

S.0 Summary of Revisions to the Final ND/Final EA

S.1 Introduction

Revisions to the Final ND/Final EA will provide new information, which will clarify the existing document partially in response to written and verbal public comments and additional internal review by Caltrans. Modifications to the body of the original document were made only when substantive comments brought to light information not covered. This section is a summary and explanation of those changes.

S.2 Responses to Comments on the Document

Specific Information Added in Response to Comments

- Air Quality (See **Section 5.III**)
- Cumulative Impacts (See **Section 5.XVII.b**)
- Traffic Analysis (See **Section 2.6.4**)
- LOS Definitions (See **Section 1.3**).
- Project Area Noise levels (See **Section 5.XI**).
- Scenic and Visual Resources (See **Section 5.I**)
- Socioeconomic Conditions and Growth (See **Section 3.14**)

S.3 Changes in Environmental and Regional Planning Guidelines

During the document review period (October 19 to November 28, 1998) two notable modifications were made to key environmental and regional planning documents:

- MTC's Draft 1998 RTP – Ratified October 28, 1998.

The RTP represents the transportation policy statement of MTC as well as its blueprint for future transportation goals and investment strategies. In order for projects to be included in the federal TIP, they must first be approved by MTC for inclusion in the RTP. This project's compliance was included in the Final RTP EIR. In addition, the RTP EIR analyzed the cumulative effect of several projects, including the Wilfred Avenue Interchange to the Route 101/12 Separation. The RTP EIR did not find a significant effect due to cumulative effects from the projects analyzed in their document.

- 1998 CEQA Guideline Revisions – Effective October 26, 1998

This IS/EA document is a joint document for CEQA and NEPA. The 1998 CEQA Guideline Revisions only affect the CEQA features of this document. State funding for this project is tied to satisfying a basic purpose of CEQA, which is disclosure of environmental impacts. The October 1998 CEQA revisions mandated replacement of Appendix I (the old Initial Study Checklist) with a revised and expanded format clearly serves this goal. The new Environmental Checklist Form (See **Table 4-4 Environmental Significance Checklist**) has been reorganized and cross-referenced to relate to existing environmental regulations. Responses to the checklist questions are also now ranked via four levels of significance rather than the previous two. As a result, although the conclusions drawn by the technical studies have not changed, the questions used by the new checklist and the degree to which environmental factors are characterized as potentially affecting the project are now represented differently. Whereas the previous checklist required a yes or no answer to whether the impact was significant, the new checklist's use of multiple categories provides for a different level of analysis. A copy of the original **Table 4-4** is included in **Appendix A** of this document.

Accompanying the change in the checklist is an attendant change in **Section 5 (Discussion of Potential Effects and Proposed Mitigation Measures)** In some cases, additional information has been provided to adequately address issues raised by the new checklist. Moreover, where necessary, details to clarify concerns specific to a NEPA context have been included as well.

S.4 New Sections Required for the Final ND/Final EA

- Public Participation

A summary of the review process has been added to Volume II - **Section 12 (Public Participation)** along with all comments and responses to the draft version of this document.

- Wetlands Only Practicable Alternative Finding

The new **Section 3.7.1** satisfies the federal requirement for actions taken within wetlands.

- Mitigation Measures

The new **Section 10** is a summary of all mitigation measures, prescribed Environmentally Sensitive Areas and any other conditions, committed to in previous sections of the document. Section references to where each commitment is discussed are included as well.

- Disposition of Section 106.

This new **Section 11** discusses the final disposition of Section 106 matters.

S.5 Errata

There were a number of errors and omissions in the original document:

- The document erroneously reports that the City of Rohnert Park does not have an Urban Growth Boundary on its books. This has been corrected. (See **Section 2.3**)
- In the Initial Checklist (**Table 4-4**)—13, 22, 28 & 50 should have said “yes” for impacts to the project and “no” in response to the impacts being significant. These changes accurately reflect the discussions of the impacts in **Section 5**. The Initial Checklist form itself has been replaced however with a new revised “Environmental Checklist Form”. The old Initial Checklist is included in **Appendix A**. See the Changes in Environmental and Regional Planning Guidelines section below for details on why this substitution has been made.
- Wetland and waters located in the project area are under the jurisdiction of the North Coast Water region and must comply with permit CAS #000003, Order #99-06-DWQ and General Permit CAS #2000002, Order #99-08-7-345.
- There will be permanent right of way takes in three locations. See **Section 2.6.1** for a discussion of these takes. These takes were reflected in the design drawings in **Exhibit 2.5-1** sheet’s 2 and 10 respectively but not initially discussed in the document.
- The area of wetlands impact has increased. Delineation has been completed. The results have been forwarded to ACOE for review (See **Section 3.7** and **Section 5.IV.c.(i)**).
- Modifications to the Colgan Creek Channel will require a permit from the ACOE not the US Coast Guard (See **Section 3.7**).
- Modifications to a culverted portion of North Branch of the Laguna de Santa Rosa that runs northwest of Roberts Lake Road, southwest of Horn Avenue, directly under the freeway will require a permit from the ACOE and additional mitigations to offset potential impacts to the habitat of endangered species/species of concern (See **Section 3.9** and **5.IV.a**). Potential environmental impacts are not significant and have been addressed in coordination with both the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).
- Incorrect accident data was included in **Table 1-3.4 (Accident Rate)**. The appropriate corrections have been made. (See **Section 1.3**). There are no changes in the original project conclusions drawn from this corrected data.

These corrections to the ND/Final EA do not change the conclusions regarding impacts outlined in the original document.

S.6 Design Changes

- Soundwall 2 has been dropped from the project because of public comments and because of its cost. The names of the remaining soundwalls have been changed to reflect a new naming convention. The new naming scheme reflected in **Exhibit 2-6.1** identifies all Soundwalls by highway centerline numbers. Below is a list of the new names:

<u>Old Name</u>	<u>New Name</u>	<u>Old Name</u>	<u>New Name</u>
Soundwall 1-	CM 244	Soundwall 8-	CM 287
Soundwall 2-	Dropped from project	Soundwall 9-	CM 299
Soundwall 3-	CM 271	Soundwall 10-	CM 300
Soundwall 4-	CM 274	Soundwall 11-	CM 303
Soundwall 5-	CM 277	Soundwall 12-	CM 307
Soundwall 6-	CM 281	Soundwall 13-	NW 312
Soundwall 7-	CM 282	Soundwall 14-	WS 314

- Soundwall CM 307 (Soundwall#12) will be located along the right of way line, not a few meters back as shown on the original plans. Accordingly, **Exhibit 2-6.1** has been modified to reflect the changes.
- The project limits have shifted slightly. The new post mile limits are on Route 12 K.P. R20.3 to T28.3 (P.M. R12.6 to T17.6). On Highway 101 new project limits are K.P 23.7 to 31.7 (P.M. 14.7 to 19.7).