

<b>D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix</b>			
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Reviewer Comments</b>	<b>Response Text</b>
1	<b>Sac County – Dean Black</b>	Section 4f: NEPA requirements is included in the EA	This comment concerns compliance with Section 4(f) for use of a strip of land along the Prairie City State Recreational Vehicle Area. The CEQA and NEPA documentation for this project were prepared separately. Caltrans is the lead agency for the preparation of the Environmental Assessment (EA). The EA will include a Section 4(f) De Minimis Findings related to the minor use of the Prairie City State Recreational Vehicle Area. The Section 4(f) De Minimis Finding will be Appendix A of the EA. The lead agency plans to circulate the EA later in 2017. No changes to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
2	<b>Sac County – Dean Black</b>	Night closure conflict with AMM Noise 1: limit construction to daytime – need to clarify “limit noisy construction to daytime hours”	This comment concerns a discrepancy between a statement in Chapter 1 and AMM Noise-1, Limit Construction Activities to Daytime Hours. AMM Noise-1 has been revised to state that construction contractors shall limit <u>noisy</u> construction activities to the daytime hours. This revision does not result in a change to the impact significance made in the Draft IS/MND; no other changes to the Final S/MND are needed.
3	<b>Sac County – Dean Black</b>	No Build: include four-lane improvements on GL Rd (linked to # of dwelling units)	This comment concerns the discussion of the Cordova Hills community required improvements to Grant Line Road. A statement about Cordova Hills' required improvements to Grant Line Road was added to Section 1.5.2, No-Build Alternative, of the Final IS/MND. The IS/MND No Build Alternative, in the Chapter 1 Project Description, has been updated to reflect that a portion of Grant Line Road would be four lanes; however this does not improve the existing conditions, because it is only a portion of the Project area. Therefore, this revision does not result in a change to the impact significance made in the Draft IS/MND, and no other changes to the Final IS/MND are needed.
4	<b>Sac County – Dean Black</b>	LED should be preferred lighting	This comment concerns the preferred use of LED lighting over metal halide light and high-pressure sodium lamps as an avoidance and minimization measure. The Final IS/MND has been revised to capture the County's preference for LED lighting. No other changes to the Final IS/MND are required.
5	<b>Sac County – Dean Black</b>	May be able to reduce # of bottomless culverts – final design refinement	This comment concerns the number of proposed bottomless culverts. JPA proposes the use of bottomless culverts as a measure to avoid impacts to jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and State. The proposed number of bottomless culverts could change during final project design. This comment does not pertain to the adequacy of the impact analysis, therefore, no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.

<b>D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix</b>			
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Reviewer Comments</b>	<b>Response Text</b>
6	<b>Sac County – Dean Black</b>	Which geometry will be built at intersections (2025 and 2035 scenarios)	The comment is assumed to refer to the intersection geometry shown in the traffic section and to the geometry shown in the 11X17 mapbook, in Appendix F of the Draft IS/MND. The mapbook’s objective is to convey the alignment’s footprint in comparison to relevant features within the Project limits. Geometrics of future roadways are not shown or are not depicted exactly as they might occur. This includes planned roadway improvements by others, such as Rancho Cordova Parkway, Kiefer Blvd (north), University Blvd, Chrysanthy Blvd, North Loop Road, and Centennial Drive. The proposed intersection geometrics are accommodated by the Project footprint analyzed in the IS/MND. This comment does not pertain to the adequacy of the impact analysis; therefore, no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
7	<b>Sac County – Dean Black</b>	Concerned about impacts on GLR/Sunrise Blvd and WRR/Prairie City Road intersection.	This comment questions whether the Project should have included an evaluation of the Grant Line Road/Sunrise Blvd and the White Rock Road/Prairie City Road intersections under the build scenarios. In the analysis of the traffic operational results for roadway segments #1 (Grant Line, south of Jackson) and #8 (Grant Line south of White Rock), the addition of the D2 Project is shown to result in moderate increases in traffic when compared to the no-build conditions. Through this evaluation, it was determined that additional analyses outside the study segment are not warranted. Please also note that the Connector D3/E1 traffic study thoroughly evaluated the White Rock Road/Prairie City Road intersection’s operations in the IS/MND for that project. No further changes to the IS/MND are warranted.
8	<b>Taylor &amp; Wiley for Teichert</b>	They want their access road modified and there may be associated impacts of raising D2 to allow vehicles under at the conveyer.	This comment concerns access to the Teichert facility. JPA will continue to work with Teichert to provide equivalent access to the Teichert facility to the condition. The IS/MND includes the evaluation and environmental review of methods to provide this access. This comment does not pertain to the adequacy of the impact analysis; therefore, no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
9	<b>SMAQMD</b>	Fully list the Basic Construction Emission Control Practices and Enhanced Dust Control Practices	This comment concerns listing the Basic Construction Emission Control Practices and Enhanced Dust Control Practices. IS/MND updates have added and addressed all PEIR mitigation measures for air quality and explicitly listed SMAQMD’s Basic Construction Emission Control Practices and Enhanced Dust Control Practices. This comment does not pertain to the adequacy of the impact analysis; therefore, no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
10	<b>SMAQMD</b>	Describe progress and strategies to encourage local jurisdictions to adopt Climate Action Plans, etc.	This comment concerns the progress and strategies to encourage local jurisdictions to adopt plans. The text has been modified to describe when mitigation measure AQ-8 would take effect based on the Draft IS/MND conducted for Segment D3/E1 project.

<b>D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix</b>			
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Reviewer Comments</b>	<b>Response Text</b>
			This comment does not pertain to the adequacy of the impact analysis; therefore, no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
11	<b>SMAQMD</b>	growth inducement may affect AQ – address PEIR POP-1 and POP-2	This comment concerns the consideration of growth inducement effects on air quality. Growth inducement and associated traffic have been taken into account in the traffic analysis, which the AQ impacts are based upon; therefore, no revisions have been made based on comment. This comment does not pertain to the adequacy of the impact analysis. No change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
12	<b>SMAQMD</b>	Describe project deviations from Connector Design Guidelines and Functional Guidelines (for the 9 I/S)	This comment concerns describing project deviations from the Connector Design Guidelines and Functional Guidelines. This comment does not pertain to the adequacy of the impact analysis in the Draft IS/MND. The Capital Southeast Connector JPA Project Design Guidelines are available online for your review ( <a href="http://www.connectorjpa.net/uploads/8/3/3/5/83350278/updated_approved_project_design_guidelines_v4_-_feb_2015.pdf">http://www.connectorjpa.net/uploads/8/3/3/5/83350278/updated_approved_project_design_guidelines_v4_-_feb_2015.pdf</a> ). No change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
13	<b>SMAQMD</b>	Advise including Landscaping Guidance for Improving AQ Near Roadways	This comment recommends including the Landscape Guidance for Improving AQ Near Roadways. Addressing Comment #9 added the mitigation measure from the PEIR to 'Implement Additional Exposure Reduction Strategies to Further Minimize Potential Health Risks' (AQ 6). Text of the AMM has been modified to mention the Landscape Guidance. This comment does not pertain to the adequacy of the impact analysis; therefore, no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
14	<b>SMAQMD</b>	SMAQMD Traffic vol of less than 100,000 – PEIR mitigation to min potential health risks still holds for this project	This comment concerns adding a mitigation measure from the PEIR. Text has been replaced stating the change in volume from no-build to build would be less than significant with regards to diesel particulate matter near major roadways with text similar to the PEIR to match the updated mitigation measures.
15	<b>SMAQMD</b>	Need modeling of Greenhouse gas emissions	This comment requests modeling of greenhouse gas emissions. GHG emissions are now provided (CT-EMFAC2014 files) in new Appendix H. While reviewing GHG emissions, the annual GHG from construction was determined to be from the unmitigated condition, and the value has been updated to the mitigated condition (2,215.46 metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e to 2,258.73 metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e). This does not change any significance determination.
16	<b>SMAQMD</b>	Need modeling runs for emissions tables – both operational and construction emissions projections.	This comment concerns the need to run models for construction and operational emissions. Operational and construction emissions have been provided (CT-EMFAC2014 and Roadway Construction Emissions Model) in new Appendix H. While reviewing post-processing from the Road Construction Emissions Model, an error in the calculation of construction emissions in tons per year was discovered and corrected. Years 2022 and 2024 were corrected for all pollutants. Mitigated emissions

D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix			
Comment No.	Commenter	Reviewer Comments	Response Text
			of PM2.5 were corrected for all years. This does not change any significance determination.
17	CA WA Board	All wastewater discharges must comply with Antidegradation Policy (resolution 68-16). Need to evaluate both surface and groundwater quality as part of NPDES.	This comment concerns compliance with Antidegradation Policy. A new regulatory section with a discussion about the Antidegradation Policy was added to Section 2.18, Utilities and Service Systems. The impact analysis section was revised to state that all discharge of wastewater would comply with the Antidegradation Policy. Both groundwater and surface runoff are evaluated in the IS/MND in Section 2.10. Through this analysis, it was determined that diverting new stormwater runoff from the pavement into BMPs such as bioswales and/or basins would keep contaminants such as heavy metals, oil, and grease from vehicular traffic in the basins, minimizing sedimentation and erosion in surface waters downstream of the Project footprint. <b>With design avoidance measures, the new and additional impervious surface would result in a less than significant impact.</b> This analysis will be further studied during the development of the NPDES, which is a commitment found in Section 2.10.4 of the IS/MND. The revisions made to the Final IS/MND are not substantive and do not change the environmental significance in the Final IS/MND. No further change is needed.
18	CA WA Board	Must obtain General Permit for Storm Water Discharges with Construction Activities (No. 2009-009-DWQ) requiring SWPPP.	This comment concerns the need to obtain a General Permit for Stormwater Discharges with Construction Activities (No. 2009-009-DWQ) requiring SWPPP. As stated in Section 2.10.1, Regulatory Setting, stormwater discharges in the City of Rancho Cordova and unincorporated Sacramento County are regulated under the Sacramento County Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit (R5-2015-0023). Moreover, Section 2.10.1, Regulatory Setting, states the Project would comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. The Draft IS/MND also states the permit has the following basic requirement: (a) Project proponent must comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. As stated in Section 2.10.3, Impact Analysis, of the Hydrology and Water Quality Section of the Draft IS/MND, "The Project would be subject to the Caltrans NPDES and Sacramento County NPDES permits, thus avoiding and minimizing the potential for release of contaminants into local streams and drainages. Compliance with the NPDES permits would require JPA or its contractor to implement a SWPPP, as described in AMM HYD-4, and to maintain BMPs to avoid releasing sediment and contaminants into surface waters as a result of construction activities, including earthwork". Further, AMM HYD-4: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP), in Section 2.10.4, states, "In compliance with

<b>D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix</b>			
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Reviewer Comments</b>	<b>Response Text</b>
			the CGP, Sacramento County Phase I MS4 NPDES, and the Caltrans MS4 Permit, the Project is required to develop and implement an effective SWPPP because the DSA would be greater than 1 acre." Because the Project would comply with the requirements of NPDES and prepare a SWPPP, changes to the Final IS/MND are not necessary.
19	<b>CA WA Board</b>	Phase I and II Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permits) and Industrial Storm Water General Permits (No. 2014-0057-DWQ)	This comment concerns Phase I and II MS4 and Industrial Storm Water General Permits. As stated in Section 2.10.1, Regulatory Setting, stormwater discharges in the City of Rancho Cordova and unincorporated Sacramento County are regulated under the Sacramento County Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit (R5-2015-0023). Because the Project is not an industrial site (i.e., vehicle rehabilitation, vehicle maintenance shop, equipment cleaning operations), an Industrial Storm Water General Permit is not required. This comment does not pertain to the adequacy of the impact analysis; therefore, no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
20	<b>CA WA Board</b>	Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit and Water Quality cert	This comment concerns the need for Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 Permit and Water Quality Certification for any discharge of dredge or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands. Sections 2.4.1, Wetlands and Other Waters, and Section 2.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, discuss the CWA 404 permit and Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB. As proposed in MM BIO-A Obtain USACE, RWQCB, EPA, and CDFW Permits and Complete Compensatory Mitigation, "To permit all permanent impacts to Waters of the United States, prior to construction, the JPA will obtain a CWA Section 404 permit from USACE, a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from RWQCB..." This comment does not pertain to the adequacy of the impact analysis; therefore, no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
21	<b>CA WA Board</b>	Waste Discharge Requirements & Dewatering permit	This comment concerns the need for coverage under the State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Risk General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board's Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Risk Waiver) R5-2013-0145. As discussed in Section 2.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, AMM HYD-3, the JPA will require the contractor to determine whether the volume of water from dewatering operations is covered under the NPDES Construction General Permit (GCP). However, if the volume is greater than the GCP allows, the contractor will obtain coverage under a NPDES Low or Threat Discharge and Dewatering Permit from the Central Valley RWQCB. This comment does not pertain to the adequacy of the impact analysis; therefore, no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.

<b>D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix</b>			
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Reviewer Comments</b>	<b>Response Text</b>
22	<b>CA WA Board</b>	Regs for Compliance for Commercially Irrig Ag	This comment concerns regulatory compliance for commercially irrigated agriculture. The Project does not propose commercial irrigated agriculture production. This comment is noted, and therefore, no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary
23	<b>CA WA Board</b>	NPDES Permit– low or limited threat	This comment concerns the need for a Low or Limited Threat Discharge NPDES Permit. As discussed in Section 2.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, AMM HYD-3, the JPA will require the contractor to determine whether the volume of water from dewatering operations is covered under the NPDES Construction General Permit (GCP). However, if the volume is greater than the GCP allows, the contractor will obtain coverage under a NPDES Low or Threat Discharge and Dewatering Permit from the Central Valley RWQCB. This comment is noted, and no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
24	<b>SMUD</b>	Timing of construction: SMUD 69kV needed in 2019 for Cordova Hills Development	This comment concerns the timing of construction of the Project and SMUD's need to construct 69-kV facilities along Grant Line Road in 2019. As stated on page vi of the Draft IS/MND, construction of the Project is expected to commence in the summer of 2020 and would require 2 years to complete. The JPA will coordinate with SMUD on project scheduling. This comment is noted, and no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
25	<b>SMUD</b>	Correct SMUD transmission facilities to 'sub-transmission – not 'transmission' facilities. Add language about the existing 230 kV lines that cross PG&E's 230 kV transmission lines.	This comment concerns the mischaracterization of transmission facilities. Transmission on page 1-24 of Chapter 1, was revised to "sub-transmission" as requested by SMUD. Added text to describe the existing 230 kV line that crosses Grant Line Road, south of the PG&E 230 kV transmission lines, on page 2-230. No additional revisions are necessary.
26	<b>SMUD</b>	Additional text on page 2-331 2nd parag: SMUD will be constructing additional 69 kV electric subtransmission facilities along Grant Line Road from the existing 69 kV facilities near the American River Aggregate Substation southerly to Douglas Road and from the southern property of the Cordova Hills development to the existing 69 kV facilities near	This comment concerns SMUD's construction of a 69-kV sub-transmission line in the project area. The text provided by SMUD was not added to Section 2.18, Utilities and Service Systems because different revisions were discussed with SMUD on May 9, 2017. The text revisions to capture the description of the 69kV line at the American River Aggregate distribution substation was added per the discussion with SMUD. In addition, the JPA will coordinate with SMUD on placement of the future sub-transmission facilities. Therefore, the intent of this comment was addressed, but with different text modifications. The revisions made to the Final IS/MND are not substantive and do not change the environmental significance in the Final IS/MND. No further revisions are needed.

<b>D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix</b>			
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Reviewer Comments</b>	<b>Response Text</b>
		the intersection of Kiefer Road and Grant Line Road; schedule to be determined.	
27	<b>SMUD</b>	Visual section: show power lines placement along the easement as part of cross section	This comment concerns depicting the power lines along the easement as part of the cross section. A cross section showing potential location of SMUD facilities has been added to Chapter 1 (Figure 1-4). Section 2.1, Aesthetics Resources, presents simulations showing relocations that would be part of the D2 Expressway project. SMUDs request to illustrate future power lines are not within the JPA's responsibility and is considered a future foreseeable action. Future foreseeable actions are evaluated under the cumulative analysis, which in this case includes additional infrastructure projects, large development projects, and new power lines. These changes are assumed to follow the regional, local, and JPA design guidelines and as such would result in large changes but would not lower the visual quality of the area. The intent of the visual section is to analyze the impacts of the Project against the existing visual setting, which the visual simulations conveys. This comment does not pertain to the adequacy of the impact analysis; therefore, no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
28	<b>SMUD</b>	Acknowledge that SMUD service will be on both side of expressway	This comment concerns SMUD's construction of infrastructure on either side of Grant Line Road in the future. The JPA will continue to coordinate utility placement within and outside the Capital SouthEast Connector right-of-way. Currently, the intent is for power lines to be located on the east side of the roadway. The IS/MND considers utilities easement, but it does not assume responsibility for the action to install utilities. Utility installation activities are considered a new action and would require SMUD to develop a supplemental environmental review. The JPA will continue to work with SMUD on the placement and evaluation of installing utility corridors. Therefore, no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
29	<b>SMUD</b>	Consistent with its standard practice, SMUD will handle and relocate the pole-mounted transformers in compliance with appropriate state and federal regulations related to PCBs.	This comment concerns SMUD's intent to assume responsibility to handle and relocated the pole-mounted transformers. This comment is noted, and no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.

<b>D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix</b>			
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Reviewer Comments</b>	<b>Response Text</b>
30	<b>SMUD</b>	SMUD will avoid wetlands: As a steward of the community and environment, SMUD will evaluate the feasible options to minimize impacts incurred by construction of necessary infrastructure.	This comment concerns SMUD's intent to evaluate feasible options to minimize impacts to wetlands. This comment is noted, and no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.
31	<b>City of Rancho Cordova</b>	Correct residential #s for SunRidge and Westborough	<p>This comment concerns updating the planned residential units for SunRidge and Westborough. Land use assumptions were vetted with the project team and agency stakeholders at the beginning of the Project. These assumptions were documented our May 17, 2016, <i>Land Use Forecast Memorandum</i>. While it is inevitable that development plans have evolved over the past 12 months, it is not feasible to update the traffic study to reflect these modifications.</p> <p>Per the D2 Project traffic study, <i>“...it was agreed that Kimley-Horn would undertake a process to refine the existing SACOG forecast in a manner that could be reasonably justified based on readily available information and data. Specifically, this forecast is intended to reflect both realistic and achievable 2035 growth within the study area, and not necessarily circumstances that would be reflective of the full potential of the study area or an overly conservative approach such as a “worst-case” scenario. This approach is consistent with the desire that the land use forecast results in identified transportation infrastructure that would accommodate “normal growth” rather than the more overly burdensome and costly transportation infrastructure that could potentially be required if a more conservative approach was undertaken.”</i> As a result, even with slightly different project unit counts, it is unlikely that the incremental absorption that was assumed in the evaluation would change enough to alter the results of the study.</p>
32	<b>City of Rancho Cordova</b>	Bring Waegell family into the process	<p>This comment regards the review of the Draft IS/MND by the Waegell family. Publication of the availability of the Draft IS/MND was made known to the local public with the Notice of Intent that was announced in a local newspaper. The Draft IS/MND was available for review from March 31 through May 1 at the Rancho Cordova Library, City of Rancho Cordova, and on the JPA's website. Because the public review period has passed, the JPA will share the Final IS/MND with the Waegell family.</p> <p>The JPA is open to engaging with adjacent property owners upon request, and the Waegell family has been invited to regular meetings that the JPA has hosted with</p>



<b>D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix</b>			
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Reviewer Comments</b>	<b>Response Text</b>
			known planning and development entities within this Project limits. This comment is noted, and no change to the Draft IS/MND is necessary.
33	<b>City of Rancho Cordova</b>	Update trail language and note that during the Phase 2 Capital SE Connector effort (interchanges) that bike trail grade separations should be built at cross streets.	This comment concerns updating the Upper Laguna Creek Trail discussion. Section 2.15.2.5 Upper Laguna Creek Trail was updated with the suggested text provided by the City as well as the planned trail grade-separated undercrossing discrepancies highlighted in Chapter 1. The JPA noted the city's suggestion for Phase 2, which is to build bike trail grade separations at cross streets. The revisions made to the Draft IS/MND are not substantive, and do not change the environmental impact in the Final IS/MND. No further revisions are needed.
34	<b>City of Rancho Cordova</b>	Transit – recognize two updates to transit service plans	This comment concerns updating text related to the City of Rancho Cordova's 2006 Transit Master Plan and adding text regarding the Transit Plan for Cordova Hills. Chapter 1 of the Final IS/MND was updated to reflect the City's recommended elimination of the HOV or Exclusive Transit Lane and with new text to discuss the Cordova Hills Transit Plan. The revisions made to the Final IS/MND are not substantive, and do not change the environmental significance in the Final IS/MND. No further revisions are needed.
35	<b>City of Rancho Cordova</b>	ITS Fiber connection, CCTVs, and smart controllers should be included.	This comment concerns the City's recommendation to integrate the Project's traffic monitoring technologies into the regional intelligent transportation systems (ITS) planned by SACOG. As discussed in Chapter 1 page 34, the Project would include ITS technology considerations. ITS technologies applicable to this Project could include coordinated signal timing, traffic monitoring stations, closed circuit television cameras, changeable message signs, lane use signs, and transit signal priority to enhance traffic management and provide drivers with useful real-time traffic information to make informed decisions. The desire for the City to have regional integration through the upcoming SACOG Regional ITS Master Plan and the suggestion for Phase 1 Capital SouthEast Connector to include foundational ITS infrastructure are reflected in and supported by the ITS discussion. The JPA will coordinate with SACOG on proposed ITS solutions, as part of SACOG's update to its Regional ITS Master Plan. No change to the Final IS/MND is required.
36	<b>City of Rancho Cordova</b>	Include a SB375 analysis	This comment concerns the inclusion of a Sustainable Communities Act, SB 375 analysis; however, the comment is assumed to be referring to SB 743 (Steinberg. Environmental quality: transit oriented infill projects, judicial review streamlining for environmental leadership development projects, and entertainment and sports center in the City of Sacramento) within which transportation analyses under CEQA are

<b>D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix</b>			
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Reviewer Comments</b>	<b>Response Text</b>
			<p>anticipated to shift to a use of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) instead of level of service (LOS).                      SB 375 requires CARB to set regional emissions reduction targets from passenger vehicles. The municipal planning organization for each region must then develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that integrates transportation, land use, and housing policies to plan emission target reduction in the region. The SB 375 also focuses on reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and urban sprawl by encouraging project that reduce VMT.</p> <p>In 2016, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) released the approved 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. Table 2.11-3 of the Draft IS/MND shows the project is consistent with SACOG's 2016 MTC/SCS policies. Because this project would provide the transportation infrastructure needed for planned development in the City of Rancho Cordova and Sacramento County and improve LOS, a vehicle miles traveled analysis is not required.</p> <p>Along with the fact that the entire Capital SouthEast Connector Project was previously cleared environmentally with a Programmatic EIR, the PEIR had a broader study area and higher projected traffic volume; as a result, the decision was made by the Project team to not perform this VMT analysis. The Project's environmental document is consistent with current CEQA requirements and fulfills all necessary traffic evaluation components. This comment is noted, and no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.</p>
37	<b>City of Rancho Cordova</b>	Centennial Dr is unlikely by 2025 and Douglas signal completed in 2017.	<p>This comment concerns the timing and development of connecting roadway infrastructure and how they differ from the assumptions in the IS/MND.                      Please note that the interim year (2025) roadway network assumptions were primarily based on the land use assumptions that had been vetted by the JPA project team with review by the JPA member agencies. It was necessary, based on the amount of development assumed to have occurred by 2025, to make reasonable assumptions for the developments' connectivity to the surrounding and regional transportation network. The network assumptions reflected in the traffic analysis are considered to be reasonable and appropriate based on the location and amount of growth assumed; therefore, no change to the Final IS/MND is necessary.</p>

<b>D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix</b>			
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Reviewer Comments</b>	<b>Response Text</b>
38	<b>City of Rancho Cordova</b>	Replace permit # with R5-2016-0040 and drainage includes: detention basins, water quality swales, culverts, etc. and the type of facilities approved by each of the jurisdiction?	This comment regards the revision of the MS4 NPDES permit number and clarification of which permit conditions apply to project areas that are in both the City's and County's jurisdiction. Section 2.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, was updated to reflect the new permit number provided by the City. Further, it was clarified that areas under the City's and County's jurisdiction, would comply with the most stringent permit conditions and approval would be required by both entities. This is acknowledged as a requirement of the normal development permit process. No changes to the Final IS/MND are needed.
39	<b>City of Rancho Cordova</b>	A low-profile noise wall characterized in the MND would have little effect in reducing noise on future sensitive receptors along the corridor and visual simulations showing the alignment without noise walls does not accurately depict future conditions along the alignment.	This comment concerns the characterization of retaining walls and noise walls in the Draft IS/MND. As stated in the Draft IS/MND, retaining walls are proposed to avoid impacts to properties and wetlands, and noise walls are proposed to reduce the effects of noise on residences. The key views and simulations in Section 2.1, Aesthetic Resources are not in locations where the noise walls would be visible; however, the noise wall and retaining wall would be required to conform to the JPA's design guidelines outlined in AMM VIS-1, which require use of relief and context-appropriate color tones and adherence to local design standards. Although the visual simulations do not depict the retaining and noise walls, the Draft IS/MND did evaluate the potential for noise walls as they would be required to mitigate for project noise. Future planned noise walls as part of future development are not considered. Future development will have to evaluate noise walls associated with their development as part of their CEQA review.  includes design boundaries to avoid and minimize potential visual impacts. This comment is noted, and revision to the Final IS/MND is not required.

<b>D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix</b>			
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Reviewer Comments</b>	<b>Response Text</b>
40	<b>City of Rancho Cordova</b>	Additionally, while implementation of mitigation measure AMM VIS-1 would improve the visual character of the noise walls themselves, the views from project alignment would differ substantially from those shown in the simulations in the MND in that views of the surrounding lands would be blocked where walls are eventually constructed.	<p>This comment concerns views of the surrounding lands with the noise walls. The commenter acknowledges that the proposed avoidance and minimization measure VIS-1 would improve the visual character of the noise walls. Figure 2.1-1, Key View Locations shows the four key viewpoints considered in the impact analysis. The four key viewpoint were chosen because they represent key project elements as well as new intersections. Figure 2.12-4, Noise Modeling Receiver Locations, shows all the receivers considered in the noise analysis, and Figures 2.12-5 through Figure 2.12-7 show the location of the proposed noise walls. Review of these figures shows that the proposed noise walls are not within the key viewpoints described in the Aesthetics Section, and therefore are not in the visual simulations. The evaluation in Section 2.1, Aesthetic Resource, is correct. Furthermore, while the noise walls were not in the simulations (which serve as a tool to provide validation to the reader), the visual analyst did consider the noise walls and make the determination that while the Project would change the landscape, the visual quality would not be substantially degraded. The Project proposes three noise walls. Noise wall 1 would be located along the front of a house, but it would not block a scenic vista or historic resource. Noise wall 2 would be located on acquired property, behind existing structures or at least 100 feet from the edge of pavement. Similar to noise wall 1, noise wall 3 would block views of a property from the highway, but it would not block a scenic vista or historic resource.</p> <p>Furthermore, as acknowledged by the City of Rancho Cordova, implementation of AMM VIS-1 would improve the visual character of the noise walls by incorporating context-appropriate color tones and adhering to local design standards to maintain consistency with the project area. This comment is noted, and revision to the Final IS/MND is not required.</p>

<b>D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix</b>			
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Reviewer Comments</b>	<b>Response Text</b>
41	<b>City of Rancho Cordova</b>	MM Noise-A on MND page 2-282 requires construction of three sound walls (12-feet, 14-feet, and 16-feet tall) that are inconsistent with the assumptions in the aesthetics discussion. The aesthetics discussion needs to analyze the walls that would be required to mitigate the noise impacts disclosed in the MND. Also, the developers generally need to construct sound walls adjacent to residential uses along arterial streets to mitigate noise due to traffic. Probably no sound walls are needed adjacent to the wetlands	This comment regards the need to analyze the noise walls in the Aesthetics Resources section. The Project proposes to use retaining walls to avoid impacts to wetlands, not noise walls. Considering the terrain, retaining walls would be low profile and frequently not seen from the roadway. Refer to the response to comment #40.
42			Need to add the AQ/GGH updates from Monday (IS and App H), as well as the MND determination/acceptance to front matter and Section 3.7 to the subsequent rows

<b>D2 IS-MND Public Comment Matrix</b>			
<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Reviewer Comments</b>	<b>Response Text</b>
43			