Appendix C Agency Consultation Letters

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – THE RESOURCES AGENCY

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, *Governor*

OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
P.O. BOX 942896
SACRAMENTO, CA 94296-0001
(916) 653-6624 Fax: (916) 653-9824
calshpo@ohp.parks.ca.gov
www.ohp.parks.ca.gov

March 2, 2006

Reply To: FHWA060216A

Jennifer Darcangelo
Deparment of Transportation
PO Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Re: Determinations of Eligibility for the Proposed Jepson Parkway Project, Solano County, CA

Dear Ms. Darcangelo:

Thank you for consulting with me about the subject undertaking in accordance with the *Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the California Department of Transportation Regarding Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as it Pertains to the Administration of the Federal-Aid Highway Program in California* (PA).

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is requesting my concurrence, pursuant to Stipulation VIII.C.5 of the PA, that the following properties are not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP):

- 579 Leisure Town Road, Vacaville, CA
- 5027 Peabody Road, Vacaville, CA

Based on my review of the submitted documentation, I concur.

Thank you for considering historic properties during project planning. If you have any questions, please contact Natalie Lindquist of my staff at (916) 654-0631 or e-mail at nlind@ohp.parks.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Stephen D. Mikesell for

Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA
State Historic Preservation Officer

: OF CALIFORNIA • BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY
GRAY DAVIS, Governor
'ARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
:3660
\ND, CA 94623-0660
86-4444

MAR 19

March 14, 2001

Mr. Daryl K. Halls
Executive Director
Solano Transportation Authority
333 Sunset Avenue, Suite200
Suisun City, CA 94585

04-SOL-O- STA
Jepson Parkway

Dear Mr. Halls,

We appreciate the opportunity to be involved with the development of the Jepson Parkway project. For the past several months we have been working together on the National Environmental Policy Act/Clean Water Act section 404 (NEPA/404) process for this project.

A key step in this process occurs when the member agencies give concurrence on the Purpose and Need for the project. This becomes a very important section in the Environmental Impact Statement.

At this time we are pleased to provide Caltrans concurrence with the Purpose and Need for the project. We look forward to continuing our working partnership with you, as the sponsor agency, and the other state and federal agencies on the NEPA/404 process and the other steps in the environmental process. Thank you for the hard work, compromise and effort that has gone into producing this.

Sincerely,

HARRY Y. YAHATA
District Director

By Jo Ann Cullom
Jo Ann Cullom
Environmental Coordinator for
Local Assistance Projects

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

RECEIVED
APR - 5 2001

IN REPLY REFER TO:
PPN 2797

March 28, 2001

Mr. Michael Ritchie, Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration, California Division
980 Ninth Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, California 95814-2724

Dear Mr. Ritchie:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Solano Transportation Authority (STA), is proposing the development of the Jepson Parkway Project; a north-south transportation corridor along the eastern edges of the cities of Vacaville, Fairfield, and Suisun City.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed the February 20, 2001 STA information package describing the Purpose and Need Statement, Criteria for Alternative Screening, and Preliminary Alternatives and concurs with the determination that these elements are acceptable for use in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)/404 Integration Process. We request an opportunity to review the final set of alternatives identified as acceptable for detailed evaluation after the Preliminary Alternatives have been applied to the screening criteria. On March 19, 1999, the Service issued a biological opinion which addressed the effects of water delivery by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to the Solano County Water Agency and its member agencies. The *Biological Opinion for the Solano Project Water Service Contract Renewal* included conservation measures for the short-term and long-term protection of listed species and their habitats within the action area (including the cities of Fairfield, Vacaville, and Suisun City). The conservation measures included the preparation and implementation of a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for an incidental take permit under section 10(a)1(B) of the Endangered Species Act for indirect effects. While many of the indirect/growth inducing effects of the Jepson Parkway project will be addressed by the Solano Project HCP, the Service is concerned that there may be effects which will not be addressed. The Service recommends close coordination with the Solano Project HCP process to ensure that the indirect/secondary effects of the Parkway project are addressed. We recommend, at the earliest identification of unmitigated effects, that the FHWA and Caltrans assist in the expansion of the Solano Project HCP to include effects of the parkway.

If you have any questions concerning the Service's comments on this project, please contact Jerry Bielfeldt (Wetlands Branch) at (916) 414-6584.

Sincerely,

Michael Hoover

for Dale A. Pierce
Acting Field Supervisor

cc: ARD (ES)-Portland, OR
STA, Suisun City, CA (Daryl K. Halls)
EPA, San Francisco, CA (Attn: Elizabeth Varnhagen)
NMFS, Sacramento, CA (Attn: Kelly Finn)
ACOE, Sacramento, CA (Nancy Haley)
Caltrans, Oakland, CA (JoAnn Cullom)

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

Mr. Daryl Halls, Executive Director
Solano Transportation Authority
333 Sunset Avenue, Suite 200
Suisun City, California 94585

Dear Mr. Halls:

We are in receipt of your letter dated February 20, 2001 requesting concurrence on the Purpose and Need, Criteria for Screening Alternatives, and Range of Preliminary Alternatives for the **Jepson Parkway Project, Solano County, California**. The request is pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act/ Section 404 of the Clean Water Act Memorandum of Understanding (NEPA/404 MOU).

We concur with the purpose and need statement dated February 12, 2001 which indicates that project implementation will:

- Provide an integrated and continuous route for local north-south trips as an alternative to using I-80 in central Solano County.
- Provide local traffic with a safe, convenient route using existing roadways when feasible.
- Enhance multimodal transportation options for local trips to central Solano County, including providing a safe and convenient multiuse path and increasing transit use in the area.

We also concur with the range of Preliminary Alternatives that are described in the document entitled *Jepson Parkway Preliminary Alternatives* dated February 16, 2001. This document depicts a no-build alternative, an alternative that performs low-cost capital improvements to existing roadway and transit systems, a mass transit alternative juxtaposed on each of the proposed alternatives, and six "build" alternatives. The alignments of these preliminary alternatives are roughly illustrated on the map entitled *Potential Alternatives for the Jepson Parkway Project,* dated February 14, 2001.

In order to identify the most reasonable alternatives to be evaluated in greater detail in the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) that will be prepared, the proposed criteria for screening alternatives have been compiled in a matrix entitled, *Jepson Parkway EIS/EIR Project Alternatives Screening Matrix*, dated February 16, 2001. The 40 screening criteria are grouped into the following categories: natural environmental effects, physical environmental effects,

community effects, transportation effectiveness, engineering feasibility, and financial feasibility. Please note that to meet the requirements of the Section 404 (b)(1) guidelines of the Clean Water Act (CWA), we consider project impacts categorized under natural environmental effects, especially those affecting waters of the United States or endangered species, of great importance. The other categories of screening criteria have relevance in determining the practicability of a proposed alternative and how well it meets the project purpose. We concur with this list of criteria for screening alternatives.

Thank you for this opportunity to participate in the planning for the Jepson Parkway Project under the NEPA/404 MOU. We appreciate your convening regular meetings involving agency representatives to keep us informed and solicit our input to project planning and evaluation. We look forward to continued involvement through the next step which will be an analysis of the beneficial and detrimental aspects of each of these alternatives in order to eliminate those with unacceptable qualities, and ultimately identify the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA) for authorization by the Corps of Engineers under the CWA. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at (415) 744-1584 or Liz Varnhagen of my staff at (415-744-1624).

Sincerely,

Lisa B. Hanf

Lisa B. Hanf, Manager
Federal Activities Office

cc: Jane Hicks, Corps of Engineers, San Francisco
Jerry Bielfeldt, USFWS, Sacramento
Harry Khani, FHWA, Sacramento
Jo Ann Cullom, Caltrans, District 4, Oakland
Nancy Haley, Corps of Engineers, Sacramento

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

JUN 29 2001

Daryl Halls
Solano Transportation Agency
333 Sunset Avenue, Suite 200
Suisun City, CA 94585

Dear Mr. Halls:

This responds to your letter dated April 19, 2001 requesting concurrence on the list of alternatives to be evaluated in detail in the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) being prepared for the **Jepson Parkway in Solano County, California**. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has already concurred with the range of the ten preliminary alternatives in our letter to you dated March 15, 2001. Our comments are offered as part of the National Environmental Policy Act/Clean Water Act Section 404 (NEPA/404) Integration Process.

Your letter indicates that from the ten preliminary alternatives, you would like to eliminate four from further consideration. According to the preliminary Alternatives Screening Report we received on June 8, 2001, the following alternatives should be eliminated from further evaluation in the DEIS. Alternative 2, the Transportation System Management (TSM) alternative consisting of low-cost capital improvements to the existing roadway and transit systems, would not satisfy the project purpose because it would not improve roadway safety or adequately address existing and future traffic congestion. Alternative 3, which is to construct a limited access expressway along any of the proposed alignments was also considered unacceptable for environmental and aesthetic reasons as well as not satisfying the multi-modal goal. Alternative 9, the Mass Transit alternative which would construct an arterial roadway within any of the proposed alignments, was eliminated because it was not believed to adequately address existing or anticipated traffic congestion, or accommodate pedestrian/non-motorized transportation. Alternative 10, which represented a route north of the I-80 corridor, would have potentially large adverse environmental and community impacts, and would open up new areas to development. Finally, Alternative 11 a) and b) would be outside of existing areas of planned development and not adequately serve the Jepson Parkway target communities.

EPA concurs that Solano Transportation Agency's selected six alternatives to carry forward into the draft EIS, alternatives 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, continue to offer an appropriate range for the purpose of NEPA. We recognize that there are additional difficult resource-based decisions ahead in this evaluation process, and offer our assistance to work with you throughout the NEPA/404 Integration process. If you have any questions concerning NEPA or the

NEPA/404 Memorandum of Understanding, please feel free to contact Liz Varnhagen of my staff at (415) 744-1624. If you have questions about compliance with the Clean Water Act, please contact Mike Monroe in the Water Division at (415) 744-1963.

Sincerely,

Lisa B. Hanf, Manager
Federal Activities Office

cc: Jane Hicks, Corps of Engineers, San Francisco
Jerry Bielfeldt, USFWS, Sacramento
Harry Khani, FHWA, Sacramento
Jo Ann Cullom, Caltrans, District 4, Oakland
Nancy Haley, Corps of Engineers, Sacramento

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
333 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105-2197

REPLY TO

JUL 13 2001

Regulatory Branch

SUBJECT: File Number 24854N

Mr. Daryl Halls
Solano Transportation Authority
333 Sunset Avenue, Suite 200
Suisun City, California 94585

Dear Mr. Halls:

Thank you for your letter of February 20, 2001, requesting concurrence with the Purpose and Need Statement for the Jepson Parkway Project in Solano County, California. You also requested concurrence with the "Criteria for Alternative Screening"("Jepson Parkway EIS/EIR Project Alternatives Screening Matrix"), and the "Jepson Parkway Preliminary Alternatives", both dated February 16, 2001. In a separate letter dated April 19, 2001, you requested concurrence on the list of alternatives to be evaluated in detail in the EIS/EIR document. Your request for concurrence is pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding for the National Environmental Policy Act and Clean Water Act Section 404 Integration Process for Surface Transportation Projects in Arizona, California, and Nevada.

Portions of the Jepson Parkway Project are proposed to be built in both the San Francisco and Sacramento Districts of the Corps of Engineers (Corps). By email of July 13, 2001, Sacramento District agreed with San Francisco District's recommendation that both Districts concur with your request.

The Corps concurs with the February 12, 2001, "Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action"; "Criteria for Alternative Screening"("Jepson Parkway EIS/EIR Project Alternatives Screening Matrix"), and " Jepson Parkway Preliminary Alternatives", both dated February 16, 2001; and the list of alternatives to be evaluated in detail in the EIS/EIR document contained in your letter of April 19, 2001. These alternatives are described in the "Jepson Parkway Preliminary Alternatives" dated March 19, 2001.

If you have questions, please contact Nancy Haley of Sacramento District's Regulatory Branch at 916-557-7772 or Jane Hicks of San Francisco District's Regulatory Branch at 415-977-8439. All correspondence should reference file numbers 200000655 and 24854N.

Sincerely,

Jane M. Hicks

for Calvin C. Fong
Chief, Regulatory Branch

Copy Furnished:

USACE, SPK-CO-R, Sacramento, CA (Attn: N. Haley)
US EPA, San Francisco, CA (Attn: L. Varnhagen)
US FWS, Sacramento-Wetlands Branch, CA (Attn: J. Bielfeldt)
NMFS, Sacramento, CA (Attn: F. K. Finn)
FHWA, Sacramento, CA (Attn: H. Khani)
M. Davis, Jones and Stokes, Oakland, CA

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Sacramento Area Office
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 8-300
Sacramento, CA 95814-4706

June 27, 2001

In Reply Refer To:
SWR-00-SA-0127:FKF

Daryl K. Halls
Executive Director
Solano Transportation Authority
333 Sunset Avenue, Suite 200
Suisun City, CA 94585

JUL 2 RECD

Dear Mr. Halls:

This letter is in response to your letter of April 19, 2001 requesting concurrence from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on the final range of alternatives for the Jepson Parkway Project Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/R). We have reviewed the proposed alternatives and concur with the determination that the range of alternatives is acceptable for inclusion in the EIS/R. The Jepson Parkway Plan includes incorporation of transit, a continuous pedestrian and bicycle traffic corridor, landscape design, and an open space element. The project sponsors have considered a broad range of alternatives to identify five action alternatives for detailed evaluation in the pending EIS/R. We look forward to working with you on this and other projects in the future.

If you have any questions or need further information please contact Ms. F. Kelly Finn in our Sacramento Area Office, 650 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, CA 95814. Ms. Finn may be reached by telephone at (916) 930-3610 or by Fax at (916) 930-3629.

Sincerely,

Michael E. Aceituno
Supervisor, Sacramento Area Office

cc: NMFS-PRD, Long Beach, CA
Stephen A. Meyer, ASAC, NMFS, Sacramento, CA