water bodies will be minimized or prevented. Both plans would be subject to

review to ensure that all applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) standards, as well as local and regional erosion and sediment control standards, are met. The project proposes to implement permanent water quality BMPs to capture and treat roadway storm water runoff. The final location, size, and number of these elements will be determined during final design. STA and its partner agencies are committed to following the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

10-6. As discussed in response 10.5, the project proposes to use biofiltration swales to treat stormwater runoff. The Vanden Road and Walters Road extension segments are good candidates for biofiltration swales and strips because of the proposed typical roadway section, proposed landscaping, and surrounding topography. Other sections that are more flat and urban in character may require a storm drain system to discharge into conveyance waterways. In these areas detention basins are more appropriate; however, the project will continue to investigate the use of storm drainage systems throughout final design. Weed management will be at the discretion of the local jurisdiction. Non-invasive plant species shall be recommended for proposed vegetated areas.

Letter 11
Cambridge Estates of Fairfield

CAMBRIDGE ESTATES OF FAIRFIELD
C/O LLW Properties
1652 West Texas St., Ste. 106
Fairfield, CA 94533
707.428.0490 Phone 707.429.8279 Fax

Response to the Jepson Parkway Project Draft EIR/CEQA Draft Section 4 (f) Evaluation

The Jepson Parkway Project Proposed (project) Alternatives C, D and E will not upgrade the link of existing local two- lane roadways between Leisure Town Road- Vander Road-Peabody Road- Airbase Parkway- Walters Road. Constructing a four- or six-lane north-south travel route for I-80 motorists will greatly impact the already immensely increasing congestion between Peabody Road – and Airbase Parkway.

The area population consists of approximately 3,000 residents, over 1,000 Single family homes which are accessed by a 2 mile two lane corridor between the Putah South Canal and Airbase Parkway on & Peabody Road. 11-1

Along the corridor are Commercial businesses that have large diesel trucks. These businesses already pose a traffic hazard when entering or exiting on to the roadway. Traffic flow on the two lane road must come to a complete stop in order for the trucks to enter or exit business.

Businesses
Solano Garbage Company (150 employees)
Roadrunner Towing (20 employees)
Solano Recycle Center (20 employees)
Clorox Company (100 employees)
California State Prison Solano (1,800 employees)
California Medical Facility (2,000 employees)
Travis AFB (20,000 employees)
Train tracks (Future Train Station)

Along with the above mentioned businesses Peabody Road and Airbase Parkway are the main arteries that service military personnel, retirees and civilian government employees that access Travis Air Force Base daily. The increasingly hazardous traffic that currently exists doesn't need additional I-80 travelers/commuter to (San Francisco – Lake Tahoe).

It is the corroboration of the residents of Cambridge Estates that the proposed Jepson Parkway Concept Plan C, D, & E, to provide relief of existing significant I-

80 traffic are not feasible. These plans will not provide relief or eliminate I-80 traffic congestion as proposed.

The physical impact that the project will have on the overly congested urban area located adjacent to Travis AFB (where Cambridge Estates is located) will create an even greater problem than already exist. If this project is allowed to continue the residents of Cambridge Estates, Travis AFB, Gold Ridge, and Students as well as Faculty at Vanden High School, and Golden West Middle School will be perilously affected.

11-1 Cont'd

It is the existence of the affected population that is greatly concerned for the Health, Safety and Well fare of our small community. To eliminate objectionable or damaging aspects of the project, we are proposing that Alternatives C, D & E not be considered.

The Community members of Cambridge Estates would like for the Solano Transportation Authority to reconsider running a freeway through our front yards. Cambridge Estates which has existed since 1993 is a small quiet development of 127 Condominiums. With the devastating housing dive our community will not be able to recover with a freeway directly in our front yard. Our community already faces a seriously hazardous traffic issue with the new construction on Peabody Road and the existing corridor which does not suffice for the 30,000 residents in the immediate area and employees of Travis AFB . By choosing Alternatives C, D or E you will directly affect the property value of our homes as well as impacting the area with the horrendous I-80 traffic problems.

The majority of Solano County is rural and there are millions of acres of unincorporated land. There is a better solution than impacting homeowners that are already struggling with today's housing market crisis. We as the Community ask that you not create an even greater problem than what already exist. Instead fix the problem not reroute it! Our 3 mile two lane road cannot take another vehicle with the congestion that exists daily. The Safety and Health of our Children as well as our Community should be first and foremost. We have a large amount of military members in our community that are serving abroad to protect us and we feel that putting their loved ones who are at risk would be a great injustice.

Substantial concerns that will negatively impact the community and the residents quality of life are:

- Dust during construction
- Noise of 6-lane "freeway"
- The already existing Commercial truck corridor to the existing warehouses
- Environmental Safety concern to run the "6 Lane project" parallel to the Clorox Plant.
- Bicycle / pedestrian use (To go where?)

- Existing traffic congestion to Travis AFB
- Existing Traffic Congestion to Vanden High School
- Existing Congestion to Golden West Middle School
- Existing Congestion to Solano Garbage Co. (Which services Solano County) Over 40 large Diesel truck fleet
- Existing safety concern for cross streets Airbase Parkway / Markley Lane this (No light/No stop sign) intersection has been the site of 4-5 fatality accidents involving students from the high school.

11-1 Cont'd

We respectfully request that you vote with the desires of the residents of our community as follows:

- **NO** S.3.3 Alternative C: Leisure Town Road- Vanden Road-Peabody Road- Airbase Parkway- Walters Road $136,752,000
- **NO** S.3.4 Alternative D: Leisure Town Road- Vanden Road-Peabody Road- Airbase Parkway- Walters Road $134,785,000.
- **NO** S.3.5 Alternative E: Leisure Town Road- Vanden Road-Peabody Road- Airbase Parkway- Walters Road $122,558,000.

Your consideration of this written testimonial and anticipated collaboration with our requests are greatly appreciated.

The Board of Directors
Cambridge Estates of Fairfield OA

Response

11-1. Thank you for your comment. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

Letter 12
Compu-Tech Lumber Products, Inc

COMPU-TECH
LUMBER PRODUCTS, INC.
dba COMPU-TECH LUMBER COMPANY

1915 HUNTINGTON COURT FAIRFIELD, CA 94533 (707) 437-6683

July 16, 2008

Janet Adams, Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

Re: Jepson Parkway

Ms. Adams:

We have reviewed the Jepson Parkway Expansion Project and have concerns with Alternative B & D (which run across Walters Road). Although the portion that the new parkway runs across is City owned property, we have leased this property for over 20 years. It would cut us off from accessing our property which is vital to our operation.

These areas are currently being used for storage of our daily shipments and storage of direct shipments by rail car. In addition to being used for our staging area where sawyers prepare material for our wall assemblies. Literally our staging area would become non-existent, which would make this portion of our property useless. It would also affect the property to the East due to the fact that the entrance would have to come from Walters Road to Crocket Road. The loss of this property would effect our business operations on a daily basis. 12-1

Other issues of concern are the raising of Walters Road as discussed by the City Engineer. The raising of this road would prohibit us from entering our office at 1980 Huntington Court. As well as the impact traffic will have at Walters Road & Huntington Road? 12-2

Alternatives C & E seem to be the most practical. The frontage area being discussed has less impact on surrounding businesses. Further studies need to be addressed on these alternatives. 12-3

Jepson Parkway will have a huge impact on our business if all the alternatives are not explored. We would like to be part of the decision process and request that we be kept informed of any new developments. 12-4

Please feel free to contact me to discuss further.

Sincerely,

COMPU-TECH LUMBER PRODCUTS, INC.

Greg Young
Vice President

Responses

12-1. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. We understand that the future extension of Walters Road is explicitly referred to in your lease agreement, which contains language to the effect that as tenant, you acknowledge that your use of the leased property for equipment storage and staging would continue only until the property is needed for the road extension. The Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS (see Impact LU-1, for example) reports the impact on your business of the extension of Walters Road.

12-2. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. The intersection of Walters Road and Huntington Drive will be raised two to three feet, which will require reconstructing a short portion of Huntington Drive to ensure moderate approach grades. A traffic signal would be installed at Huntington Drive and Walters Road and this signal would be coordinated with the traffic signal at Walters Road and Air Base Parkway.

12-3. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative.

12-4. Thank you for your comment. Your name has been added to the project mailing list.

Letter 13
Edenbridge, Inc

SHEPPARD MULLIN
SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Four Embarcadero Center | 17th Floor | San Francisco, CA 94111-4109
415-434-9100 office | 415-434-3947 fax | www.sheppardmullin.com

Writer's Direct Line: 415-774-2977
efoleygannon@sheppardmullin.com

Our File Number: 07MS-115092

August 6, 2008

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Janet Adams
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585
E-Mail: jadams@sta-snci.com

Re: Jepson Parkway Draft EIR/EIS

Dear Ms. Adams:

I write on behalf of my client, Edenbridge Inc. to provide comments on the draft EIR/EIS for the Jepson Parkway Project. Edenbridge is the sponsor for the Hawthorne Mill Project, a proposed mixed residential and commercial development that would be located on a 411 acre site in City of Fairfield. The Hawthorne Mill site is located south of Cement Hill Road, west of Peabody Road and north of the Union Pacific Railroad site. The Waters Road extension included in Alternative B for the Jepson Parkway Project would traverse the Hawthorne Mill site, crossing the approximately 260 acre proposed open space area to be protected as part of the Hawthorne Mill Project. We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the Jepson Parkway draft EIR/EIS and look forward to working with the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) to identify and develop the environmentally superior alternative for the Jepson Parkway Project that will address the needs of the community.

I. BACKGROUND: The Hawthorne Mill Project

As proposed the Hawthorne Mill Project will be comprised of two main development areas, Hawthorne Mill East and Hawthorne Mill West, separated by a large conservation are. The larger development, Hawthorne Mill East is located near the southwest corner of Cement Hill Road (on the north) and Peabody Road (on the east). Hawthorne Mill West is bounded by McCoy Basin on the north and east, Air Base Parkway on the south and Portland Road on the west.

The Hawthorne Mill East development is immediately adjacent to the area covered by the currently under preparation Fairfield Train Station Specific Plan Area and a portion of the site is located within the one-half mile radius of the proposed train station to be

addressed in this Specific Plan.[1] The Train Station Specific Plan will provide for the creation of a transit oriented urban hub with between 2,500 and 3,000 residential units as well as limited commercial uses. Hawthorne East has been designed to complement the urban development principles of the Train Station Specific Plan and will include higher density housing in the area adjacent to the proposed train station, some mixed commercial use areas and direct pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle access to the train station. Approximately 500 residential units, two restaurants, mixed-commercial, parks and trails, a recreational center, and water quality features are proposed for creation within the approximately 109 acre Hawthorne Mill East development area. Hawthorne Mill West would include approximately 177 residential units, a small park, and water quality features within the approximately 30 acre development area. The remaining approximately 273 acres of the site would be a dedicated conservation area that includes habitat for listed plant and wildlife species and a portion of McCoy Creek.

An application for a tentative map was filed with the City of Fairfield in June 2007. Together with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the City of Fairfield is currently developing a joint EIR/EIS to study the potential impacts associated with the proposed Hawthorne Mill Project.

II. COMMENTS ON THE JEPSON PARKWAY DRAFT EIR/EIS

A. Hydrology and Floodplains, Section 3.9.2 Affected Environment, Base Floodplain (p. 3.9-4) & Figure 3.9.5

The draft EIR/EIS includes figures which show the base floodplain area for the waterways included within the project vicinity. Figure 3.9.5 shows the floodplain area for the McCoy Detention Basin. This figure, however, does not reflect the physical realities of the site. Immediately to the west of the McCoy Detention Basin there is a raised berm which prevents any flood water from flowing to the west of the basin and therefore the area west of the basin should not be shown as being included in the Basin's floodplain. We ask that this figure be revised to reflect the actual physical conditions found on the site. 13-1

B. Biological Resources

As part of the planning for the Hawthorne Mill Project, Edenbridge has commissioned numerous studies to be completed regarding the biological resources located on the Project site, include the area proposed for the Waters Road Extension under Alternative B for the Jepson Parkway Project. The following information should be considered in evaluating the potential impacts associated with construction of Alternative B, specifically the Walters Road Extension.

---

[1] Although a portion of the site falls within the area covered by the Train Station Specific Plan, Hawthorne Mill Project is being developed as a separate project.

1. **Section 3.1.5.2.2 Affected Environment: Seasonal Wetlands (p. 3.15-13)**

a. **Contra Costa Goldfield Habitat**

The draft EIR/EIS states that many of the seasonal wetlands located in the Walters Road Extension area of the Project support Contra Costa Goldfields. After conducting exhaustive plant surveys on the entire Hawthorne Mill site, Edenbridge biological consultants Jones and Stokes found that the Contra Costa Goldfields in this area were limited to vernal pool habitat and were not located in the seasonal wetlands. This finding is also consistent with the draft Solano County HCP biologist, LSA, findings on the Hawthorne Mill site and in the Project area. Accordingly, impacts to Contra Costa Goldfields should be assessed by considering impacts only to vernal pool habitat within the Project site. A copy of the Hawthorne Mill Plant surveys are provided as attachment A to this letter. Because the plant species found in vernal pool habitat varies considerably from that found in seasonal wetlands located in the project vicinity, we further ask that the biological resource section included in the Draft EIR/EIS be modified to distinguish between these two types of habitat. 13-2

b. **Vernal Poll Crustacean Species**

The draft EIR/EIS identifies states that the seasonal wetlands in the study area "support a variety of invertebrates such as vernal pool fairy shrimp." We wish to clarify that the vast majority of seasonal wetlands, including vernal pools, located on the Hawthorne Mill site and within the area of the proposed Waters Road Extension do not support vernal pool crustaceans. As part of the planning process for the Hawthorne Mill Project, Edenbridge commissioned vernal pool crustacean surveys for the entire Hawthorne Mill site. These protocol level surveys (one wet season and one dry season survey) determined that vernal pool crustaceans were absent from the site, with the exception of one vernal pool adjacent to the UPRR. This occupied pool is not part of a larger complex and there is no interchange of water between this pool and the other wetland habitat located on the Project site. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has indicated agreement with Edenbridge's biological consultant's determination that listed vernal pool crustaceans are absent from the remainder of the site. A copy of the survey results is provided as Attachment B. Accordingly, the Draft EIR/EIS for the Jepson Parkway should reflect the fact that the proposed Walters Road Extension would not result in any impact to listed vernal pool species. 13-3

2. **Impact BR-5: Would Alternatives Result in Fill of or Disturbance to Seasonal Wetlands? (p. 3.15-18)**

The draft EIR/EIS states that implementation of Alternative B would result in the removal or piping of a perennial drainage located on the south side of Cement Hill Road and would result in indirect affects to both seasonal wetlands that hydrologically connected to the drainage and seasonal wetlands without such a connection but which receive floodwaters from 13-4

the drainage. Edenbridge has engaged Balance Hydrologics to complete a preliminary hydrologic study of the Hawthorne Mill Site and this study found that this drainage does not provide hydrologic support for any of the site's seasonal wetlands. Therefore, removal or piping of this drainage would not impact any of the sites seasonal wetlands. A copy of this report is provided as attachment C. We request that the Final EIR/EIS be modified to reflect the fact that such an adverse impact would not occur if Alternative B is constructed as proposed. 13-4 Cont'd

3. **3.1.5.5 Threatened and Endangered Species, 3.15.5.2 Affected Environment**

a. **Vernal Pool Invertebrates (p. 3.15-50)**

The draft EIR/EIS states that vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp are both found along the proposed Waters Road Extension between Cement Hill Road and Airbase Parkway. Protocol level surveys conducted on behalf of Edenbridge found that vernal pool tadpole shrimp were absent from the site and that vernal pool fairy shrimp were found in only one vernal pool located adjacent to UPRR. *See* Attachment B. We ask that this section be amended to reflect these survey results. 13-5

b. **Delta Green Ground Beetle (p. 3.15-51)**

We concur with the discussion in the draft EIR/EIS which indicates that extensive focused surveys for the area that includes the proposed Waters Road Extension did not locate any delta green ground beetles on the site and that the area has been determined, by the leading delta green ground beetle expert, to not constitute habitat for the beetle. A copy of the survey results and habitat assessment of the Hawthorne Mill site prepared by Richard Arnold is provided as Attachment D. 13-6

c. **Mitigation Measure BR-20: Revise Project Plans to Avoid Contra Costa Goldfields (p. 3.15-56)**

We concur that if the Walters Road Extension is constructed it should be designed to ensure that the hydrologic connectivity within the study area is maintained. However, because the drainage south of Cement Hill Road is not connected, directly or indirectly, to any vernal pool habitat which supports Contra Costa Goldfields, we request that the requirement to re-construct this drainage to maintain such connectivity be eliminated. *See* Attachment C. 13-7

d. **Mitigation Measure BR-21: Compensation for the Permanent Loss of Contra Costa Goldfields (p. 3.15-57)**

As discussed above, only vernal pools located on the area located around the proposed Walters Road Extension provide suitable habitat for Contra Costa Goldfields. We therefore ask that this mitigation measure be modified to clarify that the impacts to this species 13-8

will be determined by assessing the amount of vernal pool habitat that supports Contra Costa Goldfields and will not include seasonal wetlands in which Contra Costa Goldfields have not been found. 13-8 Cont'd

C. Preferred Alternative

Based on our review of the Draft EIR/EIS and our intimate familiarity with the resources located along the proposed Walters Road Extension, we believe that Alternative B should not be the preferred alternative. This is due to the fact that Alternative B would result in significantly greater impacts to biological resources including aquatic resources and listed species than any of the other alternatives. 13-9

III. CONCLUSION

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft EIR/EIS for the Jepson Parkway. Please feel free to contact me if I can answer any questions or provide additional information.

Very truly yours,

Ella Foley-Gannon

for SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP

W02-WEST:FEF\400981353.2
Attachments

cc: Patrick Geary, Edenbridge
Kathy Oesterreich, Edenbridge

Responses

13-1. The floodplain shown in Figure 3.9-5 is the current Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for this area. The FEMA floodplain does not follow existing topography in this area. This area has not had a detailed floodplain study and is classified as Zone "A", which means the floodplain was developed using approximation methods. As part of the final design a detailed floodplain analysis will be completed to ensure the base floodplain elevation is not increased.

13-2. Thank you for providing the Hawthorne Mill plant surveys; we have provided this information to project biologists. Contra Costa goldfields typically inhabit neutral to alkaline or saline vernal pools and adjacent seasonally moist grassy areas. As described in the project's Natural Environment Study, surveys for Contra Costa goldfields were conducted in the study area in May 2000, 2001, 2002, 2005, and 2007. Goldfields were identified in 50 seasonal wetlands located in the Walters Road extension segment, east of Walters Road between Air Base Parkway and East Tabor Avenue, and south of Air Base Parkway between Walters Road and Peabody Road. The number of Contra Costa goldfields plants observed each survey year varied greatly in some wetlands. The final determination on impacts to Contra Costa goldfields has been made during informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Service (USFWS). These impacts are summarized in Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS.

13-3. Thank you for providing the Hawthorne Mill vernal pool crustacean surveys; this information was reviewed by project biologists. The final determination of impacts to vernal pool crustaceans has been made during informal consultation with the USFWS. These impacts are summarized in Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS.

13-4. Thank you for providing the information from the hydrologic study; this information was reviewed by project biologists. While the study indicated that the drainage does not provide hydrologic support for seasonal wetlands on the Hawthorne Mill Site, indirect impacts on seasonal wetlands could occur along other portions of the study area. The determination of impacts to seasonal wetlands has been made during informal consultation with the USFWS and the Corps. These impacts are summarized in Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS.

13-5. Thank you for providing the Hawthorne Mill vernal pool invertebrates surveys; this information was reviewed by project biologists. The final determination of impacts to vernal pool invertebrates has been made during informal consultation with the USFWS. These impacts are summarized in Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS.

13-6. Thank you for your comment.

13-7. Please see response to comment 13.4.

13-8. Thank you for your comment. The final determination on appropriate mitigation measures has been made during informal consultation with the USFWS and is reflected in the Final EIS.

13-9. More than one build alternative had potential to affect vernal pools in the project vicinity, and there were other impact issues, such as use of recreational property protected by Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, potential loss of a large number of jobs, potential loss of homes, and homeland defense concerns, that factored into the identification of the preferred alternative. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

Letter 14
K&J Erickson and Associates

K&JERICKSON AND ASSOCIATES
749 OAKMEADE DRIVE
VACAVILLE, CA 95687
707- 446 2004
Kenerickson749@comcast.net

RECEIVED
JUN 20 2008
SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Mailed June 19, 2008

Janet Adams
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

Subject: Jepson Parkway EIR/EIS, Tuesday June 24, 2008

Dear Janet,

I have reviewed the Jepson Parkway Project overview documents made available to us regarding the draft EIR/EIS.

I have two significant immediate concerns that relate to all the existing residents located to the west of Leisure Town Road between Alamo Drive and Elmira Road. One concern is the intersection with Kingswood Avenue, which has no provision for a left turn shelter, and which has at least on serious rear end collision. It is dangerous in my opinion. 14-1

The other relates particularly to those whose home sites back against Leisure Town Road in Vacaville between Fallbrook Drive and Alamo .The two concerns here are (1) Pedestrian safety along this narrow sidewalk crowded between 60 mph southbound trucks, emergency vehicles, and commuters, and (2) The street noise increase since these homes were built in the late 1970's, and especially since the thoroughfare was extended recently to carry full development traffic from I-80 south all the way to Suisun City and Travis Military Base for commuting, trucking and emergency services traffic. 14-2 14-3

My urgent plea is that approval of the EIR/EIS be conditioned on budgeted and approved construction of a left turn shelter at Kingswood Avenue, and the construction of a replacement "major highway" sound wall along the west side of Leisure town Road from Kingswood Avenue to Fallbrook Drive, and some improvement of the sidewalk safety.

I have attached copies of prior correspondence to City of Vacaville Planning Commission and Public Works Department.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this hearing. The project is good, and is necessary to serve the hundreds of new homes and businesses now on the drawing board to be built along this route. Let's just do it right. OK?

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth L. Erickson
749 Oakmeade Drive

Attaches letters, aerial map

K&J Erickson & Associates
Engineering and Marketing

749 Oakmeade Drive
Vacaville, CA 95687

(707) 446 2004
Fax (707) 446 0884
kenerickso@aol.com

September 10, 2004

Mr. Larry Emerson, City Planner
City of Vacaville Planning Commission
City Hall
650 Merchant
Vacaville, CA 95688

Dear Larry,

About a year ago I stopped into the Public Works Department office and talked to them at the counter about the Leisure Town Road By-pass Project. My wife Joyce and I had recently purchased a home at 749 Oakmeade Drive, which backs up to Leisure Town Road. They were very helpful in explaining the status of this federally funded inter-jurisdictional project, and even made provision for me to have a copy of the layout in our immediate area, which really helped.

Construction Schedule

As explained to me it would probably be a 10-year construction period, considering funding, right-of-way, utilities, etc. before award of construction. This I understand, having some forty-seven years doing Federally Funded highway projects. I know they are correct, perhaps even optimistic. Therefore, I have a suggestion for the sake of the residents along Leisure Town Road between Fallbrook Drive and Kingswood Avenue. The suggestion relates to two significant current concerns, which will only grow as every new subdivision is constructed and occupied along this route.

Pre-Contract Construction

Traffic Safety

The first and most critical concern relates to the intersection with Kingswood. At least one of our neighbor friends was rear-ended there recently and is still recovering. It is a frightening experience when, in attempting a northbound left turn you have to stop for an extended period of time awaiting a break in south-bound traffic. It is not an obvious spot

to expect someone to stop northbound as all the other intersections have a left turn pocket.

I believe the extra width is available within the right of way between the east edge of pavement and the power poles to construct a widening and re-striping project to end this hazard. I talked briefly to Dale Pfieffer about that some time ago, and he was going to look into it. He was not sure if there is a right-of-way problem. If there is enough right of way, I would say, GO FOR IT!

Noise Pollution Mitigation

The other concern is more expensive to treat, but is a definite Planning Commission concern. The mitigating feature is planned as a part of the road widening project sooner or later. That is the mitigation of traffic noise.

The present level of traffic has increased in the two years we have lived her, much of which was added by the construction of the badly needed connection south to Vanden Road. Also, the traffic will continue to increase as all those homes south of Alamo and those north of I-80 become occupied. In view of this I suggest that strong consideration be given to up-front construction of a current standard sound wall to replace the flimsy, deteriorated ¾ inch redwood fence behind the 22 homes between Fallbrook and Kingswood.

There are three advantages from this early construction for these 22 impacted families. One, the immediate reduction of the currently excessive noise level; secondly, relief from the increase in road noise as these new residences become occupied; and thirdly, significant relief will be provided during the entire noisy utilities and roadway reconstruction period which will occur in phases throughout the next ten years or longer.

Larry, I would appreciate it if this request could be brought before the Planning Commission for me. I have a long-term commitment out of town the evening of September 21, or I would be there with you.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth L. Erickson, P.E.

K&J Erickson & Associates
Engineering and Marketing

749 Oakmeade Drive
Vacaville, CA 95687

(707) 446 2004
Fax (707) 446 0884
kenerickso@aol.com

July 22, 2004

Mr. Dale Tompkins, Asst. Director
Public Works Department
City Hall
650 Merchant
Vacaville, CA 95688

Dear Dale,

About a year ago I stopped into your office and talked to you at the counter about the Leisure Town Road By-pass Project. My wife Joyce and I had recently purchased a home at 749 Oakmeade Drive, which backs up to Leisure Town Road. You were very helpful in explaining the status of this federally funded inter-jurisdictional project. You made provision for me to have a copy of the layout in our immediate area, which really helped.

Construction Schedule

You explained that it would probably be a 10-year construction period, considering funding, right-of-way, utilities, etc. before award of construction. This I understand, having some forty-seven years doing just what you are doing. I know you are correct, perhaps even optimistic. Therefore, I have a suggestion for the sake of the residents along Leisure Town Road between Fallbrook Drive and Kingswood Avenue. The suggestion relates to two significant current concerns, which will only grow as every new subdivision is constructed and occupied along this route.

Pre-Contract Construction

Traffic Safety

The first and most critical concern relates to the intersection with Kingswood. At least one of our neighbor friends was rear-ended there recently and is still recovering. It is a frightening experience when, in attempting a northbound left turn you have to stop for an extended period of time awaiting a break in south-bound traffic. It is not an obvious spot to expect someone to stop northbound.

I believe the extra width is available within the right of way and the power poles to construct a widening and re-striping project to end this hazard. I talked briefly to Dale Pfieffer about that some time ago, and he was going to look into it. He was not sure if there is a right-of-way problem. If there is enough right of way, I would say, GO FOR IT!

Noise Pollution Mitigation

The other concern is more expensive to treat, but is planned be part of the road widening project sooner or later. That is the mitigation of traffic noise. The present level has increased in the two years we have lived her, much of which was added by the badly needed connection south to Vanden Road. Also, the traffic will continue to increase as all those homes south of Alamo and those north of I-80 become occupied. In view of this I suggest that strong consideration be given to up-front construction of a current standard sound wall to replace the flimsy, deteriorated ¾ inch redwood fence behind the 22 homes between Fallbrook and Kingswood.

There are three advantages from this early construction for these 22 impacted families. One, the immediate reduction of the currently excessive noise level; secondly, relief from the anticipated increase in road noise from the expected increases in road noise as new residences become occupied; and thirdly, significant relief during the entire noisy reconstruction period which will occur in phases throughout the next ten years or longer.

Dale, I would really appreciate you sitting down with Dale Pfieffer and seeing if something can be done quickly regarding these two concerns.

I would enjoy joining you, or both of you, for lunch soon just to get better acquainted. I will get back to you on that possibility.

Thanks for your attention, and for doing what you can.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth L. Erickson, P.E.

October 25, 2003

Mr. Dale Pfeiffer
Director of Public Works
City of Vacaville
650 Merchant
Vacaville, CA 95688

RE: Leisure Town Road Improvements

Dear Dale,

It has been several years since we last got together, breakfast I recall, and before that with the MUPWOC bunch at Richmond when I was the City of Martinez City Engineer.

This letter is a request for help with regard to our home on 749 Oakmeade Drive here in Vacaville. We purchased our 27 year old home in July, 2002. It backs up to Leisure Town Road between Fallbrook and Kingwood Drive along with some 20 other homes in that 1976 subdivision.

At the time of the construction of these homes it appears that the subdivision required a simple six foot wooden fence with concrete block posts to be constructed along the right of way line. The concrete curb, gutter and five foot sidewalk were constructed with the face of curb ten feet from the fence. I do not call it a wall considering what we call a wall today.

Here is the problem. Roadway noise! How in the world can we mitigate it to a reasonable level? It can be mitigated by implementing the road improvement that has been approved as a plan, of which your staff provided me a photocopy. This plan portends a four lane divided throughway facility, moving the traffic easterly some twenty feet and constructing a genuine sound wall along the property line. Good news! However, here is the fly in the ointment, your kind and knowledgeable deputy informed me that the construction may not be funded for ten years! That will not do some of us along this stretch much good.

I believe the City of Vacaville has converted this road, which in 1976 was functioning as a country lane, from the quiet two lane road from Midway south to Alamo into a two lane thoroughfare all the way through to Lawson Road and thence on to SH 12, and approved major subdivisions north of and south of I-80 which your traffic division can surely confirm that this has already generated high speed truck and automobile traffic volumes requiring a four lane divided facility. I know all the approved homes are not built or occupied yet, but I am also sure that I would have included all those statistics into the documents that justified the "By-pass" Approval for funding by FHA. These homes will be occupied within a year I am sure.

With that brief summary in mind, I would suggest an interim construction project to install the proposed and approved new concrete block sound wall. This will accomplish two significant benefits to these homes. One, it will diminish somewhat the existing traffic noise, while we await the moving of the travel lanes some distance farther from our homes, and two, it will bless the owners of these home some ten years from now when the street widening funds may be available and the construction bedlam commences. Please consider this seriously.

I have not discussed this concept yet with my neighbors up and down Leisure Town Road, but I am sure their support would be forthcoming. I started with you, Dale, because I respect your ability as our Public Works Director. Thank you for your consideration of our problem.

Very sincerely yours,

Kenneth L. Erickson, P.E.
746 Oakmeade Drive
Vacaville, CA 95687


SHADOWS
OAKMEADE
Court
749
OAKMEADE
DRIVE
CONC
CONC
SHADOWS

Page 1



Page 1

Responses

14-1. Thank you for the comment. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. A left turn lane at Kingswood Avenue and Leisure Town Road is included as part of this project.

14-2. As shown in Figure 2-2A, Figure 2-3A, and Figure 2-4A of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, the segment of Leisure Town Road between Fallbrook Avenue and Alamo Drive includes the construction of a 35-foot to 55-foot landscaped linear parkway along the west side of Leisure Town Road. This parkway will include a 10-foot wide meandering pedestrian/bicycle sidewalk set back from the roadway. Construction of the linear parkway and 10-foot wide sidewalk will separate motor and non-motor traffic and help ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists along this segment of Leisure Town Road. In addition, the 10-foot pedestrian/bicycle sidewalk will extend north along Leisure Town Road to Walnut Road. The 35-foot to 55-foot landscaped linear parkway will extend south of Alamo Drive to Vanden Road.

14-3. The area west of Leisure Town Road between Alamo Drive and Elmira Road, would experience noise levels above the noise abatement criteria under existing and future project conditions, as noted in the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS Section 3.14, Noise. Noise abatement for this area would meet reasonable and feasible criteria under FHWA guidelines; therefore, sound walls are proposed for these locations. Please refer to the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS Table 3.14-9 in Section 3.14, Noise, and Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls, for more information about proposed noise abatement.

Letter 15
Kinder Morgan

KINDER MORGAN
ENERGY PARTNERS, L.P.
SFPP, L.P.

SFPP, L.P.
Operating Partnership

July 10, 2008

ENG 4-2-1 (28.0 to 32.5 - 130)
(23.4 to 29.1 - 25) NIS
File Reference #08-472-1

RECEIVED
JUL 14 2008
SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Ms. Janet Adams, P.E.
Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority
Suite 130
One Harbor Center
Suisun City CA 94585

RE: Jepson Parkway Project – Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement covering approximately 12 mile Jepson Corridor Alternatives to Upgrade Existing Roadways

Dear Ms. Adams:

This is in reply to the letter dated June 6, 2008, concerning the above referenced project in the Cities of Fairfield, Suisun City, and Vacaville, California.

Enclosed for your information are copies of the drawings for Line Section 130, sheets 88 thru 102, and Line Section 25, sheets 41 thru 50, that respectively depict the general alignment of Kinder Morgan's (KM) active 20-inch high pressure refined petroleum products pipeline and idle 14-inch pipeline.

Regardless of the route selected it appears that the Jepson Parkway Project may significantly impact the 20-inch pipeline. 15-1

In this regard, for your reference when designing the proposed roadway improvements, enclosed is a copy of **Information Bulletin #03-001** issued by the office of the California State Fire Marshal, Pipeline Safety Division that refers to encroachments affecting pipeline easements, and **L-OM200-29 "Guidelines for Design and Construction"** relating to proposed projects affecting Kinder Morgan pipelines.

When preliminary project plans are available, please forward a full sized set of drawings to this office for our review and comment.

Sincerely,

D. R. Quinn

D. R. Quinn
Manager, Pipeline Relocations

T: Quinn/letters/ENG4-2-1/08-472-1

Enclosures

1100 Town & Country Road Orange, California 92868 714/560-4400 714/560-4601 Fax

KINDER MORGAN

Guidelines for Design and Construction near Kinder Morgan Hazardous Liquid Operated Facilities

Name of Company: _____

The list of design, construction and contractor requirements, including but not limited to the following, for the design and installation of foreign utilities or improvements on KM right-of-way (ROW) are not intended nor do they waive or modify any rights KM may have under existing easements or ROW agreements. Reference existing easements and amendments for additional requirements. This list of requirements is applicable for KM facilities on easements only. Encroachments on fee property should be referred to the ROW Department.

Design

- KM shall be provided sufficient prior notice of planned activities involving excavation, blasting, or any type of construction on KM's ROW to determine and resolve any location, grade or encroachment problems and provide protection of our facilities and the public **before** the actual work is to take place.
- Encroaching entity shall provide KM with a set of drawings for review and a set of final construction drawings showing all aspects of the proposed facilities in the vicinity of KM's ROW. The encroaching entity shall also provide a set of as-built drawings showing the proposed facilities in the vicinity of KM's ROW.
- Only facilities shown on drawings reviewed by (Company) will be approved for installation on KM's ROW. All drawing revisions that effect facilities proposed to be placed on KM's ROW must be approved by KM in writing.
- KM shall approve the design of all permanent road crossings.
- Any repair to surface facilities following future pipeline maintenance or repair work by KM will be at the expense of the developer or landowner.
- The depth of cover over the KM pipelines shall not be reduced nor drainage altered without KM's written approval.
- Construction of any permanent structure, building(s) or obstructions within KM pipeline easement is **not** permitted.
- Planting of shrubs and trees is not permitted on KM pipeline easement.
- Irrigation equipment i.e. backflow prevent devices, meters, valves, valve boxes, etc. shall not be located on KM easement.
- Foreign line, gas, water, electric and sewer lines, etc., may cross perpendicular to KM's pipeline within the ROW, provided that a minimum of two (2) feet of vertical clearance is maintained between KM pipeline(s) and the foreign pipeline. Constant line elevations must be maintained across KM's entire ROW width, gravity drain lines are the only exception. Foreign line crossings below the KM pipeline must be evaluated by KM to ensure that a significant length of the KM line is not exposed and unsupported during construction. When installing underground utilities, the last line should be placed beneath all existing lines unless it is impractical or unreasonable to do so. Foreign line crossings above the KM pipeline with less than 2 feet of clearance must be evaluated by KM to ensure that additional support is not necessary to prevent settling on top of the KM hazardous liquids pipeline.
- A foreign pipeline shall cross KM facilities at as near a ninety-degree angle as possible. A foreign pipeline shall not run parallel to KM pipeline within KM easement without written permission of KM.
- The foreign utility should be advised that KM maintains cathodic protection on their pipelines. The foreign utility must coordinate their cathodic protection system with KM's. At the request of KM, foreign utilities shall install (or allow to be installed) cathodic protection test leads at all crossings for the purposes of monitoring cathodic protection. The KM Cathodic Protection (CP) technician and the foreign utility CP technician shall perform post construction CP interference testing. Interference issues shall be resolved by mutual agreement between foreign utility and KM. All costs associated with the correction of cathodic protection problems on KM pipeline as a result of the foreign utility crossing shall be borne by the foreign utility for a period of one year from date the foreign utility is put in service.
- The metallic foreign line shall be coated with a suitable pipe coating for a distance of at least 10 feet on either side of the crossing unless otherwise requested by the KM CP Technician.

Reference: L-O&M Procedure 204
Distribution: Local Files
Engineering

Page 1 of 3

L-OM200-29
11/07

KINDER MORGAN

Guidelines for Design and Construction near Kinder Morgan Hazardous Liquid Operated Facilities

- AC Electrical lines must be installed in conduit and properly insulated.
- DOT approved pipeline markers shall be installed so as to indicate the route of the foreign pipeline across the KM ROW.
- No power poles, light standards, etc. shall be installed on KM easement
- No pipeline may be located within 50 feet (15 meters) of any private dwelling, or any industrial building or place of public assembly in which persons work, congregate, or assemble.

Construction

- Contractors shall be advised of KM's requirements and be contractually obligated to comply.
- The continued integrity of KM's pipelines and the safety of all individuals in the area of proposed work near KM's facilities are of the utmost importance. Therefore, contractor must meet with KM representatives prior to construction to provide and receive notification listings for appropriate area operations and emergency personnel. **KM's on-site representative will require discontinuation of any work that, in his opinion, endangers the operations or safety of personnel, pipelines or facilities.**
- The Contractor must expose all KM pipelines prior to crossing to determine the exact alignment and depth of the lines. A KM representative must be present. In the event of parallel lines, only one pipeline can be exposed at a time.
- KM will not allow pipelines to remain exposed overnight without consent of KM designated representative. Contractor may be required to backfill pipelines at the end of each day.
- A KM representative shall do all line locating. A KM representative shall be present for hydraulic excavation. The use of probing rods for pipeline locating shall be performed by KM representatives only, to prevent unnecessary damage to the pipeline coating.
- Notification shall be given to KM at least 72 hours before start of construction. A schedule of activities for the duration of the project must be made available at that time to facilitate the scheduling of Kinder Morgan, Inc.'s work site representative. Any Contractor schedule changes shall be provided to Kinder Morgan, Inc. immediately.
- Heavy equipment will not be allowed to operate directly over KM pipelines or in KM ROW unless written approval is obtained from (Company). Heavy equipment shall only be allowed to cross KM pipelines at locations designated by Kinder Morgan, Inc. Contractor shall comply with all precautionary measures required by KM to protect its pipelines. When inclement weather exists, provisions must be made to compensate for soil displacement due to subsidence of tires. Equipment excavating within ten (10) feet of KM Pipelines will have a plate guard installed over the teeth to protect the pipeline.
- Excavating or grading which might result in erosion or which could render the KM ROW inaccessible shall not be permitted unless the contractor/developer/owner agrees to restore the area to its original condition and provide protection to KM's facility.
- A KM representative shall be on-site to observe any construction activities within ten (10) feet of a KM pipeline or aboveground appurtenance. The contractor **shall not** work within this distance without a KM representative being on site. Only hand excavation shall be permitted within two (2) feet of KM pipelines, valves and fittings unless State requirements are more stringent. However, proceed with extreme caution when within three (3) feet of the pipe.
- A KM representative will monitor construction activity within 25 feet of KM facilities during and after the activities to verify the integrity of the pipeline and to ensure the scope and conditions agreed to have not changed. Monitoring means to conduct site inspections on a pre-determined frequency based on items such as: scope of work, duration of expected excavator work, type of equipment, potential impact on pipeline, complexity of work and/or number of excavators involved.
- Ripping is only allowed when the position of the pipe is known and not within ten (10) feet of KM facility unless company representative is present.
- Temporary support of any exposed KM pipeline by Contractor may be necessary if required by KM's on-site representative. Backfill below the exposed lines and 12" above the lines shall be replaced with sand or other selected material as approved by KM's on-site representative and thoroughly compacted in 12" lifts to 95% of standard proctor dry density minimum or as approved by KM's on-site representative. This is to adequately protect against stresses that may be caused by the settling of the pipeline.

Reference: L-O&M Procedure 204 | Page 2 of 3 | L-OM200-29
Distribution: Local Files, Engineering | 11/07

KINDER MORGAN

Guidelines for Design and Construction near Kinder Morgan Hazardous Liquid Operated Facilities

- No blasting shall be allowed within 1000 feet of KM's facilities unless blasting notification is given to KM including complete Blasting Plan Data. A pre-blast meeting shall be conducted by the organization responsible for blasting.
  KM shall be indemnified and held harmless from any loss, cost of liability for personal injuries received, death caused or property damage suffered or sustained by any person resulting from any blasting operations undertaken within 500 feet of its facilities. The organization responsible for blasting shall be liable for any and all damages caused to KM's facilities as a result of their activities whether or not KM representatives are present. KM shall have a signed and executed Blasting Indemnification Agreement before authorized permission to blast can be given.

  No blasting shall be allowed within 300 feet of KM's facilities unless blasting notification is given to KM a minimum of one week before blasting. *(note: covered above)* KM shall review and analyze the blasting methods. A written blasting plan shall be provided by the organization responsible for blasting and agreed to in writing by KM in addition to meeting requirements for 500' and 1000' being met above. A written emergency plan shall be provided by the organization responsible for blasting. *(note: covered above)*

- Any contact with any KM facility, pipeline, valve set, etc. shall be reported immediately to KM. If repairs to the pipe are necessary, they will be made and inspected before the section is re-coated and the line is back-filled.

- KM personnel shall install all test leads on KM facilities.

- Burning of trash, brush, etc. is not permitted within the KM ROW.

Insurance Requirements

- All contractors, and their subcontractors, working on Company easements shall maintain the following types of insurance policies and minimum limits of coverage. All insurance certificates carried by Contractor and Grantee shall include the following statement: "Kinder Morgan and its affiliated or subsidiary companies are named as additional insured on all above policies (except Worker's Compensation) and waiver of subrogation in favor of Kinder Morgan and its affiliated or subsidiary companies, their respective directors, officers, agents and employees applies as required by written contract." **Contractor shall furnish Certificates of Insurance evidencing insurance coverage prior to commencement of work and shall provide thirty (30) days notice prior to the termination or cancellation of any policy.**

1. Statutory Coverage Workers' Compensation Insurance in accordance with the laws of the states where the work is to be performed. If Contractor performs work on the adjacent on navigable waterways Contractor shall furnish a certificate of insurance showing compliance with the provisions of the Federal Longshoreman's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Law.
2. Employer's Liability Insurance, with limits of not less than **$1,000,000** per occurrence and **$1,000,000** disease each employee.
3. Commercial General Liability Insurance with a combined single limit of not less than **$2,000,000** per occurrence and in the aggregate. All policies shall include coverage for blanket contractual liability assumed.
4. Comprehensive Automobile Liability Insurance with a combined single limit of not less than **$1,000,000**. If necessary, the policy shall be endorsed to provide contractual liability coverage.
5. If necessary Comprehensive Aircraft Liability Insurance with combined bodily injury, including passengers, and property damage liability single limits of not less than **$5,000,000** each occurrence.
6. Contractor's Pollution Liability Insurance this coverage shall be maintained in force for the full period of this agreement with available limits of not less then **$2,000,000** per occurrence.
7. Pollution Legal Liability Insurance this coverage must be maintained in a minimum amount of **$5,000,000** per occurrence.

Reference: L-O&M Procedure 204
Distribution: Local Files
Engineering

Page 3 of 3

L-OM200-29
11/07

California State Fire Marshal Pipeline Safety Division

INFORMATION BULLETIN
#03-001

Date Issued: June 20, 2003

SUBJECT: ENCROACHMENTS INTO OR ON PIPELINE EASEMENTS

The purpose of this informational bulletin is to delineate the position of the State Fire Marshal regarding encroachments onto the pipeline easements.

Section 51014.6 of the California Government Code states, " (a) Effective January 1, 1987, no person, other than the pipeline operator, shall do any of the following with respect to any pipeline easement: (1) Build, erect, or create a structure or improvement within the pipeline easement or permit the building, erection, or creation thereof. (2) Build, erect, or create a structure, fence, wall, or obstruction adjacent to any pipeline easement which would prevent complete and unimpaired surface access to the easement, or permit the building, erection, or creation thereof. (b) No shrubbery or shielding shall be installed on the pipeline easement which would impair aerial observation of the pipeline easement. This subdivision does not prevent the revegetation of any landscape disturbed within a pipeline easement as a result of construction the pipeline and does not prevent the holder of the underlying fee interest or the holder's tenant from planting and harvesting seasonal agricultural crops on a pipeline easement. (c) This section does not prohibit a pipeline operator from performing any necessary activities within a pipeline easement, including, but not limited to, the construction, replacement, relocation, repair, or operation of the pipeline.

It is the position of the State Fire Marshal that nothing shall encroach into or upon the pipeline easement, which would impede the pipeline operator from complete and unobstructed surface access along the pipeline right of way. Nor shall there be any obstructions, which would shield the pipeline right of way from observation. In the interest of public safety and the protection of the environment, it is imperative that the pipeline operator visually assesses the conditions along the easement to ensure the integrity of the pipeline.

It is the responsibility of the pipeline operator to ensure they have unimpeded surface access and to be able to physically observe all portions of their pipeline rights of way. In cases where this is not possible, the pipeline operator shall inform the State Fire Marshal. The State Fire Marshal shall in conjunction with the pipeline operator resolve the issue.

Questions regarding the issue of pipeline encroachment can be addressed to:

Bob Gorham, Supervising Pipeline Safety Engineer
CDF/State Fire Marshal
Pipeline Safety Division
3950 Paramount Blvd. Suite 210
Lakewood, CA 9012

(562) 497-9100
(562) 497-9104 (fax)
bob.gorham@fire.ca.gov

Response

15-1. Thank you for the comment. All of the Kinder-Morgan facilities have been identified and potential impacts have been reviewed. Avoidance options have been implemented so that no Kinder-Morgan pipelines are impacted. Please see the Essay Response 6: Utility Impacts Associated with the Preferred Alternative

Letter 16
Union Pacific Railroad Company

Patrick R. McGill
Senior Counsel - Real Estate

August 6, 2008

VIA E-MAIL (jadams@sta-snci.com)

Ms. Janet Adams, P.E.
Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority
1 Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

Re: Notice of Preparation of Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement ("Draft EIR/EIS") for the Jepson Parkway Project ("Project")

Dear Ms. Adams:

Union Pacific Railroad Company ("UP") provides this letter in response to the attached notice. The Draft EIR/EIS is being prepared for the Jepson Parkway Project. UP's rail corridor is within the Jepson Parkway Project corridor. Additionally, alternatives B through E in the Draft EIR/EIS (all of the "build" alternatives) cross UP's rail corridor, and three of the four "build" alternatives (alternatives B through D in the Draft EIR/EIS) involve road modifications very near to or along side UP's rail corridor. Accordingly, UP wishes to raise the following issues.

To minimize conflicts between vehicles and rail operations, no new at-grade road crossings of UP's rail lines should be allowed. From the Jepson Parkway Project materials, it does not appear that any new at-grade road crossings are under consideration. Additionally, the grade separations currently described in the different "build" alternatives of the Draft EIR/EIS should be required as part of any "build" alternative selected, to avoid unacceptable conflicts between the increased volume of vehicular traffic in the Jepson Parkway Project corridor and rail operations on UP's rail lines. Also, the increased traffic resulting from the Jepson Parkway Project should be analyzed to determine the impact on other at-grade road crossings of UP's rail lines in or near the Jepson Parkway Project corridor, and grade separations of other existing at-grade road crossings should be required where appropriate to minimize conflicts at those other road crossings between vehicles and rail operations. 16-1 16-2

UP is also concerned about the safety issues that would be created if bicycle and pedestrian paths are located near to or adjacent to UP's rail lines. UP believes that the bicycle 16-3

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD 1400 Douglas Street STOP 1580 Omaha, NE 68179 (402) 544-5761 fx (402) 997-3603 prmcgill@up.com

and pedestrian paths should not be located near to or adjacent to UP's rail lines. Regardless of how near to the rail lines the bicycle and pedestrian paths are located, UP requests that Solano Transportation Authority examine the impacts associated with the increased likelihood of trespassing on the UP right of way and set forth appropriate mitigation measures. Solano Transportation Authority should consider requiring barrier walls or fences, pavement markings and/or "No Trespassing" signs designed to prevent trespassing onto the right of way. Depending on the location of the bicycle and pedestrian paths relative to the UP right of way, buffers and set-backs should also be required adjacent to the right of way. 16-3 Cont'd

Because the Jepson Parkway Project would be expected to increase vehicle traffic trips in the area, the Jepson Parkway Project may generate some car exhaust that may impact air quality. 16-4

Please give notice to UP of all future developments with respect to the Jepson Parkway Project as follows:

Mr. Terrell Anderson
Manager-Industry & Public Projects
Union Pacific Railroad Company
9451 Atkinson Street
Roseville, CA 95747

With copy to:
Ms. Donna Coltrane
Legal Assistant
Union Pacific Railroad Company
1400 Douglas Street, STOP 1580

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Patrick R. McGill

Enclosure

cc: Terrell Anderson via e-mail (w/Enclosure)

O:\Legal - Practice Area\Real Estate\Land Use\Solano Trnspr Auth-Adams Ltr.doc

2

Solano Transportation Authority

One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, California 94585

Area Code 707
424-6075 • Fax 424-6074

June 6, 2008

Members:

Benicia
Dixon
Fairfield
Rio Vista
Solano County
Suisun City
Vacaville
Vallejo

Terrell A. Anderson, Manager Industry and Public Projects
Union Pacific Railroad
9451 Atkinson Street
Roseville, CA 95747

Enclosed for your review and comments is the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS) for the Jepson Parkway Project. This document evaluates the potential impacts of the construction of roadway improvements in the Jepson Corridor. The Jepson Corridor is located in central Solano County and extends from Vacaville on the north, to Suisun City on the south. The corridor is approximately 12 miles long and passes through the jurisdictions of the Cities of Fairfield, Suisun City, and Vacaville, as well as unincorporated portions of Solano County.

The project would upgrade and link a series of existing local two and four-lane roadways to provide a continuous four- to six-lane north-south travel route for residents who face increasing congestion when traveling between jurisdictions in central Solano County. Roadways proposed for improvements in the corridor could include Peabody Road, Leisure Town Road, Vanden Road, Cement Hill Road, Huntington Drive, Air Base Parkway, and/or Walters Road, including a possible extension of Walters Road north of its existing terminus. The project includes unifying landscape and design features to enhance the aesthetics and character of the communities through which the corridor passes.

The Draft EIR/EIS, and all background technical reports, are available to review at the following locations:

Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City

Fairfield Civic Center Library
1150 Kentucky Street
Fairfield

Suisun City Public Library
333 Sunset Avenue, Suite 280
Suisun City

Vacaville Public Library
102 Ulatis Drive
Vacaville

In addition, the Draft EIR/EIS is available to review online at www.solanolinks.com.

Solano Transportation Authority

One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, California 94585

Area Code 707
424-6075 • Fax 424-6074

Members:

Benicia
Dixon
Fairfield
Rio Vista
Solano County
Suisun City
Vacaville
Vallejo

Please submit written comments to:

Janet Adams, P.E., Director of Projects
via email at: jadams@sta-snci.com
or mailed to:
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

Comments will also be accepted in person at the public hearing for the project on Tuesday, June 24 from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Callison Elementary School, 6261 Vanden Road, Vacaville, CA.

We welcome your comments. If you have any comments regarding the proposed project, please attend the public hearing and/or send your written comments to the Solano Transportation Authority, attention Janet Adams. Comments must be received no later than 5:00 p.m. on August 6, 2008.

Sincerely,

Daryl K. Halls

Daryl Halls
Executive Director

Responses

16-1. As described in Chapter 2, Project Alternatives, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, none of the build alternatives would include new at-grade crossings of UPRR rail lines. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative. Alternative B would construct a new grade separation of the UPRR as part of the Walters Road Extension.

16-2. As described in Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for the Project, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, the Jepson Parkway project is needed to address existing and future travel demand for north-south mobility in central Solano County and accommodate traffic associated with programmed land use and employment projections. The project in and of itself will not result in increased traffic.

As described in response to comment 16.1, Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. This alternative includes the construction of a new grade separation of the UPRR as part of the Walters Road extension. Existing at-grade crossings in proximity to the roadways that make up Alternative B include crossings at Peabody Road north of Markeley Lane and at Canon Road east of Vanden Road. No changes to the Peabody Road at-grade crossing are proposed, as this crossing was recently upgraded as part of the widening improvements to Peabody Road. The intersection of Vanden and Canon Roads would be improved as part of Alternative B to accommodate turn lanes and northbound acceleration and deceleration lanes. A traffic signal also would be installed at this intersection. The new traffic signal would be synchronized with the railroad crossing arms along Canon

Road. Minor improvements at the Canon Road crossing would be completed to minimize traffic conflicts.

16-3. As described in response to comment 16.1, Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. This alternative includes the construction of a bicycle/pedestrian path along the corridor, including along Vanden Road in the vicinity of the UPRR tracks. Along this section of Vanden Road, the bicycle/pedestrian path would be constructed west of Vanden Road opposite the UPRR tracks and would be separated from Vanden Road by an approximately 10- to 20-foot wide landscaped area, a total of four lanes of traffic, roadway shoulders, and a 16-foot wide median. This separation from the UPRR tracks will help to minimize trespassing. STA will consider the inclusion of fencing along the UPRR right-of-way during final design of the project.

16-4. Air Quality impacts are addressed in Section 3.13, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS. As described in Section 3.13, no CO violations would result with implementation of any of the build alternatives.

Letter 17
Vacaville Chamber of Commerce

From: Gary Tatum [mailto:garyt@vacavillechamber.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2008 12:29 PM
To: 'Janet Adams (E-mail)'
Subject: Jepson Parkway

The Vacaville Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors is in strong support of the Jepson Parkway and look forward to the eventual completion of the entire project in approximately three years.

The business communities of Fairfield, Suisun City and Vacaville will benefit from the completion of the Parkway. Not only do we see a degree of relief from the current use of I-80 but an increase in improved communications through transportation of those cities affected. **17-1**

We are also taking this opportunity to congratulate the Board of Directors as well as Mr. Daryl Halls and his entire staff at the Solano Transportation Authority for outstanding work on behalf of the citizens of Solano County.

Gary H. Tatum
President/CEO
Vacaville Chamber of Commerce

Response

17-1. Thank you for your comment.

Letter 18
Jack Hamlin, Valley Church

07/22/2008 10:09 FAX 7074487250 VALLEY CHURCH 002

STA
Solano Transportation Authority

Caltrans

JEPSON PARKWAY

Public Hearing Comment Sheet

June 24, 2008 • 6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.
Callison Elementary School

THURSDAY, JULY 17, 2008
SOLANO COUNTY BUILDING

Name: JACK HAMLIN
Address: 5063 MAPLE RD.
City/State/Zip: VACAVILLE, CA

Affiliation: VALLEY CHURCH
Phone: 707-448-7222
E-mail: jhamlin@valleychurch.com

1. The following are my comments on the Jepson Parkway Project draft environmental document:

18-1 Valley Church owns two parcels with frontage on Leisure Town Rd. between Poplar and Maple Rd. It is our desire to have our main entrance/exit off of the projected Jepson Parkway. After speaking with Janet Adams and other project staff, we would request a three quarter turn in front of our property enabling a right in, right out and left in. Please consider this option for the benefit of Valley Church traffic circulation.

Please use reverse side if additional space is needed.

Note: This comment sheet can be mailed directly to Solano Transportation Authority. See reverse for directions.

Comments may be submitted tonight or mailed, faxed, or e-mailed to:
Janet Adams, Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585
Fax: 707-424-6074
E-mail: jadams@sta-snci.com

Please note: Comments on the draft environmental document must be received by 5:00 p.m. on August 6, 2008

Thank you for participating in tonight's public hearing.

JEPSON PARKWAY

Project Alternatives



STA Solano Transportation Authority

Response

18-1. Thank you for the comment. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. A left turn lane from Leisure Town Road and a right-in/right-out access (3/4 intersection) for Valley Church will be investigated during the final design phase of this project. This potential change in access would be contingent on City of Vacaville approval.

Letter 19
John G. Rosten, Valley Evangelical Free Church

From: John Rosten [mailto:jrosten2020@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2008 12:31 AM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Comments on the Draft EIR for Jepson Parkway Project

Janet Adams
Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority

Dear Ms. Adams,

I enjoyed attending the workshop on Thursday July 17, 2008 for reviewing the Draft EIR for the Jepson Parkway Project.

Valley Church owns property on the east side of Leisure Town Road, between Maple Road and Popular Road. I request that in your planning you would consider allowing a left turn onto our property for vehicles traveling south on Jepson Parkway, as well as a "right in" and "right out" for vehicles traveling north. It's my understanding that this could be accomplished through installation of a "three quarter turn" in front of our property. **19-1**

Thank you very much for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

John G. Rosten
Elder Board Chairman
Valley Evangelical Free Church
5063 Maple Road
Vacaville, CA 95687
(707) 678-1314 (Home)
(707) 365-9760 (Cell)

Response

19-1. Thank you for the comment. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. A left turn lane from Leisure Town Road and a right-in/right-out access (3/4 intersection) for Valley Church will be investigated during the final design phase of this project. This potential change in access would be contingent on City of Vacaville approval.

Letter 20
Leisure Town Road Petition

Jepson Parkway

Please do not use Leisure Town Road as part of this project. We **Support Alternative E** – which uses Peabody Road instead of Leisure Town

- Home Owners along Leisure Town Road purchased their homes at the height of the price increases, and have already lost over $200,000 per home. Routes B, C and D will create a noise factor that will decrease home values even more. 20-1
- We do not want traffic on Leisure Town Road where the children wait for and board school busses 20-2
- Alternative E is a shorter route
- Alternative E goes through more open land
- Alternative E would be good for Vacaville businesses along Peabody Road
- Alternative E has fewer homes along the route
- Alternative E is a straighter path – with fewer turns

20-3

Please do not route Jepson Parkway down Leisure Town Road!

Jepson Parkway Project

I support Alternative

A	B	C	D	E	Name and address	Phone
				X	Janet Dawson 131 Sage Sparrow Circle W	447-0977
				X	Ron Dawson 131 Sage Sparrow Circle W	442-2652
				X	HILREY THOMAS 148 Sage Sparrow Cir	580-747-5305
				X	Carla Hart 136 Sage Sparrow Cir VV	707-208-0243
				X	Michael ANN ZINN 124 Woodbury Circle, VV	707-448-1780
				X	Rosario Carlos VV	446-4488
				X	MARK STROBAEL 130 SAGE SPARROW VV	446-7181
				X	Patty Bowen 119 Sage Sparrow Cir	447-6734
				X	Amanda Guido 119 Sage Sparrow Cir	447-6734
				X	Dustin Bowen 119 Sage Sparrow Cir	447-6734
				X	Rick Bowen 119 Sage Sparrow	447-6734
				X	Evanen Blair 929 Deerglen Cir. V.V. 95687	447-9197
				X	Jen Grigorzak 379 Sun Valley Way VV, 95688	455-8765
				X	[illegible] 138 Sage Sparrow Cir	446-4188
				X	CRAIG CHAPPELL 273 RED PHEASANT DR 95687	448-8995
				X	Nelly WOOLSEY 142 Sage Sparrow Circle 95687	448-4583
				X	James WOOLSEY 142 Sage Sparrow Cir. 95687	" "
				X	NICOLE CHAPPELL 273 RED PHEASANT DR 95687	448-8995

Jepson Parkway Project

I support Alternative

A	B	C	D	E	Name and Address	Phone
				X	JOHN VAN NIEUWBURG 167 SAGE SPARROW CIR VACAVILLE CA.	707 469-7274
				X	ANN VAN NIEUWburg 167 Sage Sparrow Circle VACAVILLE, CA 95687	707 469-9274
				X	ISRAEL GABRIEL 173 SAGE SPARROW CIRCLE VACAVILLE, CA 95687	707 451-4718
				X	James Woolsey 142 Sage Sparrow Circle Vacaville, CA 95687	707 448-4583
				X	[illegible] 143 Sage Sparrow Cir. Vacaville, CA. 95687	707-446-8446
				X	[illegible] 143 Sage Sparrow Cir Vacaville CA 95687	4468446
				X	Leticia Cervantes 166 Sage Sparrow Cir	530/579-4259
				X	Laurence Reyes 1772 NEWARK	(530) 831-2592
				X	OMAR CELESTIAL 343 SNOW EGRET DR	707-496-1033
				X	Nazreen Celestial 343 Snow Egret Dr	(707) 688-5323
				X	Pete Tremblay 318 Snow Egret Dr	707 446-7318
				X	Erick Diez Jr. 272 Red Pheasant Dr	707 449-9983
				X	Afton Diez 272 Red Pheasant Dr	707 449-9983
				X	Deb Cottrell 272 Red Pheasant Dr	707 386-2434
				X	Paul Price 260 Red Pheasant	707 451-1216
				X	Caroline a Price 260 Red Pheasant Dr	707 451-1216
				X	Ronald Larson 131 Sage Sparrow Cir VV	446-2656

Jepson Parkway Project

I support Alternative

A	B	C	D	E	Name and Address
				X	Naomi Sales 4652 opal court, Fairfield, CA 94534
				X	Fuentes 906 Countrywood Cir. Vacaville CA 95687
				X	Willie Miller 134 Lassen Cir Voca. 95687
				X	Anna Severs 112 Rainier cr Vaca. 95687
				X	Retuan Cabrera 118 Leeward CT
				X	Janie Knotts 554 Star Lilly Dr. Vacaville Ca. 95687
				X	" " " " "
				X	Maurice Sullivan 1037 Notre Dame VV
				X	Rachel Lopez 1060 Amber Ridge Lane.
				X	Debra Lopez " "
				X	Chelsea Lopez 1060 Amber Ridge Lane
				X	Sara Lopez 1060 Amber Ridge Ln.
				X	" "
				X	1421 Alamo Dr
				X	Marie Tello 941 Sage DR
				X	Rosalia Cortes 941 Sage Dr.
				X	941 Sage Dr.
				X	Maria Vazquez

Jepson Parkway Project

I support Alternative

A	B	C	D	E	Name and Address	Phone
				X	Maria Gordon 131 Sage Sparrow VV	707-446-3452
				X	Emmett HART V.U.	707448-8651
				X	Patty Budd 221 Sage Sparrow Cr VV	359.4915
				X	LUANA Dunbar 696 Forest Ridge Cir.	448-5701
				X	Steve Rese VV	
				X	Alejandro dela Torre VV	(707) 365 2477
				X	R. Ahrm VV	
				X	[illegible] VV	
				X	[illegible] W.	
				X	Raney Medeiros, Fairfield	
				X	[illegible] VV	
				X	Lenny Cirauto 179 Sage Sparrow	707-451-2629
				X	[illegible] 179 Sage Sparrow	707451-2629
				X	[illegible] 6012 Hawk Dr	7074513875
				X	[illegible] 125 [illegible]	446-786[illegible]

Responses

20-1. Please see Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls.

Various studies have been performed over the past 30 years or so that examine the connection between transportation improvements and the values of proximate residential property. They do not conclude

that transportation projects cause a decline in property values. Good schools and improved access to employment and other opportunities are important factors in buyers' decisions about where to live.

20-2. As shown in Figure 2-2A, Figure 2-3A, and Figure 2-4A of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, the segment of Leisure Town Road between Fallbrook Avenue and Alamo Drive includes the construction of a 35-foot to 55-foot landscaped linear parkway along the west side of Leisure Town Road. This parkway will include a 10-foot wide meandering pedestrian/bicycle sidewalk set back from the roadway. Construction of the linear parkway and 10-foot wide sidewalk will separate motor and non-motor traffic and help ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists along this segment of Leisure Town Road. In addition, the 10-foot pedestrian/bicycle sidewalk will extend north along Leisure Town Road to Walnut Road. The 35-foot to 55-foot landscaped linear parkway will extend south of Alamo Drive to Vanden Road.

20-3. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative.

Letter 21
Ellie Bush

Solano Transportation Authority

Caltrans

RECEIVED

JUL - 1 2008

SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

JEPSON PARKWAY

Public Hearing Comment Sheet

June 24, 2008 - 6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.
Callison Elementary School

Name: Ellie Bush, R.V.M.

Affiliation: homeowner Vacaville

Address: 236 Fallen Leaf Dr.

Phone: 7074493504

City/State/Zip: Vacaville, Ca. 95687

E-mail: _____

1. The following are my comments on the Jepson Parkway Project draft environmental document:

21-1 I would prefer No Leisure Town Road expansion. I live 1 block away from Leisure Town Road and am all ready kept awake at night from noise on I-80. Any increase in noise from a Leisure Town Road expansion would adversely affect my quality

Please use reverse side if additional space is needed.

Note: This comment sheet can be mailed directly to Solano Transportation Authority. See reverse for directions.

Comments may be submitted tonight or mailed, faxed, or e-mailed to:
Janet Adams, Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585
Fax: 707-424-6074
E-mail: jadams@sta-snci.com

Please note: Comments on the draft environmental document must be received by 5:00 p.m. on August 6, 2008

Thank you for participating in tonight's public hearing.



(FOLD LINE)

Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

SACRAMENTO CA 957
30 JUN 2008 PM 7 T

Janet Adams
Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

94585+2427

(FOLD LINE)

Additional comment space:

21-1 Cont'd

of life. As a resident of Vacaville for 25 years and a business owner in Vacaville for 17 years, I strongly urge you to leave Leisure Town Road alone. Thank you,
Dr. Ellie Bu

Staple Here

Response

21-1. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, which identifies Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative. This alternative would result in a widening of Leisure Town Road from two to four lanes. Also see Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS Section 3.14, Noise, and Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls, for a summary of project noise impacts and the locations of proposed noise abatement.

Letter 22
Elias J. Castro

From: Castro, Elias J Jr Civ USAF AMC 60 CMS/MXMCE [mailto:elias.castro@travis.af.mil]
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2008 12:06 PM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Jepson Parkway Hearing 24 June 2008

Dear Miss Adams

I attended the hearing and I was presented several proposals for the parkway. I live on 742 Fallbrook Ave in Vacaville. I purchased my house in 1978. The neighborhood has been a great place to live to raise my two children. Recognizing the parkway as a necessary alternative, I have discussed this issue with several of my neighbors and these are some of our concerns:

22-1 1. Large truck access; Currently trucks over 5,000 pounds are not allowed on Leisure town road. Will this stay the same once the project is completed?

22-2 2. Speed limits; Will the posted 40 MPH limit on Leisure Town road stay the same from Alamo drive to I-80? During peak traffic times it is very difficult to perform a left turn on to Leisure Town. If two additional lanes are projected including a set back and a median will make it almost impossible to safely execute.

22-3 3. Noise; I am 7 houses from Leisure Town and I can hear the road traffic now. The concern is that by adding two more traffic lanes the noise level would be unacceptable. Please ensure all efforts are made to install sound walls are included to the set back plan.

22-4 4. In talking to the planners, we noticed that Arbor Oaks drive is designated a right hand turn only on to Leisure Town road. This leaves Fallbrook Ave the only alternative for a left hand turn on to Leisure Town. The traffic from all surrounding housing including Leeward Court will funnel down Fallbrook Ave. We have several households with children and this is a major safety concern. We offer a solution ; designate Fallbrook Ave also as right hand only on to Leisure Town Road. This would significantly reduce the amount of traffic on Fallbrook Ave. Please strongly consider our solution, we cannot stress enough the importance of our children's safety.

Please forward our questions and concerns to the city of Vacaville. Thank you

Elias J. Castro
Electrical and Environmental Section Foreman
60 CMS Travis AFB CA.
DSN 837-5271 COMM (707) 424-5271

Responses

22-1. Thank you for the comment. Truck traffic along Leisure Town Road would continue to be restricted in accordance with City of Vacaville Ordinance No. 1638, which designates Leisure Town Road as a "Limited Truck Route." This restricts truck access to local deliveries only.

22-2. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. The current posted speed limit of 40 mph is expected to remain on Leisure Town Road. The addition of a travel lane in each direction and the installation of a raised median with turn lanes will provide improved safety conditions for vehicles entering and leaving Leisure Town Road. The additional travel lane will reduce long queues of traffic and provide better gaps to enter Leisure Town Road, and the raised medians and turn lanes will provide a safe refuge for vehicles turning left.

23-3. A summary of noise impacts and proposed noise abatement is provided in Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls, and details of the project noise

analysis are presented in the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS Section 3.14, Noise. The commenter's address is along Fallbrook Avenue. As presented in the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, Section 3.14, Noise, the segment of Leisure Town Road north and south of Fallbrook Avenue was evaluated for noise abatement. Soundwalls would meet reasonable and feasible criteria and are therefore proposed for this location; see Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS Table 3.14-9 in Section 3.14, Noise.

22-4. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. Arbor Oaks Drive will have right-in/right-out access because of its close proximity to Elmira Road. Changing Fallbrook Avenue to a right-in/right-out access configuration will be explored during the final design phase. Fallbrook Avenue has adequate spacing related to adjacent intersections, so a full movement intersection is appropriate for safety and traffic operations.

Letter 23
Mercedes Chase

RECEIVED

AUG - 4 2008

SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

July 28, 2008

Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

Re: Jepson Parkway Project

I am in favor of a convenient bypass through Solano County as outlined in the Jepson Parkway flyer mailed to our homes last month. This roadway will provide access and speed for more motorists and businesses in the area.

23-1a My number one concern and the reason for this letter is that this traffic increase will also raise sound and air pollution along the route. When we purchased our home off of Leisure Town Road five years ago, there was discussion about adding a sound wall. 23-2

The time-lapsed photo of our neighborhood, which is displayed in the flyer, shows an expansion of the sidewalk but no sound barrier. To my knowledge, this stretch between Elmira and Marshall Roads in Vacaville is the *only* home development on Alternatives B, C, and D that does not have a barrier wall.

This area is less than 2.5 blocks long. I believe the cost to build a wall would be marginal, yet the benefit to residents would be enormous. There is already frustration with the amount of traffic on our common roadway. A barrier wall would provide goodwill as well as protection from excessive road noise and air pollution. 23-1b

Every resident I contacted along the corridor was in favor of STA building a wall. Their signatures have been added on the next page to communicate our mutual concern. We thank you for including this improvement to the Jepson Parkway.

Sincerely,

Mercedes Chase

Mercedes Chase

Residents who second the desire for a barrier wall:

Print Name	Street Address	Signature
Colleen + Kevin Newcomer	701 Arbor Oaks	
Carl + Maxine Bruegmann	720 Arbor Oaks	Colleen Newcomer
Bruegmann		Maxine Bruegmann
MARLENE PAULMAN	701 OAKMEADE	Marlene Paulman
RAMONA REED	773 OAKMEADE	Ramona Reed
Ben Reed	773 OAKMEADE	Ben J Reed
Marjorie Gifford	755 OAKMEADE	Marjorie Gifford
WILLIAM GIFFORD	755 OAKMEADE	William Gifford
David Gregor	731 Oakmeade	David Gregor
Toni Wilson	725 Oakmeade Dr	Toni Wilson
LINDA SANDERS	707 Oakmeade Dr.	Linda Sanders
Lyonne Paetz	214 Kingswood Ave	Lyonne Paetz
BRUCE DORWORTH	761 OAKMEADE	
BARB DORWORTH	761 OAKMEADE	
Khoy Chan	779 Oakmeade	

Responses

23-1a and 23-1b. As noted in the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS in Section 3.14, Noise, and Table 3.14.-9, Alternative B, which has been identified as the Preferred Alternative (see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative), would result in noise levels in excess of the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria for areas along Leisure Town Road. Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls, provides a summary of the noise impacts and identifies the locations of proposed noise abatement.

The area between Elmira Road and just south of Kingswood Avenue is proposed for noise abatement; however, the area between Kingswood Avenue and Marshall Road has existing sound walls and additional noise abatement would not meet feasibility criteria. That is, additional noise abatement in the form of higher sound walls would not achieve the required 5 dBA reduction. Details on this feasibility requirement are provided in the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS in Section 3.14, Noise.

23-2. Section 3.13, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS acknowledges that temporary air emissions would be associated with construction impacts from project construction

equipment exhaust and fugitive dust. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 in Section 3.13, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS are proposed to mitigate these impacts to a less-than-adverse level. Impacts associated with operation of the project were identified to be less than adverse, as the project would not result in CO hot spots or a substantial increase in mobile source air toxics.

Letter 24
Janet Davison

From: Janet Davison [mailto:janetdavison47@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2008 12:41 PM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Trains, Planes and Automobiles

Good afternoon Janet,

I regret that I will be unable to attend the public hearing tonight where you have invited discussion of the Jepson Parkway Project.

I want to express my strong desire that you do not include Leisure Town Road in the project. I live in Alamo Place on the edge of Leisure Town Road, we are already subjected to trains, planes and automobiles! I can only imagine the additional noise involved with expanding Leisure Town Road.

Those of us who live near Leisure Town Road purchased our homes during the height of expense, approximately 2 years ago. Immediately after purchase, the housing market started it's decline. The value of our homes has decreased by about $200,000 already. If any options except E or A are selected, it will mean a further decrease in our property value. 24-1

But, even aside from our personal situation, the best choice is E. It is a shorter route. E does not interfere with as many homes. E will bring traffic into the local businesses along Peabody Road. E has lots of open space.

Please select E as the route for the Jepson Parkway Project 24-2

Thank you for listening,
Janet Davison
131 Sage Sparrow Cir
Vacaville, CA 95688
707-447-0977

Responses

24-1. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, and Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls.

Various studies have been performed over the past 30 years or so that examine the connection between transportation improvements and the values of proximate residential property. They do not conclude that transportation projects cause a decline in property values. Good schools and improved access to employment and other opportunities are important factors in buyers' decisions about where to live.

24-2. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

Letter 25
Bruce Dorworth

From: Bruce Dorworth [mailto:bad2@att.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2008 8:30 PM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Jepson Pky Project

Mr Adams, Much to my dismay I was not able to make it to the meeting last night, but I would still like to voice my opinion.

Because my house backs up to Leisure Town rd(I live in Arbor Oaks). I favor option "E". My house is a two story, and my bedroom is in the back of the house. As it is right now, if I try to sleep with my bedroom window open it is almost impossible. I have to believe that if they use Leisure Town rd for this project It will only get worse. As it is right now, we can hardly get out of our subdivision in the morning because of traffic. 25-1 25-2

At the last meeting I was at, there was talk of moving Leisure Town rd at least 30 feet. Do you know if that is still being considered? 25-3

Bruce Dorworth
761 Oakmeade dr
Vacaville, Ca
707-448-3786

Responses

25-1. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, which provides a discussion of the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative. A summary of noise impacts and proposed noise abatement is provided in Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls. Reasonable and feasible noise abatement in the form of sound walls is proposed along Leisure Town Road between Elmira Road and Kingswood Avenue.

25-2. Thank you for the comment. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B. The addition of a travel lane in each direction and the installation of a raised median with turn lanes will provide improved safety conditions for vehicles entering and leaving Leisure Town Road. The additional travel lane will reduce long queues of traffic and provide better gaps to enter Leisure Town Road, and the raised medians and turn lanes will provide a safe refuge for vehicles turning left.

25-3. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative.

As part of Alternative B, Leisure Town Road would be widened to four lanes. In the vicinity of Elmira Road south to New Alamo Creek, this widening would occur along the east side of the existing roadway; from New Alamo Creek to Vanden Road, the widening occurs on the west side. A 35- to 55-foot wide linear parkway with a 10-foot wide meandering bicycle/pedestrian path would be

constructed along the west side of Leisure Town Road. This configuration would have the effect of "moving" the existing west side curb and gutter of Leisure Town Road easterly 20 to 30 feet east.

Letter 26
Larry Greenslate

From: Larry & Ronda Greenslate [mailto:greenslate@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2008 8:35 PM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Cc: ecgarcia3@sbcglobal.net; :letters@thereporter.com
Subject: Comments on Jepson Parkway

Janet Adams, Director of Projects
Solano Transportation Authority

RE: Jepson Parkway Project

According to the Draft EIR/EIS for the Jepson Parkway Project it is clear that all of the five alternatives come with specific and general adverse impacts.

The only alternative that does not offer obvious and directly adverse impact(s) to my Stonegate/Chestnut Grove neighborhood, is Alternative A.

Alternative A, is in fact, the status quo for this section of the proposed project. When this project was first made public eight to ten years ago, the people living along Leisure Town Road (LTR) were warned that by this date and time, what is in effect, Alternative A, would have already led to: increased traffic accidents, either gridlock or bumper to bumper traffic flows on LTR and it's feeder streets, gross damage to LTR caused by the heavy traffic load, cars regularly crashing into creeks and canals, constant gridlock on Interstate 80, traffic trouble associated with a proposed new high school along LTR and greatly increased noise, light and air pollution, as well as, declining property values due to these predicted events. 26-1

None of these scary predictions have, as yet, been manifested.

Leisure Town Road is working well, serving the people who live along it in two ways. One, LTR is *adequately* and *safely* serving the people who use it. Two, in remaining a "small road" it *discourages* unwanted and dangerous amounts of traffic and their attendant adverse impacts. At this time we have no big problems, in point of fact, no measurable adverse impacts, other than the already "too noisy" traffic, since the needed improvements near the Interstate and creeks were done.

Alternatives B, C & D will negatively impact the quality of life for everyone living along Leisure Town Road. None of these alternatives provide enough distance or barrier, between the neighborhoods and the increased traffic the expanded road 26-2

will bring, to effectively mitigate the increased levels of noise, light and air pollution shown in the models. Growth along LTR will increase. Traffic will increase. Costs will increase. Crime will increase. No effective mitigation of these negative impacts has been designed, by the Sponsors of the Jepson Parkway Project, for the people along LTR that will have their environment adversely impacted. Another potentially devastating impact of these alternatives is the increased encroachment on Travis Air Force Base. 26-2 Cont'd 26-3

Alternative E has long been identified as the preferred route between Vacaville and Fairfield/Suisun. Three of the five alternatives agree, in recommending the improvement of Peabody Road. 26-4

Alternative I-80 is long overdue. STA and it's partners should refocus on what the real problem is in this area, I-80. You should continue to insist that the State and Federal Governments do their sworn duty and effect the maintenance, expansion and improvement of our existing Highways and Freeways. 26-5

Alternative R, the road less traveled, might simply be called Responsibility. Continue to keep all truck traffic off Leisure Town Road and improve existing signage to that effect. Support reduced speed limits on LTR. Work to further reduce traffic on our already too busy and too noisy road. Design relief from the existing adverse impacts that Jepson Parkway has on our neighborhoods. Do build a useful bike path from Sacramento to San Francisco if it has real merit. Extend true mass transit, via BART, Lightrail or CalTrain through Solano, Yolo and Napa Counties. And, most importantly, at all cost, stay away from Travis Air Force Base. 26-6

The Draft EIR/EIS for the Jepson Parkway Project identifies several adverse impacts to the quality and character of life enjoyed by the people who live in the many neighborhoods adjoining Leisure Town Road. This project, as designed, does not adequately protect or compensate these thousands of people against the many identified problems it will inflict upon them. This project should not move forward as designed.

Larry Greenslate
242 Fallen Leaf Drive
Vacaville, CA 95687
707 448-2773
greenslate@sbcglobal.net

Responses

26-1. Based on the results of the projected travel demand forecasts and traffic operations analyses, and the intersection improvements incorporated into the project, virtually any of the build alternatives would result in improved traffic operations at corridor intersections, compared with no-build conditions in both future analysis years. Alternative B, which has been identified as the Preferred Alternative, offers somewhat better traffic operations than the other build alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS. Please see the Essay Response 4: Traffic Implications of the Jepson Parkway Project, and the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, Section 3.6, Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities.

26-2. Please see the Essay Response 4: Traffic Implications of the Jepson Parkway Project, and the previous response 26-1 regarding predicted travel demand and operations impacts. Please also see the Essay Response 6: Potential Growth Inducing Effects of the Jepson Parkway Project. As described in Chapter 2, Project Alternatives, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, all four of the proposed build alternatives include a 10-foot-wide meandering bicycle/ pedestrian path set back from the edge of the roadway at least five feet and separated by a planted strip where possible given right-of-way constraints. Alternative B, which has been identified as the Preferred Alternative, includes this bicycle/pedestrian facility on one side of the proposed roadway with standard shoulders and sidewalks contiguous to residential developments along the opposite side. A less than five-foot-wide separation between the bicycle/pedestrian path and the roadway along the Walters Road extension to minimize right-of-way impacts to biological resources would require an exception to Caltrans Design Manual criteria.

Air quality studies were performed and are reported in Section 3.13, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS. Air pollution is not expected to increase as a result of operations along the new facility. Construction emissions (calculated and reported in the Final EIS, in Section 3.13, Air Quality) would exceed Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District thresholds for Nitrogen Oxides. These emissions would occur only during grading and excavation operations during the construction phase of the project. Required mitigation in the form of construction equipment exhaust control measures will be implemented to reduce this impact to below the threshold.

Anticipated noise impacts have been quantified and can generally be addressed with abatement measures in the form of sound walls; please see the Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls, and the Noise section of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, Section 3.14 and Table 3.14-9.

26-3. STA has coordinated with officials of Travis Air Force Base (TAFB) regarding impacts of the build alternatives on their facility. Please see the Draft EIR/EIS comment letter from Colonel Mark Dillon, USAF Commander, TAFB, Letter 2, and its responses. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. It would avoid the impacts on TAFB mentioned in these discussions and this letter.

26-4. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

26-5. Widening I-80 without local roadway improvements would not have addressed the project purposes (described in Section 1.2, Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS) to serve local north-south trips with a safe, convenient local route that incorporated bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

26-6. It is anticipated that the improved Jepson Parkway segment along Leisure Town Road will be designed and signed for speeds of 40-45 miles per hour. Truck traffic along Leisure Town Road would continue to be restricted in accordance with City of Vacaville Ordinance No. 1638, which designates Leisure Town Road as a "Limited Truck Route." This restricts truck access to local deliveries only.

Current transit routes use portions of the corridor, serving travel primarily east-west in Vacaville generally north of Alamo Drive, and in Fairfield, along and south of Air Base Parkway. Transit serving north-south trips between Vacaville and Fairfield and into Suisun City travels primarily along I-80. The Jepson Parkway project provides for two new north-south routes within the corridor, one local and one express, coordinated to serve the new Fairfield Multi-modal Train Station. With Alternative B identified as the Preferred Alternative, these new transit services would be provided along portions of Leisure Town and Vanden Roads. Identification of specific route segments and stops would be made following implementation of the multi-modal train station and other corridor development these transit improvements are designed to serve.

As described in Chapter 2, Project Alternatives, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, all four of the proposed build alternatives include a 10-foot-wide meandering bicycle/pedestrian path set back from the edge of the roadway at least five feet and separated by a planted strip where possible given right-of-way constraints. Alternative B, which has been identified as the Preferred Alternative, includes this bicycle/pedestrian facility on one side of the proposed roadway with standard shoulders and sidewalks contiguous to residential developments along the opposite side. A less than five-foot-wide separation between the bicycle/pedestrian path and the roadway along the Walters Road extension to minimize right-of-way impacts to biological resources would require an exception to Caltrans Design Manual criteria.

Please also see Essay Response 1: Transit Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion, regarding alternatives considered and withdrawn.

Letter 27
Robert B. Javan

From: JAVAN, BOB [mailto:BOBJAV@SAFECO.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2008 10:45 AM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Jepson Parkway Project

Good Sunday morn, Janet. I was going through my in-box this morning and noticed the project flyer STA had sent us. As we live in the Alamo Place development, this project will have a direct impact on us. Here are my thoughts for what they are worth:

27-1 1. Trying to minimize the number of dog-legs to avoid bottle necks, it appears that Alternatives B and E are the only ones with the least amount of 90 degree turns, though I suspect Alternative D would be less costly as it avoids having to build a flyover.

27-2 2. With gas prices what they are and no end in sight, I suspect the bike path would take on a more significant role than just being there for recreational purposes. Rather than being part of the roadway, I think it would be safer to put in a grass separator between the path and and the roadway and widen it to allow for heavier, two-way, bike traffic use. Also, thought should be given to allow for spill-outs into adjacent roadways for folks who wish to ride their bikes between the three municipalities.

Good luck.

Bob

Robert B. Javan
Attorney At Law
LAW OFFICES OF SHEILA F. GONZALEZ
1300 Oliver Road, Suite 240
Fairfield, CA 94533
(707) 639-4200
(888) 879-2169 Fax
PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION: This e-mail and any attachments are confidential and subject to the Attorney-Client Privilege and, as documents prepared in the course of or in anticipation of litigation, are also subject to protection as Attorney Work Product. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this e-mail or any attachment is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the sender and delete this copy from your system. You may also call 707-639-4200 for assistance. Thank you for your cooperation.

Responses

27-1. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

27-2. As described in Chapter 2, Project Alternatives, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, all four of the proposed build alternatives include a 10-foot-wide meandering bicycle/pedestrian path set back from the edge of the roadway at least five feet and separated by a planted strip where possible given right-of-way constraints. Alternative B, which has been identified as the Preferred Alternative, includes this bicycle/pedestrian facility on one side of the proposed roadway with standard shoulders and sidewalks contiguous to residential developments along the opposite side. A less than five-foot-wide separation between the bicycle/pedestrian path and the roadway along the Walters Road extension to minimize right-of-way impacts to biological resources would require an exception to Caltrans Design Manual criteria.

Letter 28
Lewis M. Martin

From: Martin, Lewis M LtCol MNC-I Surgeon Joint Medical Planner
[mailto:lewis.martin@iraq.centcom.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2008 1:53 PM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Jepson Parkway Options

Hello,
Writing from Iraq, so have limited access to all the info on this but...
I would like to see as little additional traffic on Peabody Rd as possible. **28-1**
I drive from my home in Vacaville to work at Travis AFB daily and it is tough between Vanden Rd and the Vanden High School turn off.
To that end Alternate B then D are my preferences in order. **28-2**
Every attempt should be made to minimize the impact on access to Travis AFB.

Thanks

Lewis M. Martin
Joint Medical Planner/AF LNO
MNC-I Surgeons Office
Camp Victory, Iraq
APO AE 09342

DSN: 318-822-3299
SVOIP: 242-0031
NIPR: lewis.martin@iraq.centcom.mil
SIPR: lewis.martin@iraq.centcom.smil.mil
CENTRIX: lewis.martin@centcom.mfci.cmil.mil

Responses

28-1. The project is being designed to accommodate projected corridor travel demand. As reported in Section 3.6, Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS intersection operations were evaluated for all alternatives compared with no-build conditions in 2010 and 2030. Study intersections would generally operate better under build than no-build conditions. Signalization is recommended for study intersections that would not meet local level-of-service standards in 2010; see Mitigation Measure TRA-1. All study intersections are assumed to be signalized by 2030. Alternative B helps maintain access to Travis Air Force Base by providing for some redundant north-south connectivity in the system. Please see Essay Response 4: Traffic Implications of the Jepson Parkway Project, regarding Traffic Operations.

28-2. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

Thank you for your comment.

Letter 29
Catherine McKenzie, June 15, 2008

From: Catherine McKenzie [mailto:jckid272@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 15, 2008 2:01 PM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Jepson Parkway

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

Alternatives C and D both look good to me. Alternative E looks like a traffic and noise nightmare; I live on Peabody Road, and there is already too much traffic moving too fast within the city limits of Vacaville. **29-1**

However, a bus route extending from the Greyhound station on Peabody to Air Base Parkway is an idea I wish would be seriously considered very soon. It isn't uncommon to see young recruits new to Travis Air Force base walking along Peabody Road. I have talked with some, who say they were told there was a shuttle, but they don't know how to access it. For myself, if a bus line ran down Peabody Road, to the vicinity of K-Mart in Fairfield and back, I'd take it to and from work. I sometimes use bus 20 from the Davis Park and Ride, but the alternative route would be MUCH more convenient. Another alternative would be to have that bus extend to Solano Mall as an express, with one more stop at North Bay Hospital. **29-2**

Any chance a light rail from Vacaville to Fairfield might be considered as part of this project? The commute crowd seems to be all for it. **29-3**

Catherine

Visit Benjamin at http://www.dogster.com/?420104

Responses

29-1. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

29-2. Please see the Essay Response 1: Transit Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion. Discussion regarding the bus routes that have been planned in concert with planning for the Jepson Parkway Project. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative, so these new express and local routes would primarily use Leisure Town Road and Vanden Road. Specific route segments and stops will be established in coordination with the local transit providers once the project is approved for final design and implementation.

29-3. Please see Essay Response 1: Transit Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion.

Letter 30
Catherine McKenzie, June 17, 2008

From: Catherine McKenzie [mailto:jckid272@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 10:20 PM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Jepson Parkway comments

I submitted comments regarding the Jepson Parkway project the other day, stating that I preferred plans C and D. After further reading, I would like to revise my comments to Plans B and C. I learned that Plan D would displace a large number of workers, and I cannot believe this is a plan that is even under consideration. Thank you for your time. **30-1**

Catherine

Visit Benjamin at http://www.dogster.com/?420104

Response

30-1. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

Letter 31
Kevin Newcomer

From: Kevin Newcomer [mailto:Kevin@ci.vallejo.ca.us]
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2008 8:41 AM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Jepson Parkway Questions

Hello Janet, We live at 701 Arbor Oaks Drive, which is on the corner of Arbor Oaks and Leisure town Road. We want to know if the Jepson Parkway plan includes the installation of a concrete fence or sound wall along our leisure Town Rd. property line? And then our second question is, We have heard that the intersection of Arbor Oaks Drive and Leisure Town Rd. will be closed off. 31-1
We are ok with that but we still want to know if that is true. Can you find out for us, and get back to me? Thank You very much. We look forward to hearing from you. 31-2

Responses

31-1. The area noted by the commenter is proposed for reasonable and feasible noise abatement in the form of sound walls. Please refer to Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls, for more information.

31-2. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. The intersection of Arbor Oaks Drive and Leisure Town Road will be changed to a right-in/right-out access configuration because of the close proximity to Elmira Road. There will be a median in Leisure Town Road separating northbound and southbound traffic.

Letter 32
Jerry Olive

From: Jerry Olive [mailto:jerryolive@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2008 8:58 AM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Jepson Parkway Concept Plan

I'm not convinced this is a good idea. Expanding a road that leads to Fairfield isn't very exciting to me. The expense and time involved doesn't add up to any real benefit for Vacaville in my view. **32-1**

Jerry Olive
http://www.jerryolive.com

Response

32-1 Thank you for your comment.

Letter 33
Robert and Debra Papin

STA
Solano Transportation Authority

Caltrans

RECEIVED
JUL 28 2008
SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

JEPSON PARKWAY

Public Hearing Comment Sheet
June 24, 2008 - 6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.
Callison Elementary School

Name: Robert/Debra Papin
Address: 6140 & 6144 Leisure Town Road
City/State/Zip: Vacaville, CA, 95687

Affiliation: N/A
Phone: (707) 448-9330
Cell Phone: (707) 689-0923

The following are our concerns of the Jepson Parkway Project draft environmental document:

All of our concerns encompass two separate parcels, our home at 6144 Leisure Town Road, and the home at 6140 Leisure Town Road that our daughter lives in.

- **Traffic**: how are we going to enter and leave our properties safely, and without making it an inconvenient process for us? 33-1
- **Noise**: since the road is widening and there will be more cars creating noise closer to our homes we will be impacted negatively. 33-2
- **Dirty Air quality**: since the road is widening and there will be more cars closer to our homes our air quality will decrease significantly. 33-3
- **Trees and Fence**: we have a fence line with heritage and old trees lining the road. This offers a much needed barrier between the road and our homes from noise, pollution from the cars, headlights, and not to mention safety. The fence was built by us, maintained by us and we consider both the trees and our fence to be part of this property that we hate to lose. 33-4
- **Position of Road to Our Homes**: both of our properties will become closer to the road with this project and we want to know how close the road will be to each home and what can be done if we feel it is too close. We feel our homes will be right at the street and while our neighbors are being accommodated with sound walls and buffer zones all we are getting is a curb. We want some input such as should our homes be relocated on our properties further away from the road. 33-5
- **Property Lines**: we would like the discrepancy of the property lines established. We were under the impression that our property line was to the middle of Leisure Town Road. We would like to come to an agreement as to where the property lines are before the project continues. 33-6
- **Value of Remaining Property**: our feelings are any time you take a part of our property away you devalue the remaining property. So we want to be compensated for not only the property you are taking but also the devaluation of the rest of our properties. 33-7
- **Because of a lot of unknown and unseen factors these are our concerns at this moment, but we know things will come up in the future that we still want to be able to voice.**

Responses

33-1. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. The construction of the raised median on Leisure Town Road in this area will require a change in access to and from your property. On the southern parcel a right-in/right-out access will be provided. To enter the parcel from southbound Leisure Town Road, a u-turn would be made at Elmira Road, and to go south from this parcel, a right turn out of the parcel followed by a u-turn at Commerce Place would be required. The northern parcel will have full movement access (left from Leisure Town Road and left onto southbound Leisure Town Road) directly across from the existing Commerce Place.

33-2. The location of the commenters' properties along Leisure Town Road was evaluated in Section 3.14, Noise, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS as location 61a; see Figure 3.14-2, and Tables 3.14-7 and 3.14-8. The noise level for the property was identified to be above the Noise Abatement Criteria under existing and project conditions. Noise abatement was considered but rejected for this area because construction of a sound wall for the two residences would not meet reasonableness criteria under Caltrans guidance. In response to the comment, however, additional sound wall analysis was conducted to show what noise level reductions could be achieved with construction of sound barriers at the locations of the two individual residences. As shown in Table 2 below, construction of a noise wall for these two residences would result in a reduction of 5 dB for the southern residence, which is close to the roadway. However, for the northern residence, because it is set back farther from the roadway, even with a 10-foot wall, a 5-dB reduction would not be achievable. As shown in Table 3, this noise wall would not meet reasonable and feasible criteria.

Table 2
Year 2030 Traffic Noise Impacts under 23 CFR 772 (L_{eq}) for Residences East of Leisure Town Road

Receiver[a, b]	Major Roadway	Existing Worst Noise Hour Noise Level (dB-L_{eq} [h])	Predicted Worst Noise Hour Noise Level (dB-L_{eq} [h])[c]		Noise Increase (dB) Relative to Existing Conditions		Feasibility Analysis (Noise Reduction) of Noise Barriers by Barrier Height					
							6ft		8ft		10ft	
			Alt. A	Alt. B	Alt. A	Alt. B	Pred. Noise Level (dB)	Pred. Noise Red. (dB)	Pred. Noise Level (dB)	Pred. Noise Red. (dB)	Pred. Noise Level (dB)	Pred. Noise Red. (dB)
61f	**Leisure Town Road**	**64**	**68**	**69**	**4**	**5**	**66**	**3**	**65**	**4**	**65**	**4**
61g	**Leisure Town Road**	**66**	**70**	**72**	**4**	**6**	**67**	**5**	**66**	**6**	**65**	**7**

Source: PBS&J, 2008

Notes:

— = not applicable.

Bold = Impacts identified. Impacts only identified for noise abatement criterion thresholds which are approached or exceeded under existing and/or 2030 conditions. No impacts are identified under Alternative A, as this is the No Build Alternative.

Highlight indicates receiving a 5 dB or greater noise reduction by noise barrier.

a. All receptor locations were residential developments that would be considered within the FHWA Activity Category B. Applicable Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) for the residences would be 67 dBA.

b. See Figure 3.14-2 for receiver locations.

c. Predicted design year 2030.

Table 3
Soundwall Feasibility and Reasonableness Allowances for Residences East of Leisure Town Road

Noise Barrier	Height (feet)	Provides 5 dB of Noise Reduction?	Impacted Residences	Benefited Residences	Reasonable Allowance per Residence[a]	Total Reasonable Allowance[a, b]	Projected Cost of Construction[c]	Reasonable and Feasible?
East of Leisure Town Road— Union Way to Commerce Place	6	Yes	2	1	$52,000	$52,000	$195,931	No
	8	Yes		1	$54,000	$54,000	$261,252	No
	10	Yes		1	$54,000	$54,000	$326,525	No

Source: PBS&J, 2008

Notes:

a. Cost in 2007 dollars.

b. Based on Caltrans guidance, no modification to the reasonable allowance is required as the barrier costs for each alternative would be less than 50 percent of the construction cost without abatement; see Appendix B in the Noise Study.

c. Cost prediction based on $45 per square foot.

33-3. The Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, Section 3.13, Air Quality, acknowledges that temporary air emissions would be associated with construction impacts from project construction equipment exhaust and fugitive dust. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 in Section 3.13, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS are proposed to mitigate these impacts to a less-than-adverse level. Impacts associated with operation of the project were identified to be less than adverse, as the project would not result in CO hot spots or a substantial increase in mobile source air toxics.

33-4. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. The widening of Leisure Town Road will require removing some of the trees and the fence near the existing roadway. The fence and landscaping will be replaced in kind by the project.

33-5. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. The widening of Leisure Town Road will move the edge of the roadway approximately 25 feet closer to your homes. Discussions regarding right-of-way acquisition from your property, if any, will take place during the final design and right of way phases of the project.

33-6. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. According to legal descriptions on record with Solano County, your property line is 30 feet from the section line in Leisure Town Road. The 30-foot right of way originates in a very old Solano County Road Grant, which states 30 feet either side of a section line shall be County road right of way.

33-7. As described in Section 3.4, Community Impacts, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, all right-of-way acquisition associated with the proposed project would be subject to the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended) and Title 49 CFR Part 24. The act requires that property owners are provided with an objective appraisal of the fair market value of their property. The purpose of the act is to ensure that persons displaced as a result of a transportation project are treated fairly, consistently, and equitably so that such persons will not suffer disproportionate injuries as a result of projects designed for the benefit of the public as a whole.

The act requires STA, as the project proponent, to provide relocation advisory assistance to any person, business, farm, or nonprofit organization displaced as a result of acquisition of real property for public use. STA would assist residential displacees in obtaining comparable, decent, safe, and sanitary replacement housing by providing current and continuous information on sale prices and rental rates of available housing. Nonresidential displacees would receive information on comparable properties for lease or purchase. Residential replacement dwellings would be in equal or better neighborhoods, at prices within the financial means of the individuals and families displaced, and reasonably accessible to their places of employment. Before any displacement occurs, displacees would be offered comparable replacement dwellings that are available to all persons consistent with the requirements of Civil Rights Act Title VIII. Relocation assistance would also include supplying information concerning federal and State assisted housing programs, and any other known services

being offered by public and private agencies in the area. A local certified public agency designated by STA would carry out the relocation plan to help eligible displaced individuals move with as little inconvenience as possible. Appraisals to determine fair market value would be conducted for each displaced property after an alternative has been selected and the environmental document is complete.

All relocation services and benefits are administered without regard to race, color, national origin, or sex in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 2000d, et seq.). Please see Appendix D of the Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix C of the Final EIS for a copy of the Title VI Policy Statement.

Letter 34
Debra Pucci

From: Debra Pucci [mailto:coolbreezedeb@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 29, 2008 12:35 PM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Jepson Project

To all this concerns,

My husband and I moved to Suisun 27 years ago, from San Francisco. We moved here because we wanted to raise our children in a small city atmosphere. We moved near the base because we wanted to be as far from the congestion as possible. We have loved it here until recently. Between the Walmart project and the Jepson Project, officials of Suisun and Solano County are bring the crowding to us. It is so difficult to get around town now, especially on 12. It seems that the officials have no desire to keep the integrity and beauty of Suisun as a small peaceful city intact. It seems that they want to turn it into another Vallejo. As for my family, we will be moving as soon as it is possible and in the mean time we will remember the names of those responsible coming election time and when support is needed. It truly saddens me that greed and selfishness is turning our beloved Suisun into just another overcrowded, rundown city. **34-1**

Sadly,
Debra Pucci

Response

34-1. Thank you for your comment.

Letter 35
Sandra Schiff

From: Cordof3strands2@aol.com [mailto:Cordof3strands2@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2008 7:38 AM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Jepson Parkway Comments

Dear Ms. Adams,

I wish to comment on the Jepson Parkway project and have my opinion taken into account along with the opinions of others that will be presented at the public hearing on June 24, 2008.

I understand the need for expanding the roadways for the Jepson Parkway corridor but I wish to make it clear that I do not want it to become a 6-lane highway for people to go speeding through. 35-1
My home is near Leisure Town Road and I am not looking forward to the increased traffic or the noise that accompanies it. This is a residential area and I think the expansion in this area should 35-2
be no more than 2 lanes in each direction and speed restricted to 40 mph. In addition there needs to be a traffic light at Marshall Road and Leisure Town Road so that traffic on Marshall Road does 35-3
not get backed up when trying to turn left onto Leisure Town Road.

Sincerely,
Sandra Schiff
649 Fox Hollow Way
Vacaville, CA 95687
446-6266

6-1

Responses

35-1. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative. Noise studies have been prepared for the project and abatement in the form of sound walls is recommended as described in Section 3.14, Noise, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS and summarized in the Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls. Based on the traffic operations analysis performed for the project and reported in Section 3.6, Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, the Leisure Town Road/Marshall Road intersection would continue to operate below local level of service standards in 2010, with or without the proposed project in place. Mitigation measure TRA-1, presented in Section 3.6, Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, recommends that all unsignalized study intersections be evaluated for signal warrants, and the cumulative impacts analysis presented in Section 3.6, Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS assumes for Alternative B that all unsignalized study intersections would be signalized by 2030. By 2030, all study intersections would operate at or above local level of service standards with Alternative B in place.

35-2. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. Leisure Town Road will be a four-lane roadway with a raised median and appropriate turn lanes. The current posted speed limit of 40 mph is expected to remain on Leisure Town Road.

35-3. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

As described in Mitigation Measure TRA-1 in Section 3.6, Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, several study intersections are projected to operate below local level-of-service thresholds in 2010. These intersections, including the intersection of Leisure Town Road and Marshall Road, are recommended to be evaluated for signal warrants based on field-measured traffic data. Regular monitoring of actual traffic conditions and accident data shall be undertaken by the jurisdiction responsible for implementation to prioritize and program intersections for signalization where warrants are met.

Letter 36
Roberto Valdez, Jr.

From: Roberto Valdez [mailto:robertovaldez55@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 3:41 PM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Response Comments to Jepson Parkway Project

Based on my stakeholder's involvement in past 10 years with the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan(HCP) of Solano County, i am concerned about the adverse impact to the following threatened/endangered/species of concerns and their habitats re: Jepson Parkway Project; they are:

1. Known to coexist: Northwestern pond turtles, western borrowing owls, vernal pool fairy shrimps, vernal pool tadpool shrimps, Valley Elderberry Longhorn beetles in Alamo Creek, CRLFs in drainages/ponds, CTS in valley floor grasslands & low foothills as well as uplands, giant garter snakes, and CCGFs in McKoy Creek and Walter Road.

2. Possibel to coexist: delta green ground beetles in potential study area.

3. Not likely to coexist which i am not convince biologically/environmentally: conservancy fairy shrimps, callippe silverspot butterflies.

In addition, i recommend that your environmental consultant(s) verify with UCD Professor Peter B. Moyle on the possible existance of central valley steelhead fish "in corridors during high flows" as well as Sacramento winter-run chinook salmons within the JPP.

Roberto Valdez Jr., HCP staleholder, at email: robertovaldez55@hotmail.com.

36-1

Response

36-1. Thank you for your comment. Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, includes a thorough discussion of potential project impacts on biological resources including those listed in this comment, along the corridor. This discussion is based on the Natural Environment Study prepared for the project and is a result of field surveys, literature review (including Version 2.2 the Draft Solano County Multi Species Habitat Plan), and coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Additional consultation with the USFWS has resulted in the completion of a no-jeopardy Biological Opinion, which provides further details on the adverse biological effects of the proposed project as well as measures required to avoid, minimize or compensate for these adverse effects. Section 3.15, Biological Environment, of the Final EIS has been revised to include a summary of the Biological Opinion.

Letter 37
Rob Watso

From: RCW [mailto:rob2002w2002@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2008 10:31 AM
To: jadams@sta-snci.com
Subject: Jepson Parkway

Just wanted to note a few things that should be considered,

Continued restrictions on Leisure Town Rd for commercial vehicles and this includes hazardous material. 37-1

Speed limit to remain at 40mph. 37-2

Maximum buffer zone possible at 55 ft. 37-3

Replacing existing wall past Arbor Oaks to a much better sound wall and more decorative on the Leisure Town Rd side. 37-4

Rob Watso
697 Forest Ridge Cir
17 Years at this address

Responses

37-1. Truck traffic along Leisure Town Road would continue to be restricted in accordance with City of Vacaville Ordinance No. 1638, which designates Leisure Town Road as a "Limited Truck Route." This restricts truck access to local deliveries only.

37-2. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. It is anticipated that the improved Jepson Parkway segment along Leisure Town Road will be designed and signed for speeds of 40-45 miles per hour.

37-3. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. The project proposes the slight realignment of Leisure Town Road easterly to establish a linear parkway/buffer area that varies between 35 feet and 55 feet. It is not possible to maintain the maximum 55-foot width in all locations because of varying existing right of way and the need to minimize impacts to properties and buildings on the east side of Leisure Town Road.

37-4. As noted in Section 3.14, Noise, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, Figure 3.14-3 and Table 3.14-9 and in Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls, a new sound wall is proposed for the area along Leisure Town Road between Elmira Road and Kingswood Avenue to replace the existing wood fence. The final design of the sound wall,

including possible decorative features, will be determined in coordination with the City of Vacaville and local residents prior to construction.

Public Hearing Transcript

PUBLIC HEARING

THE JEPSON PARKWAY PROJECT

LOCATION: JEAN CALLISON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
6261 Vanden Road
Vacaville, CA 95687

DATE AND TIME: Tuesday, June 24, 2008
6:00 P.M. to 9:00 P.M.

CERTIFIED COPY

REPORTED BY:
ANNETTE M. SHEPHERD, CSR NO. 12663

1

SPEAKERS

2

3 Elias Castro
742 Fallbrook Avenue
4 Vacaville, CA 95687

5

Carl & Maxine Bruegmann
6 700 Arbor Oaks Drive
Vacaville, CA 95687

7

8 John Daramo
733 Forest Ridge Circle
9 Vacaville, CA 95687

10

Ron Davison
11 131 Sage Sparrow Circle
Vacaville, CA 95687

12

13 Rob Watso
697 Forest Ridge Circle
14 Vacaville, CA 95687

15

Greg Young
16 1380 Huntington Court
Vacaville, CA 95687

17

18 T.J. McCarthy
414 Robert Road
19 Vacaville, CA 95687

20

Colleen & Kevin Newcomer
21 701 Arbor Oaks Drive
Vacaville, CA 95687

22

23 John Burnett
579 Leisure Town Road
24 Vacaville, CA 95687

25

1 SPEAKERS

2

Robert Barnes
3 662 Carson Court
Vacaville, CA 95687

4

5 Ken Brand
2475 Freitas Way
6 Vacaville, CA 95687

7

Larry Greenslate
8 242 Fallenleaf Drive
Vacaville, CA 95687

9

10 Ed Garcia
230 Fallenleaf Drive
11 Vacaville, CA 95687

12

Doug Bush
13 236 Fallenleaf Drive
Vacaville, CA 95687

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2 PUBLIC COMMENTS

3

4

5 ELIAS CASTRO: Okay. I have lived in
6 742 Fallbrook Avenue in Vacaville for approximately
7 35 years. I have a concern regarding the proposed
8 roadway, I guess, the proposed project for Measure
9 Ten. And I have one request. If this comes to
10 pass, I would like to make Fallbrook Avenue a
11 right-hand only turn based on people flowing into my
12 street.
13 We have a lot of children on our street and
14 I think it's a major safety concern for our
15 residence on that short street. So please consider
16 if the final planning comes to Leisure Town Road and
17 this is going to happen, I'd like to make that a
18 right-hand turn only.

PH-1a

19

20 MAXINE BRUEGMANN: We are at Leisure Town
21 and Arbor Oaks Drive on, as you turn -- let's see,
22 we are on the left-hand side -- corner, right on the
23 corner. And we are anxious to see the project go
24 ahead on Jepson Parkway because we have had -- we
25 have had cars totalled. Our neighbor across the

1 street has been hit and his pickup moved out on his
2 lawn just two weeks ago for him. Ours was two years
3 ago.
4 They come around the corner way too fast on
5 two wheels most of the time, making a right-hand
6 turn on to Leisure Town Road. And we are anxious
7 for the sound wall, very definitely, because the
8 traffic is so heavy and so noisy. Even at night
9 trucks are using their jack brake at night.
10 And so that is one concern. We want the
11 sound wall up as soon as they can put it up, you
12 know. And another question I had, how come Peabody
13 entered into it because when it was started there
14 was -- when it's been going, there has been no
15 mention of Peabody. And why would it possibly even
16 be considered before Leisure Town Jepson Parkway is
17 done?
18 And they have vacated the property across
19 the street that needed to be about at least four
20 years ago and it -- and why did they move those
21 people before it really needed to be if they aren't
22 going to fix it -- fix the road, and -- what else?
23 I mentioned Peabody and the sound wall. What else
24 is there?
25 They moved -- also when the traffic

PH-2a

PH-2b

PH-2c

PH-2d

DeMICHELLE DEPOSITION REPORTERS OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
FAIRFIELD, CA (707) 425-6000 NAPA, CA (707) 226-6000

moved -- traffic bunches up and it must go for at least three blocks. And we're having an awfully hard time trying to get out on to Leisure Town Road.

And the stops sign at Elmira, it helped a little, but people come around that right-hand turn and go like a bat out of hell. And we have a really hard time getting out on Leisure Town.

So when the Jepson Parkway goes in, there is only going to be right-hand turns and maybe it will slow down some of those people making a right-hand turn on our street. When the last we heard of the project was back when they were putting it together and they thought they would begin in '05 or '06 and now we are hoping that the project gets underway soon.

PH-2d Cont'd

JOHN DARAMO: I think both ways would be good. I live -- my house backs up to Peabody -- I mean, to Leisure Town. So I would be in favor of Peabody. But I think Leisure Town is a better route. And if they go with the thing 35 feet to the first roadway with all the trees and things I think it would be pretty good. If they put it through town, I don't know where they would get all the land and whatnot. It would be more expensive, I would

PH-3a

DeMICHELLE DEPOSITION REPORTERS OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
FAIRFIELD, CA (707) 425-6000 NAPA, CA (707) 226-6000

1 think. So that's my opinion. You got my vote. PH-3a Cont'd
2
3 RON DAVISON: I feel that what they are
4 doing to us is quite unethical. I mean, we
5 purchased this property two years ago. And it was a
6 model home that sold for almost a million dollars.
7 We lost two hundred thousands dollars, you know,
8 with the housing crunch.
9 And now when -- they put this Parkway
10 through behind the city of Vacaville or behind our
11 property, it will decrease our property value even PH-4a
12 more. I felt that somebody should have revealed to
13 us the plans. I mean, I didn't know nothing about
14 it until now. And then we -- besides that, we have
15 a -- my wife and I own quite a bit of real estate in
16 the city of Vacaville and our property taxes is
17 going to help put this Parkway in.
18 I think the most sensible route would be
19 Alternate E. It's a straight shot down Peabody PH-4b
20 Road, it would be less work, less money, and be more
21 convenient for the City of Vacaville. It would
22 bring some revenue into the City of Vacaville rather
23 than place it on the outskirts on Leisure Town Road.
24 ///
25 ///

1 ROB WATSO: We will start with the sound
2 wall. It should not be limited to just the areas PH-5a
3 that are fenced. The walls that were built in 1989
4 or '88 that are currently there are not -- would
5 not -- I would not consider them proper sound walls.
6 Commercial vehicles, there is a restriction
7 right now of special vehicles on Leisure Town Road. PH-5b
8 That should remain regardless of whatever changes
9 are. That includes hazardous material.
10
11 GREG YOUNG: Basically what Alternatives B
12 & D do to us is take out a large section of our PH-6a
13 construction yard that we have there, which is a
14 piece -- a portion of the property we lease from the
15 City. But we have been leasing it for probably over
16 20 years. And what that will do is it will cut off
17 our lumber operation to that side of the property.
18 So it actually will split a portion of our
19 property in half and leave a, probably an acre and a
20 half to two acres unusable to us because we won't be
21 able to access it. And we have no alternatives for
22 other property in that area that is going to, you
23 know, where we can make up that area. So it impacts
24 our facility there. We are probably going to lose
25 some jobs. We have what we call sawyers, which cut

lumber and that's where we do our lumber cutting and our storage for our trucking. I guess that's all I have got to say for right now. It's a bad alternative for us. PH-6a Cont'd

T.J. McCARTHY: My main concern is semi traffic, you know, large vehicles coming down there and just taking all the traffic off of I-80 and run it through down there, the noise, the pollution coming down Leisure Town Road. That's my main thing. Just the heavy semi traffic. PH-7a

Traffic is going to increase and I don't think -- right now if my daughter was to go to school, to this school, she either walks through a wooded area or walks down Leisure Town Road -- or I'm sorry. Walks down Elmira Road, then down Leisure Town Road and comes to this school.

So now she's going to be walking down four or six lane highway with all the speeding and traffic and everything else. So I mean just --

COLLEEN NEWCOMER: We would appreciate or hope the City would consider putting up a sound barrier on Leisure Town Road from Elmira down to Marshal. And that it be a sound wall being one that PH-8a

minimizes traffic noise as opposed to a concrete fence because I don't -- also we have concerns about the traffic coming out -- in and out of Arbor Oaks Drive off of Leisure Town. And it's our understanding that they are going to be putting a median up. So we hope that they do that on Leisure Town to have right-turn only -- right turn in, right turn out. That's what he said that's what it was going to be. We want that too.

PH-8a Cont'd

PH-8b

KEVIN NEWCOMER: I like the idea of right turn in and right turn out for the intersection of Arbor Oaks Drive and Jepson Parkway.

PH-9a

JOHN BURNETT: I had a concern we have not been contacted for over two years after the initial surveying of the Lawson property. We are on the east side of Leisure Town Road. And large piece of property about five and a half acres losing a fair piece in front of it to do this, its the corner of Leisure Town Road and Elmira Road.

I want to know when we are going to get done. It has already been over five years. Property value is suffering from that. It doesn't look like it is going to happen in the next five

PH-10a

DeMICHELLE DEPOSITION REPORTERS OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
FAIRFIELD, CA (707) 425-6000 NAPA, CA (707) 226-6000

1 years. So if you can find out what is going on.
2 Nobody has contacted the family. Nobody has wanted PH-10a Cont'd
3 to talk about the property. Nobody has wanted to
4 talk about negotiating for the property, nothing.
5 Also there is city utilities that are
6 already plumbed on to that property to the property PH-10b
7 line at the existing roadway. The roadway is
8 expanded and widened. We need to make sure that
9 those utilities, even though they are not used by
10 the landowner, are still made available to the
11 landowner at the edge of the property, just like
12 they are today. So we don't lose those.
13 The property acquired by the City is in the
14 light state at the present time. It has been for PH-10c
15 years. The fence was destroyed when the City bought
16 the property and moved the house off of it. And the
17 City has not fixed the fence, allowing public access
18 on to the private property of the existing
19 landowner.
20 And I wanted some type of feedback of how
21 that might be fixed. It's been open to the public
22 for quite a while. It's quite a health hazard and a
23 nuisance. That's it.
24 ///
25 ///

DeMICHELLE DEPOSITION REPORTERS OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
FAIRFIELD, CA (707) 425-6000 NAPA, CA (707) 226-6000

1 ROBERT BARNES: On Peabody Road heading
2 north from Air Base Parkway before you get to the
3 railroad tracks, you are going to pass -- there is a
4 street, Markley, M-a-r-k-l-e-y, and from Markley
5 heading north to the road -- railroad tracks, a
6 short distance there where they didn't widen the
7 road, there is about 600 feet, I'm guessing, of
8 really old Eucalyptus trees on the right-hand side
9 of the road. PH-11a
10 If you widen the road to put in another
11 lane, because it's one lane there heading north, so
12 you have two lanes heading north, plus a pull-off
13 area, the curb would be right up next to the trees.
14 What they should do is put in metal grades in the
15 road there like next to the curb. Okay. So when it
16 rains, the water can pass down through to the ground
17 for the trees.
18 And besides, the road is going uphill to
19 cross the railroad tracks. Railroad tracks are
20 usually higher than the surrounding roads and ground
21 work. Okay. And then you can take the sidewalk
22 that is already laid out up to the point where they
23 haven't finished yet, and run the sidewalk around
24 the trees. So if anybody is on the sidewalk and
25 some nitwit tries to pass on the right, it won't be

12

DeMICHELLE DEPOSITION REPORTERS OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
FAIRFIELD, CA (707) 425-6000 NAPA, CA (707) 226-6000

on the sidewalk because the person on the sidewalk would be protected by the trees. So you don't have to spend the money to wipe out the beautiful trees. PH-11a Cont'd

One of the guys with your organization showed me an overpass they are planning for that railroad track area there, which I don't have a comment on that except for the fact that the overpass -- I don't see how they are going to do it because Cement Hill Road crosses Peabody, what, in 75 feet after you cross the railroad tracks. Okay. PH-11b

Then according to the master plan, I think Alternative D is the best one. That's pretty much all I have got for what you have presented. PH-11c

Something I'd like to add what they should really consider, they -- consider Route 113 north of Route 12, where it intersects there, that road should be -- it's -- right now it's just two lanes each way. They should put in a whole new section of road divided from the existing road so you have two lanes going north, two lanes going south, but with, you know, a large area dividing it in between. PH-11d

Which means buying some more land running there all the way up toward Dixon. You just have to build another road next to the existing road and then fix up the old road that would be heading

DeMICHELLE DEPOSITION REPORTERS OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
FAIRFIELD, CA (707) 425-6000 NAPA, CA (707) 226-6000

south. And the new road would be next to it heading north.

Does that make sense? I drive that road now and then -- it's in such bad shape. It's a scary road. But another thing they should do long-term, I'm thinking way down the road, 680, the Gold Hill exit, Gold Hill Road exit, take Gold Hill and go straight across the open land there and you can make it T-end at Route 12 at Pennsylvania Avenue, for example.

That should be about right. And that would relieve a whole lot of traffic. That's about it. And plus that would connect Route 12 to make all this existing stuff you are talking about doing, it would all work together. That's it.

PH-11d Cont'd

KEN BRAND: First thing I want to say is that I appreciate all the work the STA has done to develop the projects within Solano County. In addition to my written comments, I would like to suggest that when they do further study on this project, that they try and eliminate as many stop lights as possible and any stopping as much as possible while they travel from Route 12 up to I-80 and back and forth like that. That's all the

PH-12a

1 comments I have.

2

3 LARRY GREENSLATE: All right. My name is
4 Larry Greenslate and I'm concerned with the proposed
5 Jepson Parkway project and its alternatives. And PH-13a
6 I'd like to go on the record as saying I'm in favor
7 of Alternative E, Peabody Road. And following that
8 when it comes -- let me just go ahead and talk about
9 the Leisure Town Road portion of it, should you
10 choose one of those alternatives.
11 We are mainly concerned with the noise and
12 quality level of the project. And I think the
13 quality concerns both the noise and the way the road PH-13b
14 looks. I'm worried about the damage that my
15 neighborhood, and I live in Chestnut Grove. I'm
16 worried about the damage that my neighborhood is
17 going to incur from the increased road noise.
18 Your road studies show that we're going to
19 have a four-decibel increase at our homes. And I
20 think if you can mitigate that, then you need to do
21 something for us to make that worthwhile. And I'm
22 talking about the quality of the construction of
23 Leisure Town Road.
24 I think you need to do a really good job on PH-13c
25 the landscaping and moving the road as far away from

DeMICHELLE DEPOSITION REPORTERS OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
FAIRFIELD, CA (707) 425-6000 NAPA, CA (707) 226-6000

1 our homes as possible like you promised you would.
2 And raising the median so that it will reflect some PH-13c Cont'd
3 of the noise from the northbound traffic. And also
4 we are interested in heavy landscaping so that we
5 will have a nice looking road.
6 Help pay us back for the damage that is
7 going to be done to us from the noise and increased
8 traffic from this Jepson Parkway project.
9 I also would like to reiterate that the
10 City's position has been -- Vacaville's position has
11 been that they are not going to allow truck traffic
12 on Leisure Town Road. And that we want them to
13 continue to restrict truck traffic on Leisure Town PH-13d
14 Road.
15 And I also want them to improve the
16 signage, should they go ahead with this project.
17 Improve the signage in regards to the trucking. So
18 that the truckers will know that they can't use
19 Leisure Town Road and that the alternatives are
20 clearly marked so that they will go some place else
21 with their traffic. That's my main concerns. Thank
22 you very much.
23
24 ED GARCIA: My concern is that this
25 discussion has been going on for quite a while. We PH-14a

1 have been part of a committee. So I know the road
2 and the improvements need to be -- need to be there
3 but my main concern is that the road be designed in
4 such a way to absorb noise and be aesthetic so it's,
5 you know, appealing.
6 The same as leaving going towards Green
7 Valley, the road has a median -- has a higher median
8 in the middle with grass, has redwood trees
9 throughout staggered, very close together to absorb
10 noise. Actually, you can't hardly see the traffic
11 on the opposing side. So that's my concern. Is the
12 noise level.
13 I know the road needs improvement and I
14 think if it's done in the correct way, everybody can
15 be satisfied. But typical -- I have been a
16 Vacaville resident for 29 years. Typical
17 landscaping doesn't quite meet my requirements of
18 landscaping. They start the project. They do a
19 little bit. Never complete it and don't maintain
20 it.
21 This road here would have to have grass,
22 trees, shrubs, redwoods, things that would totally
23 absorb noise, sound, and be aesthetic when you drive
24 down. So I'm really concerned about that. If the
25 road is not going to be landscaped correctly and

PH-14a Cont'd

DeMICHELLE DEPOSITION REPORTERS OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
FAIRFIELD, CA (707) 425-6000 NAPA, CA (707) 226-6000

1 just going to be a big slap of concrete, and
2 asphalt, and trucks going up and down and cars, then
3 I'm not for it at all. PH-14a Cont'd
4 If they can make this road to where the
5 committee and the neighbors, because we have to live
6 there, then we can accept it, but -- I guess that's
7 what I have to say.
8
9 DOUG BUSH: I'm for Alternative A or E,
10 preferably A. Currently where I live in Stonegate PH-15a
11 neighborhood, there is a fair amount noise from I-80
12 and I even sleep with the windows shut because it's
13 so loud already. It doesn't seem to me that this --
14 any of these plans are really necessary.
15 I understand that there is projected
16 growth, but I feel like a lot of the projections
17 ignore the alternatives that include better mass
18 transit or, you know, train system like extending PH-15b
19 BART, or something of that sort. And I feel like
20 those options should be looked at. I feel like if
21 those options were taken into account, it might not
22 be necessary to spend so much money and have such a
23 negative impact on so many people as these
24 alternatives and these plans seem to plan for.
25 Also, the proposed noise mitigation options PH-15c

DeMICHELLE DEPOSITION REPORTERS OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
FAIRFIELD, CA (707) 425-6000 NAPA, CA (707) 226-6000

1 don't seem like they will do an adequate job of
2 preventing the negative impact on the quality of
3 life for people who live along the roadways. If
4 these things did happen and the roads were expanded,
5 I would expect that the project would attempt to do
6 the best job possible of making the landscaping
7 beautiful and hopefully doing a good enough job that
8 the negative impact on the property values could be
9 somewhat -- could be made up for to some degree.
10 Another thing is as far as the landscaping
11 goes, I would like to see native plants used as much
12 as possible. And currently there is grass being
13 planted at some new entrances and exits to the
14 highway. And it seems like, with our current
15 drought, that our lack of clean water should be
16 respected and paid attention to because I don't
17 think we can afford to ignore our current situation
18 and increase the problem by improper landscaping
19 planning. So native plants are an important thing
20 to me to see on the future landscaping should it
21 occur. That's it.
22 (Hearing concluded)
23
24
25

PH-15c Cont'd

PH-15d

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

) ss.

COUNTY OF SONOMA)

The persons in the foregoing hearing personally appeared before me, Annette M. Shepherd, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California.

The statements of all persons and all remarks were reported by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter, under my direction and control, caused to be transcribed into typewritten form by means of Computer-Aided Transcription.

I am a Certified Shorthand Reporter licensed by the State of California. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to the case named in the within caption, and that I am not related to any party thereto.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto affixed my signature this 9th day of July, 2008.

Annette M. Shepherd, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter #12663

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS MADE AT THE PUBLIC HEARING

Public Hearing Speaker 1 - Elias Castro

PH-1a. Thank you for the comment. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. A right-in/right-out movement at Fallbrook Avenue will be investigated during final design.

Public Hearing Speaker 2 - Bruegmann, Carl & Maxine

PH-2a. The timing of construction of the sound walls will be established during the final design phase. Customarily, every effort would be made to construct the sound walls as a first order of work so that they would help to abate construction noise.

PH-2b. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

PH-2c. The property became available to be purchased by the City because the landowner saw that it was in the path of the proposed roadway based on the approved Jepson Parkway Concept Plan. This type of protective acquisition is permissible so long as the acquisition does not limit the consideration and evaluation of alternatives. No project development on such land may proceed, however, until the environmental process has been completed.

PH-2d. Thank you for the comment. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. The project will improve traffic flow and reduce congestion near your intersection, making it easier to access Leisure Town Road.

Public Hearing Speaker 3 - Daramo, John

PH-3a. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

As part of Alternative B, Leisure Town Road would be widened to four lanes. In the vicinity of Elmira Road south to Vanden Road, this widening would occur along the east side of the existing roadway. A 35- to 55-foot wide linear parkway with a 10-foot wide meandering bicycle/pedestrian path would be constructed along the west side of Leisure Town Road.

Public Hearing Speaker 4 - Davidson, Ron

PH-4a. Various studies have been performed over the past 30 years or so that examine the connection between transportation improvements and the values of proximate residential property. They do not conclude that transportation projects cause a decline in property values. Good schools and improved access to employment and other opportunities are important factors in buyers' decisions about where to live.

PH-4b. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

Public Hearing Speaker 5 - Watso, Rob

PH-5a. The areas along Leisure Town Road with existing sound walls were evaluated with respect to the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria in the noise analysis presented in the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS; see Section 3.14, Noise. Even with existing sound walls of between six and eight feet, some areas were shown to exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria in the Year 2030. Noise abatement was considered and rejected for these areas because sound walls would not meet Caltrans reasonable and feasible criteria. Please refer to Draft EIR/EIS and Final EIS Section 3.14, Noise, and Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls, for a discussion of why areas with existing sound walls were determined not to meet Caltrans reasonable and feasible criteria.

PH-5b. Truck traffic along Leisure Town Road would continue to be restricted in accordance with City of Vacaville Ordinance No. 1638, which designates Leisure Town Road as a "Limited Truck Route." This restricts truck access to local deliveries only.

Public Hearing Speaker 6 – Young, Greg

PH-6a. The future extension of Walters Road is explicitly referred to in your lease agreement, which contains language to the effect that as tenant, you acknowledge that your use of the leased property for equipment storage and staging would continue only until the property is needed for the road extension. The Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS (see Impact LU-1, for example) reports the impact on your business of the extension of Walters Road.

Public Hearing Speaker 7 - McCarthy, T.J.

PH-7a. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

Leisure Town Road is currently restricted for heavy trucks from Orange Drive to Alamo Drive in accordance with Vacaville Ordinance 1638 (2000). It is anticipated that the improved Jepson Parkway segment along Leisure Town Road will be designed and signed for speeds of 40-45 miles per hour.

As part of Alternative B, Leisure Town Road would be widened to four lanes. In the vicinity of Elmira Road south to Vanden Road, this widening would occur along the east side of the existing roadway. A 35- to 55-foot wide linear parkway with a 10-foot wide meandering bicycle/pedestrian path would be constructed along the west side of Leisure Town Road.

Truck traffic along Leisure Town Road would continue to be restricted in accordance with City of Vacaville Ordinance No. 1638, which designates Leisure Town Road as a "Limited Truck Route." This restricts truck access to local deliveries only. A major component of the project is the construction of continuous bicycle and pedestrian facilities to improve the non-motor connection between the existing roadways and neighborhoods.

Public Hearing Speaker 8 - Newcomer, Colleen

PH-8a. As noted in the Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls, the project would include sound walls from Elmira Road to just south of Kingswood Avenue, to match up with the existing concrete wall south of Kingswood Avenue. Please refer to Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls, for more information about the selection of noise abatement areas and the proposed sound walls.

PH-8b. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. The intersection of Arbor Oaks Drive and Leisure Town Road will be changed to a right-in/right-out access configuration because of the close proximity to Elmira Road. There will be a median in Leisure Town Road separating northbound and southbound traffic.

Public Hearing Speaker 9 - Newcomer, Kevin

PH-9a. Thank you for the comment. Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. A right-in/right-out access configuration at Arbor Oaks Drive and Leisure Town Road is required because of its close proximity to the Elmira Road and Leisure Town Road intersection.

Public Hearing Speaker 10 - Burnett, John

PH-10a. As described in Section 3.4, Community Impacts, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, all right-of-way acquisition associated with the proposed project would be subject to the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended) and Title 49 CFR Part 24. The act requires that property owners are provided with an objective appraisal of the fair market value of their property. The purpose of the act is to ensure that persons displaced as a result of a transportation project are treated fairly, consistently, and equitably so that such persons will not suffer disproportionate injuries as a result of projects designed for the benefit of the public as a whole.

The act requires STA, as the project proponent, to provide relocation advisory assistance to any person, business, farm, or nonprofit organization displaced as a result of acquisition of real property for public use. STA would assist residential displacees in obtaining comparable, decent, safe, and sanitary replacement housing by providing current and continuous information on sale prices and rental rates of available housing. Nonresidential displacees would receive information on comparable properties for lease or purchase. Residential replacement dwellings would be in equal or better neighborhoods, at prices within the financial means of the individuals and families displaced, and reasonably accessible to their places of employment. Before any displacement occurs, displacees would be offered comparable replacement dwellings that are available to all persons consistent with the requirements of Civil Rights Act Title VIII. Relocation assistance would also include supplying information concerning federal and State assisted housing programs, and any other known services being offered by public and private agencies in the area. A local certified public agency designated by STA would carry out the relocation plan to help eligible displaced individuals move with as little inconvenience as possible. Appraisals to determine fair market value would be conducted for each displaced property after an alternative has been selected and the environmental document is complete.

All relocation services and benefits are administered without regard to race, color, national origin, or sex in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 2000d, et seq.). Please see Appendix D of the Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix C of the Final EIS for a copy of the Title VI Policy Statement.

Construction of the project will occur in segments and is projected to begin in 2013. Full implementation of the project is expected to take up to five years from the start of construction. At this time, an actual schedule of the first segments to be built is not finalized.

Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative. The current schedule for construction of the Jepson Parkway project is to begin the first phase, Vanden Road segment, in 2013 with an anticipated two-year construction timeline. Following this phase, work will begin on the Leisure Town Road, contingent on the availability of funding. As the project moves through the completion of the environmental approval phase and into the final design phase, STA and the cities in the corridor will make coordinate with adjacent property owners to discuss potential right of way requirements.

PH-10b. As described in Chapter 2, Project Alternatives of the Draft EIR/EIR, all existing utilities would be relocated, as necessary, to ensure continuance of service to parcels in the corridor.

PH-10c. Thank you for your comment. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

Your concerns regarding the condition of the property in question have been forwarded to the City of Vacaville.

Public Hearing Speaker 11 - Barnes, Robert

PH-11a. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

PH-11b. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

A railroad overpass along Peabody Road is not included as part of Alternative B.

PH-11c. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

PH-11d. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative and Essay Response 1: Transit Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion.

Public Hearing Speaker 12 - Brand, Ken

PH-12a. Thank you for your comment.

Public Hearing Speaker 13 - Greenslate, Larry

PH-13a. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

PH-13b. The area of concern is along Leisure Town Road between approximately Stonegate Drive and Elmira Road. This area has an existing concrete sound wall. This area was analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS as having a noise level increase of up to 3 dB under Alternative B compared to existing conditions; see Table 3.14-9 in Section 3.14, Noise. Even without implementation of the proposed project, noise levels would be expected to increase as a result of growing travel demand and traffic. When the with-project condition was compared to the No-Project condition (Alternative A), the proposed project's contribution would be up to a 2 dB increase in some areas and a reduction of noise levels in others. In general, a 2 dBA increase in noise is considered to be at the threshold of human perception.

Please refer to the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS Section 3.14, Noise, and Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls, for a discussion of when noise abatement is required to be considered, and why areas with existing sound walls were determined not to meet Caltrans reasonable and feasible criteria.

PH-13c. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

As part of Alternative B, Leisure Town Road would be widened to four lanes. In the vicinity of Elmira Road south to Vanden Road, this widening would occur along the east side of the existing roadway. A 35- to 55-foot wide linear parkway with a 10-foot wide meandering bicycle/pedestrian path would be constructed along the west side of Leisure Town Road.

PH-13d. Leisure Town Road is currently restricted for heavy trucks from Orange Drive to Alamo Drive in accordance with Vacaville Ordinance 1638 (2000). It is anticipated that the improved Jepson Parkway segment along Leisure Town Road will be designed and signed for speeds of 40-45 miles per hour.

Public Hearing Speaker 14 - Garcia, Ed

PH-14a. Thank you for comment. As described in Chapter 2, Project Alternatives, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, the project includes landscaping along each segment of roadways proposed for improvement. The plant selection will include both drought tolerant and native species.

In addition, as described in Chapter 2, Project Alternatives, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, within its jurisdiction, the City of Vacaville has committed to consult further with its citizens regarding the specific density and design of the landscaping within the linear park. It is anticipated that the landscaped buffer within the City of Vacaville would be more dense and lush than in other portions of the Alternative B alignment to buffer existing residential neighborhoods from the effects of the traffic on the roadway.

Public Hearing Speaker 15 - Bush, Doug

PH-15a. Please see Essay Response 2: Identification of the Preferred Alternative, regarding the identification of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative and Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls.

PH-15b. Please see Essay Response 1: Transit Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion.

PH-15c. Please see Essay Response 3: Summary of Noise Impact Analysis and Determination of Sounds Walls.

PH-15d. Thank you for comment. As described in Chapter 2, Project Alternatives, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, the project includes landscaping along each segment of roadways proposed for improvement. The plant selection will include both drought tolerant and native species.

In addition, as described in Section 2.3, Project Alternatives, of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final EIS, within its jurisdiction, the City of Vacaville has committed to consult further with its citizens regarding the specific density and design of the landscaping within the linear park. It is anticipated that the landscaped buffer within the City of Vacaville would be more dense and lush than in other portions of the Alternative B alignment to buffer existing residential neighborhoods from the effects of the traffic on the roadway.