

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: DELLINGER, PAT

Comments regarding the
Folsom Dam Road Access Restriction Plan EIS

Written comments can be submitted tonight at the Comment Table or are due to the Bureau of Reclamation by close of business on Monday, January 18, 2005.

If you do not submit your comments tonight, please mail them to the address on the back, or fax your comments to 916 989-7208, or e-mail your comments to rschroeder@mp.usbr.gov. Thank you.

(Please print clearly)

Name Pat Dellinger

Organization and Address 471 Parker, Folsom, CA 95630

Phone () _____ FAX () _____ E-mail _____

Comment here: 1-7-05
Date

I have rental property at 1012 Bidwell & when necessary to go there I find it almost impossible some days. Please re-open the Dam Road.

Thanks,
Pat Dellinger

All comments become part of the public record.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

RESPONSE: DELLINGER, PAT

Dellinger-1

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

COMMENT: WILSON, RAEH


January 8, 2005

Bureau of Reclamation
Central California Area Office
7794 Folsom Dam Road
Folsom, CA 95630-1799

Attn: Robert Schroeder

DATE	TIME	BY	REMARKS
JAN 11 2005			

In comment to your article in the Sacto Bee re: the Folsom Dam Road, I have lived in Rancho Cordova for many years and have experienced many floods. Due to the terrorist threat it would be foolish and wrong to re-open the Folsom Dam Road just for the convenience of people who wish to take that route to work, living downstream thousands of people, animals, etc. would be completely wiped out if an terrorist act should occur.

Sincerely,

Raeh Wilson

RESPONSE: WILSON, RAEH

Wilson-1

The commenter's opinion that Folsom Dam Road should remain closed is noted.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: RIEDINGER, MICHAEL

January 11, 2005

United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation
Central California Area Office
7794 Folsom Dam Road
Folsom, CA 95630

Re: Folsom Dam Road Access Restriction Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The following is in response to your EIS documentation. Upon review of your statement I find many areas where Major impacts are either not addressed or dismissed a not an issue. The lacking information in the report is bordering on a cover-up and the conclusions are flawed and in error. Many of the assumptions are in error and the reasoning behind the closure is inconclusive and unsupported by the bureaus actions.

Before reviewing the impacts I would first like to address the closure action itself. The bureau has tried for many years to eliminate the public roadway use over the dam. The fact that the State of California did not see the need to establish a state highway over the dam when it was constructed does not justify the fact that the roadway is not needed for public access. When the dam was constructed, there were 4 crossings over the American River that were flooded by the lake. There was an agreement that the dam road would be used as a replacement until such time that a new bridge at the dam be constructed. This has yet to occur. In research, this agreement has either been "lost" by the federal government or the agencies simply agreed verbally to do this. Verbal agreements between agencies were common place at the time of the dam construction. If bureau would take the time to review this with the former city fathers, this would be addressed. It is my belief that the bureau is bound by this agreement as a legal and binding agreement and needs to honor that agreement. Allow the use of the dam until the bridge is constructed!

I look at the "security" threats to the dam as idle threats and not real issues. While there may be a "top secret report" on the safety of the dam, I do question its accuracy. If there really was a true security problem, the bureau would have acted far differently in addressing the dam security. A few points of example:

- When the dam was initially closed, there were no guards posted that would have been capable in stopping a vehicle that wanted to get onto the dam for the purpose of terrorist activities. In my judgment, that is still the case today. A terrorist hell bent on creating a problem would simply drive through barricades and not stop at a gate because it's locked.
- It was only recently that moves have been taken to protect the earthen dike structures from activities. But even today a vehicle could drive up to the base of the dike at Mormon Island. If there were a serious risk from terrorist activities, this would have been immediately addressed at the time of the closure and not be

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

possible today. If there really is a threat, the bureau's inaction borders on criminal negligence.

- The guards that "patrol" the gate on the southerly end of the dam road have not been at their post when vandalism has occurred both on the dam structure and in areas around the dam. It shows that the dam is open to those on foot getting to the dam structures which again shows, the bureau is not serious about protecting the dam.
- When a look is taken at the physics of a car laden explosive, there is a serious question if the dam is at risk at all. An explosion will go up and out and not down into the structure. I question if there is a real risk to the structure. The dam itself is constructed like a bunker and probably would resist a nuclear explosion let alone a car of truck bomb. The earthen dikes are the real risk if there is one. Where the road traverses over the dam, I don't believe there is a major risk. Again, explosions travel up and out. There would be some damage that could be protected from by adding concrete to the top of the roadbed. I did ask the question of a bureau employee that should know about these things and the comment came back that we didn't look at that possibility. This should be one of the options added to the EIS since it would be quantifiable and a way to mitigate the impact.
- The September 11 attacks were by aircraft, and that may be the only way to harm the dam, yet there is no protection from an airborne attack. If the government sees the dam as an essential structure that needs to be protected at all cost, the airspace around the dam would be closed and some type of protection would be in place. I question why this is. I also question why the areas on the lake adjacent to the dam and the dikes on the lake have not been closed to boat traffic. Again the bureaus lack of action either proves the department is out of touch and unwilling to protect the people of Sacramento or there really isn't a risk.

I judge after looking at these items, the real reason why the dam is closed, is because the bureau can. It's all a matter of one government agency acting like a spoiled possessive child, it's mine and you can't have it! Last I heard, the dam belonged to the citizens of the United States and not the Bureau of Reclamation. It needs to open again to the citizens.

The City of Folsom has proposed several security measures that can be done to allow the dam to re-open. But these suggestions have fallen on deaf ears. Should any of these items be implemented, the costs needs to be addressed as an economic impact to the community unless the federal government will handle the security or pay the complete costs. This economic impact is not addressed in the EIS.

Now that that's addressed let me review impacts that are not addressed in the EIS.

First are the hours of closure noted in the alternatives. Due to the active community Folsom is, traffic begins to drastically increase at about 2:30 PM as parents begin to travel to pick up students from school. The traffic gets sever at 3:00 PM as schools let out. From then on, parents are taking kids to soccer practice and ballet and further creating traffic problems as they mix with the commute traffic. The dam needs to open during these times

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

3 to allow parents one more way to cross the river and not impact our neighborhoods with severe traffic backups and air pollution. The EIS needs to look at traffic patterns and address different hours of opening including moving the afternoon hours from 2:45 to 7 PM. This needs to be addressed in the EIS.

4 The closure of the dam has changed the culture of the area. Yet there is no mention of this in the EIS. People living on the north side of the river go out of their way now to not come over the river on the 2 remaining bridges during certain times of the day. Instead they shop in other communities and choose business professionals such as dentist and accountants in areas other than Folsom. What was once a close-knit community has now become a city divided due to the dam closure. The town "feels" different. The citizens act different. Even church communities are seeing this. Church members won't venture across the river for evening meetings, they complain that it's too difficult to get across the river. People won't go out to dinner with friends that live on the other side of the river, because it's too difficult. This needs to be addressed in the EIS.

5 In parts of the document it's noted that the business failures that we blame on the dam closure are a result of a downturn in the economy. First of all, I doubt if President Bush and his advisors would appreciate this comment after they have professed that the economy is healthy and growing. In actuality, the economy in the area has been growing strongly over the past few years. Several businesses have failed as a direct result of the dam closure and the added traffic it has caused, making it difficult and undesirable to cross the river. Other businesses have had to lay off employees or cut back on improvements. This is having a domino effect through the business community and the micro economy that is not addressed in the EIS.

6 There are also hidden costs to the governing agencies. There is a loss of sales tax dollars to the City of Folsom, since people are shopping elsewhere. Though difficult to quantify, this needs to be addressed. There are added costs to the city in manpower and transportation costs due to greatly increased travel times to get to the other side of the river. This needs to be addressed in the EIS. There are also added costs to the school district in transportation costs that aren't dealt with properly in the EIS.

7 The issue of traffic is glossed over and even noted that the bureau has no responsibility to do anything about it. Some 17,000 added cars per day choke our roadways and neighborhoods from the pre-closure days. In a small community such as Folsom, that is a significant impact that needs to be addressed in the EIS. It IS the bureau's responsibility to do something about it and now. This is a major impact not only in traffic, but added commute times, economic impact to the individual motorist and ruining the quality of our neighborhood. But none of this is addressed in the EIS. When a commute time goes from 15 minutes one day to 45 minutes the next as it has with Intel employees that live in American River Canyon North, that has a far reaching impact on the community, yet, it's not covered. This needs to be addressed in the EIS.

8 For the citizens that used to cross the dam on a daily basis, plus those who would cross it just to see the lake, this scenic vista has been taken for us. We can't just go for a drive

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

and see the lake. This is an impact that affects the entire region. This needs to be addressed in the EIS.

9 Air quality is another item that is not adequately covered. Folsom has the unfortunate location of receiving the air pollution of the Bay Area. When you add in an additional 17,000 cars into our neighborhoods and taking 3 times longer than normal to get through because of the traffic issues created by the dam closure, you create significant impacts to the localized neighborhoods. Yet there is no measurements of this impact and mention of the severe problems it creates for young families with children and our elderly. To put in simply, you are doing the terrorists jobs for them and killing us. This one issue alone is enough to require the dam to be reopened, the impacts are that severe. This needs to be addressed in the EIS.

10 Another issue the bureau has been addressing for years is the earthquake stability of the dike structures. With all the seismic instability in California, I wonder if a natural disaster is more of a possibility than a terrorist activity. In short I look at this whole closure as a smoke screen to close the road so the bureau can have unfettered access over the structure. I would think the bureau would like to have 17,000 pairs of eyes handling security on the dam. The traffic over the dam would allow the community to watch out for problems, and with all the cell phones people have, it could very quickly be reported. If the bureau can't handle the dam security then maybe the City of Folsom should completely block all roads leading to the dam and only allow the bureau partial access during say midnight and 4 AM.

Sincerely:

Michael Riedinger
Architect
189 Wellfleet Cir.
Folsom, CA 95630

RESPONSE: RIEDINGER, MICHAEL

Riedinger-1

With the exception of intermittent road closures that were necessary for dam rehabilitation or maintenance, Reclamation has kept Folsom Dam Road open to the public since its construction in the 1950s. Although Reclamation is not aware of any agreement that was entered into to keep the road open to the public until such time that a bridge is built, Reclamation recognizes the importance of the road to local communities. Sections 1.2.1 and 1.2.3 of the EIS describe the road's function as an important traffic artery.

The closure of Folsom Dam Road in February 2003 was an emergency action taken upon the recommendation of independent security assessments of Reclamation's facilities between 2001

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

and 2002. The objective of the February 2003 closure was to provide immediate security to Folsom Dam facilities.

Riedinger-2

Security reviews of all of Reclamation's facilities, including Folsom Dam facilities, were commissioned by Reclamation but carried out by well-qualified, independent entities. Among the recommendations made in the assessments, closing Folsom Dam Road to public access was a top priority. Although details of the analyses cannot be divulged due to their sensitive nature, Folsom Dam facilities were noted as being among the most vulnerable of Reclamation's dams and reservoirs in the western United States.

Reclamation has been consistent with respect to the level of protection afforded to all of the dam structures. Prior to the February 2003 road closure, temporary barriers were installed on earthen dikes and the Mormon Island Auxiliary Dam. The temporary barriers were positioned to prevent motor vehicle access to the crests of these structures but allow pedestrian and bicycle access to trails. Local fire departments and the California Department of Parks and Recreation were notified in advance of the placement of barriers.

Recent construction activity on the earth embankment dam and dikes is intended to: (1) allow for improved security patrol of the earth embankments, (2) allow California Department of Parks and Recreation personnel (park rangers) to patrol and respond to issues that develop in the State recreation area, (3) allow for emergency vehicle access to attend to medical emergencies and grass fires, (4) allow Reclamation to more efficiently perform monthly Safety of Dam inspections, (5) continue to allow public pedestrian use of the established trail systems, and (6) provide effective vehicle barriers that are more visually pleasing than the unattractive concrete barriers.

On Folsom Dam Road, Reclamation has blocked off public access based on security recommendations. In addition to installing physical barriers, Reclamation has stationed patrols to monitor entry points. Reclamation is unaware of any security breaches at these locations. For a discussion of other forms of access to Folsom Dam facilities, see Master Response to Comment-3.

Upon review, adding concrete to the top of the roadbed was not considered as a viable alternative to controlling access on Folsom Dam Road because it would not provide adequate security. Furthermore, extensive engineering studies and design and environmental reviews would be required before such a plan could be implemented.

Riedinger-3

The City of Folsom proposed alternatives to reopen Folsom Dam Road to public vehicles during peak morning and evening commute hours, as maximum congestion and traffic-related impacts occurred during these times. The City also proposed features to limit exposure to security risks while the road is open to public access. Restricted Access Alternative 2 and Restricted Access Alternative 3, which are analyzed in the EIS, incorporate the key features of the City's proposal. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

The differences between the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2 and Restricted Access Alternative 3 include the duration for which access to Folsom Dam Road is permitted and the directional flow of traffic. Section 2.2 provides a detailed description of each alternative. The "peak periods" reviewed in the EIS analysis were 6 AM to 9 AM and 4 PM to 7 PM for the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2 and 6 AM to 8 AM and 4 PM to 6 PM for Restricted Access Alternative 3. These hours of operation were selected based on peak-hour traffic volumes and the City's proposed alternatives.

The alternatives analyzed cover a range of impacts from the No Action Alternative scenario to the long-term closure scenario. Therefore, any adjustment to the hours of operation under the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2 and Restricted Access Alternative 3 would shift impacts within the range of impacts analyzed in the EIS. For example, if the road is open from 8 AM to 11 AM and 6 PM to 9 PM under the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, there would likely be additional economic benefit to local businesses and service providers. However, traffic delays and related impacts would continue to be adversely affected during earlier commute hours when a larger volume of vehicles is on the roads. Alternatively, if the hours of operation are extended beyond 3 hours, there would be an increase in daily traffic volumes as more vehicles could pass through the roadways. Additional inspection capabilities would be required for the extended hours. Nevertheless, the impacts would remain within the range of impacts analyzed. Therefore, Reclamation can adjust the hours of operation in the Record of Decision without additional environmental review.

The cost of implementing the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2 or Restricted Access Alternative 3 cannot be estimated because the exact nature and design of vehicle inspections have not yet been defined. As noted above, the alternatives analyzed would have a range of impacts. The exact cost would depend on characteristics such as hours of operation, number of inspection stations required, personnel requirements, engineering and design, and construction requirements. The "incidence" of the costs (that is, who pays) may have a local or regional economic impact. At one extreme, if all security costs are borne by local government agencies, the net regional effect, if all other factors remain unchanged, would be a reallocation of government funds among uses. At the other extreme, if all security costs are borne by nonlocal entities, the payment of those costs represents an injection of new economic activity to the area.

Riedinger-4

The commenter notes that road closure has had an impact on the culture of the local communities, including choices people make and the sense of community people feel. For further discussion of these effects, see Master Response to Comment-1.

Riedinger-5

A number of businesses located on roadways that were affected by changes in traffic patterns following the February 2003 road closure were surveyed for the EIS analysis. As emphasized in Section 3.4.2, changes in traffic patterns caused by the road closure was cited as one of the contributing factors for a number of businesses that experienced a decline in revenues. However, the exact economic impact of the road closure on business revenues will vary from business to business. In order to isolate this impact, furthermore, the analysis would have to control for

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

factors such as ongoing commercial growth in the area and business competition, industry-specific trends, changes in demand, cost of goods and services, and other business-specific issues such as cost of property rental or the retirement of an owner/operator. Section 3.4.2 provides a detailed discussion of the range of impacts reported by individual businesses. These impacts are summarized in Table 3.4-9. The sales impacts identified reflect loss of projected sales revenues. Therefore, they account for reduction in business size and lower-than-anticipated growth. The information provided by businesses was correlated with data provided by the City of Folsom.

Riedinger-6

As noted in Section 3.4.2, population and commercial growth in Folsom have occurred primarily in areas outside of downtown for several years. Although there would be variations among businesses, it is possible that the businesses in these recently developed areas have drawn customers away from Folsom's historic district and nearby neighborhoods affected by changes in traffic patterns. In the area most immediately impacted by closure of Folsom Dam Road, the extent to which declines have been offset by increases in business and sales taxes in other parts of the city cannot be characterized in general economic terms. Impacts would have to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

It is noteworthy, however, that taxable retail sales in Folsom increased by 8.2 percent from calendar year 2002 to calendar year 2003, based on a California Board of Equalization report issued after the Draft EIS was completed (see <http://www.boe.ca.gov/news/tsalescont.htm>; data for later periods are not yet available). Consequently, the data do not support that the city has experienced net losses in sales tax revenue because of the closure of Folsom Dam Road. Some commenters have noted a decline in other forms of tax revenue to the city, such as the Hotel Occupancy Tax. To the extent that economic losses are not offset by gains elsewhere within the city, there would be a reduction in net revenue to the City of Folsom. In order to accurately describe these impacts and establish trends, more data for periods following the road closure would be required. These data were not available for the economic analysis in the EIS.

Riedinger-7

To the extent that data were available, changes in daily traffic volumes from pre-February 2003 to post-closure (with and without the Folsom Historic District Traffic Calming Program) are shown in Table 3.1-2. The increases are factored into the analysis of congestion and delays associated with the action alternatives, although delays will vary depending on the trip (from origin to destination) taken by individuals (as in the commenter's example of Intel employees who live in American River Canyon North). The results of the analysis are broken down by type of impact and study year and are presented in Section 3.1.2. The anticipated changes in roadway operations are described in terms of changes in Levels of Service and are shown in Tables 3.1-5 and 3.1-9. These tables and the associated discussions clearly identify the roadway segments where adverse traffic impacts would occur.

Since impacts to resources including air quality, noise, social and economic conditions, recreation, and public services were attributed largely to changes in traffic patterns, the traffic analysis was used to address impacts to these resource areas. Therefore, the impact of traffic on other resources was taken into account throughout the EIS analysis.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

Riedinger-8

For a discussion of impacts to the charm of the area, see Master Response to Comment-1.

Riedinger-9

Section 3.2.2 of the EIS describes the impacts on air quality as a result of additional miles traveled by vehicles in the Folsom area. The difference in emissions is less than 1 pound per day across the Folsom regional area for most pollutants (reactive organic gases, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides and particulate matter) and 4.7 pounds per day for carbon monoxide for the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2.

Predicted maximum CO concentrations (existing CO monitored levels plus the predicted worst-case increase with Long-Term Closure Alternative traffic changes) were calculated at 8.6 to 9.9 ppm for the 1-hour measurement period. (The California standard is 20 ppm for CO, and the Federal standard is 35 ppm.) For the 8-hour measurement period, the predicted maximum CO levels range from 5.3 to 6.2 ppm (the California and Federal standard for CO is 9 ppm). These levels are well below the applicable standards. Therefore, the analysis concluded that implementation of any of the proposed action alternatives would not cause any exceedances or add to any exceedances of the ambient air quality standards for oxides of nitrogen, particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in diameter, and ozone.

Although Reclamation recognizes that air quality may be temporarily affected to a greater extent in areas experiencing high levels of congestion during a short period of time, the analysis demonstrates that the predicted worst-case concentrations would not result in exceedances of Federal or State standards and would not present sustained risks to public health.

Riedinger-10

The issue of the seismic stability of the dam facilities is separate from the proposed action. Although projects related to seismic stability are described in Section 3.11.2 as related projects that would contribute to cumulative impacts, they do not affect the purpose and need for the proposed action and are therefore not analyzed as part of the EIS. If, and as, actions are taken that would require modifications to the dam facilities, appropriate environmental review will be conducted.

Riedinger-11

The EIS discusses the potential effects of reopening Folsom Dam Road during peak commute hours with special security measures under two alternatives, Restricted Access Alternative 2 and Restricted Access Alternative 3. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. As noted in Sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3, a key element of the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2 and Restricted Access Alternative 3 is that a security review would be required of every vehicle using the road. In order to achieve the City of Folsom's volume goals for traffic flow through inspection stations and across Folsom Dam, the average time required to inspect vehicles on-site would have to be minimized. Therefore, the restricted access alternatives would incorporate the use of permits or prescreening of vehicles before access to the road is allowed. This proposed system relies on a one-time

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

inspection of a vehicle with limited random searches on-site. Reclamation recognizes that this design and proposed operation is important to achieve the desired traffic flow.

COMMENT: WELLS, RUSS AND LINDA

JAN. 13, 05

DEAR MR. Robert Schroeder,
Our suggestion for the partial opening of the dam road. Is to charge a toll for crossing. You could charge A fifty cent toll to cross the road from either direction. Opening the Road during the rush hour commute in the morning and early evening. And also maybe opening it during the weekend day times.

By charging the toll, it will help pay for the security guards and help pay for the new bridge.

Time is money and people are willing to pay to be to work on time.

THANK YOU,
Diana Lynn Wells

RESPONSE: WELLS, RUSS AND LINDA

Wells-1

The commenters' opinion that Folsom Dam Road should be reopened during peak commute hours with special security measures is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

A toll for the use of Folsom Dam Road is not under consideration. Whether a toll charge, if required, would completely offset the cost of implementing these alternatives has not been analyzed.

COMMENT: RUANA, VIRGINIA

January 13, 2005

Bureau of Reclamation
Central California Office
7794 Folsom Dam Road
Folsom, CA 95630

ATTN: Robert Schroeder

I must express my opinions regarding the Folsom Dam Road closure. The published e-mail address for your office is incorrect so I don't know how many replies you will receive that way.

DO NOT reopen the Dam Road. I know that opinion is in direct opposition to those of most Folsom residents however the reason for closing it should take precedence. We are probably more inconvenienced than most as we live on the east end of Cimmaron Hill, opposite the prison land and have a hard time entering Natoma from our neighborhood without a traffic light.

We have resided in Folsom for 25 years and know that Folsom's major traffic problems are not related to the Dam Road closure. The traffic issues have always been on the "back burner" and have just recently started to be major problems. The closure of the Dam Road has just been a good place to put the blame. Street closures, lack of enforcing traffic laws, not proper planning for through streets and growth without a good traffic plan are the real problems.

There must be proper regards for people and property downstream rather than a few minor minutes of inconvenience to some Folsom residents and those further up the hill in El Dorado County.


If you were to reopen the road with good inspections and heightened security they would all find that the traffic would flow slower and even bog down causing more inconvenience that they now have. The complaints of course would continue.

We will survive a couple of minutes extra on our commutes and look forward to a new bridge and some extra traffic planning. Right now for the city it only seems to be closing more streets and causing more problems as they rush into increasing the development of the city. Growth is fine with proper planning.

When they developed the Broadstone Mall they T-ed Riley Street (which should have been a business thoroughfare) right into the back of the mall forcing traffic back to Bidwell, the only main business street in the city. Rather than creating a residential neighborhood on Riley it could have been done properly with some thought to traffic flow. That is just another example of their poor planning.

I know the Bureau has taken a lot of heat and Folsom has spent a lot of money trying to put pressure into reopening the dam road but I have faith that the proper measures were taken with the original decision to close it.

Sincerely,



Virginia R. Ruana
206 Saddle Court
Folsom, CA 95630

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

RESPONSE: RUANA, VIRGINIA

Ruana-1

The commenter's opinion that Folsom Dam Road should remain closed is noted.

COMMENT: CAMPBELL, CAROL

>>> "Carol Campbell" <CCampbel@fcusd.k12.ca.us> 1/13/2005 9:25:08 AM >>>
Dear Mr. Schroeder,

- 1 [As a taxpayer and 20-year resident of Folsom, I am requesting that the Folsom Dam Road be re-opened for community traffic. If that is not possible at this time, then please assist in opening it during morning and evening commute hours. Folsom has changed from a town in which you could run out for groceries after work, do some shopping, attend local events. Now, as soon as I leave for home, I make sure I don't stop at any local merchants or plan any return to town due to the traffic I'd have to endure. I live 5 miles from work, and that "commute" used to take me about 6 minutes...it now takes me close to a half hour in the morning, and 45 minutes at night.
- 2 [

- 3 [While I appreciate the interest in "national security", I also know that more populated transportation structures, and therefore, more likely targets of terrorism, i.e., the Bay Bridge, the Golden Gate Bridge, are still open to the public. Let common sense prevail.

Thanks for your help.

Carol Campbell
100 Lost Lake Ct
Folsom, CA 95630

RESPONSE: CAMPBELL, CAROL

Campbell, C.-1

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road, if only for morning and evening commute hours, is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Campbell, C.-2

Traffic delays following the closure of Folsom Dam Road are discussed in Sections 3.1.1.3 and 3.1.2. Note that delays were calculated based on roadway segments and routes modeled in the traffic analysis. They may differ from individual experiences because of the specific trip taken (from origin to destination).

Campbell, C.-3

See Master Response to Comment-3 for a discussion of the security basis for the road closure.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

COMMENT: BOUCK, STEVEN

>>> Steven Bouck <StevenB@WasteConnections.com> 1/14/2005 4:48:12 PM >>>

- 1 [Dear Mr. Schroeder - I am writing to implore you to re-open the Folsom Dam Road. This road is a vital part of the local transportation infrastructure and its closure has caused congestion, inconvenience and huge amounts of wasted hours sitting traffic.

- 2 [We are all cognizant that it was closed as a security precaution following the September 11th attacks. However, based on many studies going back to the World War Two, detonation of an explosive device on the top of a dam is unlikely to cause catastrophic failure unless there is some inherent existing structural issue with the Dam. As such it is not a real security threat. Security concerns could be further reduced if the road was only open during certain high traffic times, although my preference would be for unrestricted access.

I work in Folsom and would be at risk in the event of a breach. If opening the road will increase that risk, I am willing to live with it. Please re-open the road.

Sincerely,

Steve Bouck

RESPONSE: BOUCK, STEVEN

Bouck-1

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road is noted. The EIS discusses traffic effects of the road closure in Sections 3.1.1.3 and 3.1.2.

Bouck-2

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road at least during the commute hours as a security precaution is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

COMMENT: FIELD, SUE

>>> LARRY FIELD <sueatbrightbegin@sbeglobal.net> 1/14/2005 3:27:51 PM >>>

1 [As a small business person doing business in Folsom and surrounding communities, I have found the dam road closure to be more than a slight inconvenience. The time that I waste traveling through the congested streets of Folsom could be much more profitable by the simple compute over the Folsom Dam. I have decided not to do business in Roseville because of the length of time it now takes me to get there. It breaks my heart to see the struggles and often failures of small businesses in Folsom because of this closure. Please understand that I support our government in its quest for homeland security but feel that a plan that benefits the people who work and live in Folsom needs to be re-evaluated. Thank you for your consideration.

Most sincerely,
Sue Field, owner
Bright Beginnings
"Your Friendly Neighborhood Welcoming Service"
(916) 967-7039

RESPONSE: FIELD, SUE

Field-1

The commenter's opinions are noted. The EIS discusses traffic delays and congestion in Section 3.1.2 and business and community impacts in Section 3.4.2.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

COMMENT: GOODWIN, TOM

>>> tom goodwin <tgoodwin@macnexus.org> 1/14/2005 6:41:30 PM >>>

1 [Mr. Schroeder. I am a sailor that would like the Folsom Dam road opened. i sail in Folsom Lake and it would be better for me to drive around the city of Folsom to the entrance than thru it as i have been doing. It might help to lessen the congestion that is happening now. signed tom.

tom goodwin
8708 #d Woodman Way,
Sacramento, CA, 95826.

RESPONSE: GOODWIN, TOM

Goodwin-1

The commenter's suggestion regarding access to Folsom Lake is noted. Impacts to recreational use of the lake and its marinas are discussed in Section 3.8.2.

COMMENT: HOLMES, KAREN

>>> <KiKiHansen@aol.com> 1/14/2005 4:28:37 PM >>>

Dear Mr. Schroeder,
1 [In regard to the possibility of opening the Folsom Dam during commuter hours, yes, please. I opened my business in the Historic District of Folsom two weeks prior to the dam closure. I am unclear of the impact the dam road closure has had on my business because we weren't here long enough to be able to measure the difference. However, I live very close to this area, and commute home through the traffic each night. Relieving that traffic should be a priority for the immediate future. The quality of life, the impact on our immediate environment, and the discontent of the population here should be weighed. The dam road is a vital passageway, and once there is an alternative, great, close the dam. But in the meantime, a bit of relief for our nature, our roadways, and our population would be welcome. Sincerely, Karen Holmes, Karens Bakery Cafe and Catering Kitchen
2 [
3 [

RESPONSE: HOLMES, KAREN

Holmes-1

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road during commute hours is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

Holmes-2 and -3

Reclamation's decision to close Folsom Dam Road in February 2003 was an emergency security action, as described in Section 1.2. Reopening the road immediately is evaluated in the EIS as the No Action Alternative. Reopening the road under the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2 or Restricted Access Alternative 3 would require time to implement additional security measures and facilities.

Reclamation notes the comment that the discontent and quality of life of the community should be weighed. See Master Response to Comment-1.

COMMENT: NECE, KAREN

>>> "Karen Nece" <knece@softcom.net> 1/14/2005 2:51:51 PM >>>

1 I live in Orangevale and am a member of the Folsom Chamber of Commerce. Even though I know the City is pushing us all to tell you to open the Dam Road I writing to ask you **to leave it closed**. If you open it again Folsom will never deal with and fix their own traffic problems. The City has severe traffic congestion problem going into town over the Rainbow Bridge. But if you open the Dam Road they will just put off fixing their problems. Though it does seem pretty stupid to have built the New Folsom Bridge and then to cut off all the traffic that made it necessary.

Thanks
Karen Bramlett Nece
NECE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
916-987-8105

RESPONSE: NECE, KAREN

Nece-1

The comment that Folsom Dam Road should remain closed to force the City of Folsom to solve its traffic issues is noted. Sections 3.1.1.2 and 3.4 of the EIS describe how the populations of Folsom and nearby communities have substantially increased and how the functionality and operations of the primary arterial roadways in the area have declined over the past decade.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: SCOTT-SKILLMAN, THELMA

>>> "Scott-Skillman, Thelma" <Scottst@flc.losrios.edu> 1/14/2005 2:05:44 PM >>>

1 Hello: This email is being sent to expressly request the reopening of the Folsom Dam Road in Folsom, CA. As president of Folsom Lake College, the local community college, a large number of our students live, work, and/or attend two other community colleges within close proximity to Folsom Lake College. Students will typically travel between colleges to obtain the necessary courses needed to complete their degrees and enhance their skills to better their lives and be more productive citizens.

2 The closure of the Dam Road has negatively impacted traffic and travel time on the connecting streets/roads used to commute between three local community colleges: Folsom Lake College, Sierra College, and American River College. Students are becoming increasingly frustrated because of their inability to access certain required courses offered at other institutions in the area. Folsom Lake College is a brand new college in a developing/high growth area of Folsom. As such, Folsom Lake College is not able to offer every course our students currently need to complete their education in a timely manner. Access to other colleges in the area used to afford students access opportunity to complete their education in a 2-3 year cycle. The closure of the Dam Rd. has caused such traffic congestion that it will take students much longer to reach their goals. Nearly one-fourth of our 7,000 student population attend other multiple colleges within a thirty mile radius to American River College and Sierra College. Access to these two institutions are on those streets that are negatively impacted by the closure. And, many students used to utilize the Dam Rd. to access Folsom Lake College.

As president of Folsom Lake College and on behalf of our students, faculty, and staff, I urge you to open the Folsom Dam Road during peak commute hours with special security measures!

Sincerely,

Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman, President

Folsom Lake College

100 Scholar Way

Folsom, CA 95630

RESPONSE: SCOTT-SKILLMAN, THELMA

Scott-Skillman-1

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road during peak commute hours with special security considerations is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Scott-Skillman-2

Folsom Lake College is located off of East Bidwell Street, just north of U.S. Highway 50, and Sierra College and American River College are closer to Interstate 80. The closure of Folsom

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

Dam Road eliminates one travel route between these campuses, and the negative impact of the increased congestion is noted. Travel time from destinations off of US-50 would be the least impacted. Traffic congestion is identified in the EIS as an adverse impact for many reasons, but it is not possible to specifically relate traffic congestion to students' academic goals or achievements. Traffic congestion and travel delays are discussed in Section 3.1.2 of the EIS.

Frustration over traffic congestion, increased commute times, and other quality-of-life issues are discussed in Master Response to Comment-1.

COMMENT: COLSON, DARLA

>>> Darla Colson <dcolson@gilbertcpa.com> 1/15/2005 12:15:49 PM >>>

1 I believe that the Folsom Dam road should be opened during commute hours with additional security that the City of Folsom has offered to provide. I do not believe that the closure of the Dam permanently is the right conclusion. The Bureau needs to consider the impact on the city of the closure and the potential risks of anything actually being able to happen on the Dam. I believe that opening the Dam road during the commute hours with restrictions on vehicle types and additional security is a good alternative that the Bureau of Reclamation should adopt.

Please reconsider the Bureau's conclusion and consider opening the Dam road.

Thank you,

Darla A. Colson, CPA, MST
Gilbert Associates, Inc.
CPAs and Advisors
Ph: (916)646-6464
Fx: (916)641-2727
2880 Gateway Oaks Drive, Ste 100
Sacramento, CA 95833
101 Parkshore Drive, Ste 100
Folsom, CA 95630
Email: dcolson@gilbertcpa.com
www.gilbertcpa.com
www.gilbertfs.com

RESPONSE: COLSON, DARLA

Colson-1

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road during peak commute hours with special security considerations is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: GARITY, JIM

>>> "Jim Garity" <2jgarity@comcast.net> 1/15/2005 9:24:17 PM >>>

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

The Bureau is hiding its risk assessment of possible catastrophic damage to the dam under a cloak of classified secrecy. I have read and heard various citizen reports about any possible damage to the dam structure by bombing to be minimal to illusory as any bomb explosion on the massive dam structure would result in the force of the event being expelled away from any surface. The Bureau should permit the Folsom city government to have the classified assessment independently reviewed by its own experts.

In any event I believe that any security would be greatly enhanced and be vastly superior than anything the Bureau could provide or has provided by having the eyes of thousands of daily commuters proactively assisting in security vigilance for the dam. How could the Bureau's security force detect any sophisticated terrorist activity if the Bureau's security force can't even stop graffiti artists – you really are in need of citizen vigilance – the dam is safer with daily commuter's observance than with a few inept security guards.

When the dam was built, various avenues to the other side were closed – the dam road was the only venue left for motorists to get to the other side which the Bureau permitted. Now you offend the sensibilities of everyone in the area by using the color of 9/11 to do something which the Bureau has always wanted to do.

1 Please open the dam road and let the citizens serve as the eyes of security.

Jim Garity
1413 Humbug Creek Dr.
Folsom, CA 95630
(916) 984-6089

RESPONSE: GARITY, JIM

Garity-1

The commenter's opinion that Reclamation is overstating the security risk is noted. See Master Response to Comment-4.

The recommendation that the road should be reopened is noted.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

COMMENT: HAYS, OPAL

>>> "Opal Hays" <sisnsashays@worldnet.att.net> 1/15/2005 2:44:20 PM >>>

Mr.Schroeder

- 1 [In my opinion I feel the Dam Road should be reopened, especially during commute hours. Have
- 2 [you people stopped to realize how much fuel is being used by having to go thru Folsom, tearing up the streets (who is going to pay for their repair - residents or you???) I live in El Dorado County and it is at least 2 miles out of my way to go thru Folsom (waste oof fuel). If someone really wanted to damage the Dam all they have to do is get in a boat to go water skiing or sailing and they are into the lake and from there they due as they please. Having a Securite Guard at Mormon Island is of no use, there are many ways they could damage the whole thing if they wanted to. Do you check every boat launching at the boat ramps? If this is not done everything else is for naught and you are wasting the taxpayers money. Opal B. Hays

RESPONSE: HAYS, OPAL

Hays-1

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road, especially during commute hours, is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Hays-2

The commenter's statement that the road closure is causing excessive fuel consumption and damage to local roadways is noted. Fuel consumption is addressed in Section 3.7.2 of the EIS. Costs associated with the maintenance of city or county roads are the responsibility of the city or county in which the roads are located and are not within Reclamation's jurisdiction. The comment that the dam is not secure from boats is noted. See Master Response to Comment-3.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

COMMENT: LACASSE, CINDY

>>> <KevnandCindy@aol.com> 1/15/2005 12:59:59 PM >>>

- 1 [I am emailing to put my vote in to open the road. I live in the American River Canyon area and can say on behalf of many of my neighbors and my family, that we don't shop in Folsom anymore- it takes too long to deal with traffic.
- 2 [The road closure has caused so much headache and inconvenience. It has effected quality of life.

Please consider reopening it.

Cindy LaCasse
A Chamber of Commerce member and business person in the city of Folsom.

RESPONSE: LACASSE, CINDY

LaCasse-1

Reclamation notes the comments that Folsom Dam Road should be reopened and that traffic congestion prevents the commenter from shopping in Folsom. See Master Response to Comment-2.

LaCasse-2

In regard to the commenter's statement that the road closure has caused inconvenience and affected quality of life, see Master Response to Comment-1.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: RUBLY, SANDRA

>>> "S. Rubly" <righttouchflwr@earthlink.net> 1/15/2005 12:25:57 PM >>>

PLEASE RE-OPEN THE DAM ROAD!!!

- 1 I own The Right Touch Florist and my business has been severely impacted from the closure of the Dam Road.
- 2 Please reopen the dam road during peak business hours.

Thank You
Sandra F. Rubly

S. Rubly
righttouchflwr@earthlink.net

RESPONSE: RUBLY, SANDRA

Rubly-1

The statement that the commenter's business has been severely impacted by the closure of Folsom Dam Road is noted. See Master Response to Comment-2.

Rubly-2

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road during peak business hours is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: SCOTT, PHIL

>>> "Phil Scott" <pscott@libertyreverse.com> 1/15/2005 7:05:17 AM >>>

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

I am a businessman and resident in Folsom for the past 15 years, and I love my city! I have served on the Parks and Recreation Commission for 6 years, Folsom Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors for 8 years -2 of which being President, and a volunteer assistant coach to the wrestling team at Folsom High School.

I am writing to provide comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) report for the Folsom Dam Road closure. I am supportive of re-opening the road during peak traffic commute hours with appropriate safety measures in place.

I will not recapitulate all that you have heard from us as citizens not only in town, but surrounding communities as well, about the Dam Road closure and the dramatic economic impact on the city of Folsom and surrounding counties. Please check your records and you will see that I attended your meetings in downtown Sacramento and here in Folsom. I am requesting the partial openings - especially in the commute hours when we need the relief the most. ***And letting logic prevail*** - sedans, pickups, SUV's only. No semi trucks or container trucks or trailers.

The risk of substantial damage from explosives packed into one of these types of vehicles is negligible as the explosive forces do not "crater" significantly enough to cause water loss even at peak levels. Visual inspections with mirror sticks similar to entering Air Force bases as needed. This would help tremendously. This partial opening procedure makes even more sense as the lake level drops through the summer time - so does the risk of flooding down stream from a failure of the Dam. We have experienced gate failures in the not so distant past when the lake was at capacity -and there was no damage to any property. At least 6 months of the year, the Folsom Lake is very low - and the discharge capability of the river basin is more than ample to disperse the water in the event of a failure at the Folsom Dam. Additional mitigation measures can be taken during the higher water levels in Folsom Lake. Dramatically decreasing the water retained in Lake Natoma held by Nimbus Dam would be additional buffer from any discharge due to dam failure at Folsom Lake. If the policy is truly about risk factors; then the policy should fluctuate because the corresponding risk level fluctuates with the water level as it drops.

We as the City have already contributed millions of dollars to helping solve a regional traffic problem by completing the Lake Natoma Crossing several years ago. Similarly, the Dam Road is a regional issue as most of the cars that traversed the Dam Road are not Folsom residents, but people from El Dorado and Placer Counties using it as a "bypass". Now that is has been closed, we as residents are now saddled with another regional traffic problem with those people coming through, at a very slow pace, our city.

What I am asking, is as a fellow American citizen, please work with us to solve this problem. I am confident that since we have been able to figure out how to navigate an orbiter through the rings of Saturn successfully; together, we can certainly solve this problem too!

I sincerely thank you for your help in this matter,

Phil Scott

753 Duncan Court
Folsom, Ca. 95630
916-826-6030

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

RESPONSE: SCOTT, PHIL

Scott, P.-1

Reclamation notes the commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road during commute hours for passenger vehicles. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Scott, P.-2

Reclamation is responsible for protecting the integrity of its facilities, providing regional power and water, and ensuring the safety of people and public resources in relation to its facilities. Several commenters have directed their concerns at the prospects of a sudden release resulting from a potential dam failure. Even without a release, however, damage to the facility would affect Reclamation's ability to provide reliable water supply, power, and flood protection – the purposes for which Folsom Dam was constructed. Varying security measures seasonally or based on lake levels would not protect dam facilities or the provision of water and power in the region, and is not a reasonable alternative to the proposed action.

Scott, P.-3

Although other area residents used Folsom Dam Road, a large number of commenters have indicated that they live in Folsom. Regardless, the effects of the closure and of each alternative are addressed for both regional and local issues.

COMMENT: SOLBERG, GERALD

>>> <CalSolberg@aol.com> 1/15/2005 3:25:07 PM >>>

- 1 [Since the Dam Road has been closed, the business at Lake Natoma Inn in Old Town Folsom has been hurt dramatically. During commute hours on work days, Folsom Boulevard has long back
- 2 [ups and potential guests do not want to travel to the Hotel because of the time it will take to get from Highway 50 to Old Town Folsom.
- 3 [The solution of opening the Dam Road during commute hours would help immensely.

Thank you.

Gerald Solberg, Partner
Lake Natoma Inn, Folsom

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

RESPONSE: SOLBERG, GERALD

Solberg-1 and -2

Reclamation notes the comments that business at the Lake Natoma Inn in Historic Folsom has declined since the road closure and that congestion has caused delays. See Master Response to Comment-2.

Solberg-3

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road during commute hours is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

COMMENT: SPRAGUE, STEVE

>>> Steve Sprague <ssprague@farmersagent.com> 1/15/2005 10:41:34 AM >>>

Dear Sir:

- I would respectfully request that the alternative opening of the Folsom Dam Road during peak hours with enhanced security measures be considered and
- 1 [implemented by the appropriate agency. The traffic impact to the city and increased commute times have become an extremely devastating burden on the
 - 2 [business and residential communities of Folsom. The increase in traffic accidents, overcrowding and increased commute times are negatively effecting the current status and future growth of this area.
 - 3 [As a business owner, many of my clients are impacted by the subsequent re-routing of traffic due to the closure of the dam road. As far as the security of the dam road, it appears that a real danger would exist at the base of the dam, not on the top of the road. A large number of members of the community have been quite perplexed at the level of perceived danger associated with the dam road.

Thank you for your consideration of my input regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Steven Sprague
Sprague Insurance Agency

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

RESPONSE: SPRAGUE, STEVE

Sprague-1 and -2

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road during peak commute hours is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Traffic impacts for each of the alternatives are analyzed in Section 3.1.2 of the EIS, and business issues and impacts are addressed in Section 3.4.2. The City of Folsom has reported an increase in traffic accidents in the year following the road closure, as discussed in Section 3.1.1.3.

The impacts of traffic congestion and increased commute times on quality of life are discussed in Master Response to Comment-1.

Sprague-3

The statement that the commenter's business clients are being impacted by the traffic congestion is noted. See Master Response to Comment-2.

COMMENT: BLANK, MICHAEL

>>> Michael Blank <mhblank@yahoo.com> 1/17/2005 8:17:09 PM >>>

Dear Mr. Schroeder,

1 I am an investment representative with Edward Jones
working in Folsom. I agree with the overwhelming
number of concerned citizens that the Folsom Dam road
needs to be re-opened for at least normal commuting
hours. Please add my name to the list of those who
2 feel that keeping the road closed permanently will
cause unnecessary hardship for both the local business
owners and the residents of not only Folsom, but also
the surrounding communities.

Thanks for your consideration!
Michael Blank
916-353-4888

RESPONSE: BLANK, MICHAEL

Blank-1

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road during commute hours is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Blank-2

The commenter's statement about the adverse effect of the road closure on local businesses and the community is noted. See Master Response to Comment-2.

COMMENT: CAMERON, MINA

>>> mina cameron <mmina3287@yahoo.com> 1/17/2005 11:19:02 AM >>>

To whom it may concern,

1 I believe that this road was built with tax payors money,I believe that it should be open. I live in
Cameron Park and it makes a long and hard drive to go to Kaiser Hospital in Roseville from my
home along with my age.

RESPONSE: CAMERON, MINA

Cameron-1

The commenter's recommendation that Folsom Dam Road should remain open is noted.

COMMENT: EDMONDSON, PAIGE

>>> "Paige Edmondson" <pie@nekoind.com> 1/17/2005 6:13:00 PM >>>

Dear Mr. Schroeder,

I would like to add my opinion to the others you have received regarding the Folsom Dam.

1 Since the closure of the Dam, traffic in downtown Folsom has significantly increased, making it
painfully slow to cross either bridge into or out of Folsom. This is especially true during rush
hour traffic.

2 If it were done with the appropriate security measures, opening the Dam road during those peak
traffic hours would help the situation immensely, while not compromising the safety of the
citizens in this area.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Paige Edmondson

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

RESPONSE: EDMONDSON, PAIGE

Edmondson-1

The commenter's statement about the effect of the road closure on traffic in downtown Folsom is noted. An analysis of the traffic congestion in the Folsom area since the road closure in February 2003 is presented in Section 3.1.1.3 of the EIS.

Edmondson-2

The commenter's opinion that reopening Folsom Dam Road during peak hours with appropriate safety measures would greatly improve the situation is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

COMMENT: EVANS, SHELENE

>>> "Delicates" <delicates@shellenesdelicates.com> 1/17/2005 5:51:37 PM >>>

Robert Schroeder
Project Manager
Bureau of Reclamation, Central California office
7749 Folsom-Auburn Road
Folsom, CA 95630-1799

Dear Mr. Schroeder,

I am writing in regards to the Folsom Dam Road closure.

1 [I would like to put forth my support for the PREFERRED alternative of re-opening of the Folsom Dam Road during peak commute hours in the Environmental Impact Statement.

2 [I am a current business owner, with an obvious decline in sales, that has been affected by the road closure. It is imperative to my business, and other businesses in the area, that the commuter traffic be allowed to use the road. In the event that the road remains closed, many businesses will be forced to shut down for financial reasons. In due course, a previously thriving economic area will fall privy to the lack of consumers in the immediate area.

Thank you,

Shellene Evans
Owner / shellene's Delicates
6693 Folsom Auburn Road, Suite F
Folsom, CA 95630

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

RESPONSE: EVANS, SHELENE

Evans-1

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road during peak commute hours is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Evans-2

Many commenters have discussed impacts to downtown businesses since the road closure. Section 3.4.2 ("Socioeconomic Effects Since 2003") describes the survey of local businesses conducted for this EIS and the sales changes reported by some business owners and operators. Also see Master Response to Comment-2.

COMMENT: FLORES, MICHELE

>>> <jh.hhq@jhnet.com> 1/17/2005 11:47:02 AM >>>

Dear Project Manager,

1 [I am a local Folsom Business owner and wanted to let you know that all business people, residents and commuters are impacted on a daily basis by the road closure. I agree with the Folsom Chamber of Commerce that the preferred alternative in the Environmental Impact
2 [Statement is to open the Folsom Dam Road during peak commute hours with special security measures. This would help tremendously.

Thanks & Regards,

Michele Flores
Jackson Hewitt Tax Service
Folsom, CA

RESPONSE: FLORES, MICHELE

Flores-1

The comment that the Folsom Dam Road closure has impacted businesses, residents, and commuters is noted. See Master Response to Comment-2.

Flores-2

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road during peak commute hours with special security considerations is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

COMMENT: JACKSON, BARBARA

>>> "Barbara Jackson" <blj@cal.net> 1/17/2005 11:06:40 AM >>>

- 1 [Please reopen the Dam road. It just doesn't make sense to us or to anyone else we have discussed this issue with.
Thanks
Jackson
Placerville

RESPONSE: JACKSON, BARBARA

Jackson-1

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road is noted.

COMMENT: MCKINNEY, PATTY

>>> <patty@ppm4you.com> 1/17/2005 6:21:38 PM >>>

- 1 [As a business owner who travels from Granite Bay to El Dorado Hills daily, having to go through Folsom each way has certainly made it very time consuming and difficult for me. Getting through Folsom at almost anytime of the day now is quite a chore due to extremely heavy traffic.
Having the dam road open would make life easier on all.
Patty McKinney
Professional Property Management
916 712-6986

RESPONSE: MCKINNEY, PATTY

McKinney-1

The commenter's statement regarding traffic in Folsom is noted. Effects of the Folsom Dam Road closure on local transportation are analyzed in Section 3.1.1.3 of the EIS. Additional analysis of the various effects each alternative will have on traffic is provided in Section 3.1.2.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

COMMENT: MILLER-HOBBS, LISA

Lisa Miller-Hobbs

2206 Stockman Circle
Folsom, CA 95630
916-983-3623

January 18, 2005

Robert Schroeder, Project Manager
Bureau of Reclamation, Central California Office
7794 Folsom Dam Road
Folsom, CA 95630

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

- 1 [I am writing to you in regards to the closure of the Folsom Dam Road. This closure has negatively impacted Folsom and the surrounding communities to the point that long time residents are moving out of the area and even the state. Several of these people had businesses, and decided to close them due to revenue losses due to increased traffic congestion caused by the dam closure. The bumper-to-bumper traffic happens not only at peak hours, but also at other times throughout the day depending upon the road maintenance work being done by the City of Folsom. It also seems as if the number of accidents has increased, but again, I have seen no statistics on this, I only have to compare my memories of living in Folsom from 1994 to present. Ten years ago, this was a nice place to live, now the traffic makes it no different than the Bay Area, and frankly my husband and I hate it.

- 2 []
3 []
4 [The truly sorry thing about this whole mess is that the Bureau is trying to protect the dam from terrorists, but is also causing other targets by having the traffic back up over three bridges in the area, Hazel Avenue, the Rainbow bridge in Folsom and the new Folsom bridge. It would be very easy for three terrorists to take out all three bridges in a matter of minutes with car bombs since these three bridges don't seem to warrant any special attention from any governmental agency. Also, the environmental impact of the increased traffic flow to these areas has been completely ignored.

So in effect, the message I'm getting from the government is that it's OK to destroy one or two small town's lifestyles, small businesses, and ignore public safety where it fits their needs, just so the government can say they are protecting the whole of Sacramento by closing the Dam Road. Unfortunately, if the Dam were a target, it would be very easy for a boat or even a hiker to take that Dam out.

- 5 [A more simple solution to the problem would be to open the Dam Road and monitor it by having users apply for permits and have check points like they do at military bases until another bridge could be built and be ready for use.
- 6 [My last comment is why should the residents of this area have their lives and businesses turned upside down due to a very low terrorist threat. It doesn't make any sense to me that this little Dam Road is closed, but traffic still flows over the Golden Gate Bridge, the Bay Bridge and near the Hoover Dam.

Sincerely,

Lisa Miller-Hobbs

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

RESPONSE: MILLER-HOBBS, LISA

Miller-Hobbs-1

The EIS contains an evaluation of existing traffic conditions as presented in Tables 3.1-2 and 3.1-3. These tables show several roadway segments that operate at LOS E and F on a daily basis. As shown on Figure 1-4, LOS E and F represent operations where traffic approaches or exceeds the capacity of the roadway system and delays are significant.

Miller-Hobbs-2

The City of Folsom has reported a 16 percent increase in traffic accidents in the 12 months following the closure of Folsom Dam Road in February 2003, as described in Section 3.1.1.3 of the EIS.

Miller-Hobbs-3

The commenter's opinion that traffic congestion has affected how people feel about living in Folsom is noted. See Master Response to Comment-1.

Miller-Hobbs-4

The traffic analysis in the EIS contains both Rainbow Bridge and the new Lake Natoma Crossing (at Folsom Boulevard). These two bridges are projected to operate at LOS F and E, respectively, in 2005 with or without Folsom Dam Road open (see Table 3.1-5). They are both projected to operate at LOS F under 2013 conditions (see Table 3.1-9) with or without the road open. These poor operating conditions even with Folsom Dam Road open are due to the amount of population and employment growth projected for the area. The effects of the traffic on the environment in terms of air quality, noise, and fuel consumption are discussed in Sections 3.2.2, 3.4.2, and 3.7.2 of the EIS, respectively.

Miller-Hobbs-5

The commenter's recommendation to reopen the road using monitors, use permits, and checkpoints is noted. Both Restricted Access Alternative 2 and Restricted Access Alternative 3 would incorporate such security features, as described in Sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Miller-Hobbs-6

For a discussion regarding intangible quality-of-life effects, see Master Response to Comment-1. For a discussion on the rationale for the road closure, see Master Response to Comment-4. Because risks and vulnerabilities of facilities owned and operated by Reclamation are unique, they were evaluated individually and in depth through multiple security assessments. Based on security recommendations and taking into account the different issues surrounding each facility,

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

actions taken by Reclamation to protect and secure each of its facilities are unique to those facilities and may differ when compared to each other.

COMMENT: PACKER, RON

>>> "Ron Packer" <mpacker@InternetExpertsForBusiness.com> 1/17/2005 9:56:13 PM >>>

1 [Dear Sir
I respectfully urge you to make the proper decision to implement the PREFERRED alternative in the Environmental Impact Statement that supports opening the Folsom Dam Road during peak commute hours with special security measures! This is the only viable and reasonable regional decision.

Sincerely
Ron Packer
Internet Business Consulting
916-983-7708
mpacker@internetexpertsforbusiness.com
www.internetexpertsforbusiness.com

RESPONSE: PACKER, RON

Packer-1

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road during commute hours with special security considerations is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: QUISENBERRY, DONNA

>>> <Fortitudepilates@aol.com> 1/17/2005 4:32:36 PM >>>

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

1 [I am a small business owner on Sutter Street in Historic Folsom -- Fortitude Pilates Studio. My clients have been GREATLY impacted by the closure of the Dam Road. I have lost many clients due to the road closure. Many come from the El Dorado Hills area and beyond.

2 [If the Dam Road could be opened during peak commute hours at a minimum, it would be helpful. My clients start coming to the studio at 6 a.m. until 7 p.m., so would benefit tremendously by re-opening the Dam Road -- at whatever level it can be opened.

I was unable to attend the latest meeting held due to work -- but would like to voice my opinion at this time.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Donna Quisenberry
Fortitude - A Pilates Studio
608 Sutter Street, Suite 200
Folsom, CA 95630
(916) 351-0226

RESPONSE: QUISENBERRY, DONNA

Quisenberry-1

The statement regarding the commenter's loss of business clients due to the closure of Folsom Dam Road is noted. The effects of the road closure (and each of the alternatives) on businesses, particularly in downtown Folsom, are described in Section 3.4.2 of the EIS. Also see Master Response to Comment-2.

Quisenberry-2

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road during peak commute hours is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: RITTENHOUSE, JOHN

>>> "Rittenhouses" <moonrisers@comcast.net> 1/17/2005 9:25:43 PM >>>

Dear Mr. Schroeder,

1 [I have been a Folsom resident for more than 11 years and I have worked in Folsom for more than 17 years. I have seen a fair amount of growth in the city and with it the associated rise in traffic problems. But nothing has been as dramatic or had such a negative impact as what has happened to traffic in the city since the closure of the Folsom Dam Road. Although I only commute from one side of the city to the other, that commute has become a great source of aggravation. The 2 [slowly moving stop-and-go traffic leads to frayed nerves as well as reduced fuel efficiency and additional emissions. Frayed nerves have an impact beyond just the period of the commute, and 3 [can lead to an increased likelihood of accidents (I don't know if that has actually been the case).

4 [In an attempt to avoid the bottle necks I avoid the down town/old town area. This means I am very unlikely to stop by any of the merchants in that area on my way home from work. I'm sure you have heard plenty about the drop in business. I have also tried driving through residential areas, along with hundreds of other drivers. This has led the city to erect barriers and use other means to keep excess traffic out of the neighborhoods. If I lived in one of those neighborhoods I would not want to be subjected to all the excess traffic either. Some of the biggest bottlenecks are near the Rainbow bridge, and at the intersection of Natoma Street with Folsom Blvd. These are the areas which now take the main flow of traffic between Placer and El Dorado counties which was previously handled by the Dam Road.

I only have to commute a bit over six miles. I really feel for the many drivers who have 20-30 min. or longer to commute on top of navigating through Folsom. I urge the USBR to open the Dam Road for limited times during commute hours to relieve the conjection until a permanent solution is in place.

Sincerely,

John Rittenhouse
100 Flat Rock Dr.
Folsom CA 95630

916-989-6912
moonrisers@comcast.net

RESPONSE: RITTENHOUSE, JOHN

Rittenhouse-1

The commenter's statement that traffic congestion has worsened following the Folsom Dam Road closure is noted. Post-closure traffic effects are discussed in Section 3.1.1.3.

Rittenhouse-2

Traffic congestion as it relates to air quality (Section 3.2.2), fuel and energy consumption (3.7.2), and other resource areas is discussed in the EIS.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

Rittenhouse-3

Traffic accident data from the City of Folsom are discussed in Section 3.1.1.3.

Rittenhouse-4

The commenter's opinion that the road should be reopened during commute hours is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

COMMENT: STRAIN, LAURA AND DAVID

>>> "D & L" <landave@copper.net> 1/17/2005 11:07:04 AM >>>

Dear Mr. Schroeder,

My husband, family, and I have watched with great interest as the drama over the useage of Folsom Dam Road has played out in the communities affected, and the press. Personally, we are in favor of keeping the road open. We've included perhaps some new, or perhaps the same old reasons.

1. Any terrorist bomb laid on the road, or upon the upper reaches of the dam would BLOW UP. Towards the sky. Not down, towards the dam itself. The damage would be superficial.

2. Throughout the country, terrorist-damageable roads and accesses are easily available to terrorists. Highways intersect military bases, open and unprotected airways are available to any nut with a bomb, and an opening jettison doorway. Surely there are more desirable targets than the American River watershed.

3. If the REAL issue (as many citizens believe) is who pays for the maintenance of the road and surrounding area, then turn the road into a toll road, charging enough to pay for the toll takers, and the maintenance. Let the users pay. It was already closed from midnight to 6AM so there would be no cost for those hours.

4. Consider, please, that people intent upon harm will find a way to inflict harm. Closing the Dam Road does not deter anyone with harmful intentions. The closure itself does inflict harm upon business and the community.

Sincerely,

Laura and Dave Strain
citizens of El Dorado County
Members of Folsom Lake Yacht Club
Users of Folsom Lake

RESPONSE: STRAIN, LAURA AND DAVID

Strain, L. and D.-1

The commenters' opinion that Folsom Dam Road should be reopened is noted. The EIS discusses the potential effects of reopening Folsom Dam Road as the No Action Alternative.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

Strain, L. and D.-2

The commenters' opinion regarding the potential damage that could be caused by an attack on Folsom Dam is noted. See Master Responses to Comment-3 and Comment-4 for a more detailed discussion about the security of the facility.

Strain, L. and D.-3

The commenters' suggestion to charge a toll to offset maintenance costs for Folsom Dam Road is noted. Folsom Dam Road was closed to limit public access to Folsom Dam to improve the security of the dam. As stated in Section 1.2.2 of the EIS, the closure of Folsom Dam Road in February 2003 occurred after Reclamation analyzed recommendations received from a security assessment and decided to enhance security procedures and fortify facilities based on the associated risks.

Strain, L. and D.-4

This issue is addressed in Master Response to Comment-2.

COMMENT: STRAIN, LAURA

>>> "D & L" <landave@copper.net> 1/17/2005 7:30:01 PM >>>

1 Dear Mr. Schroeder,
I messaged you earlier about my feelings about opening the Folsom Dam Road. My comment included a plan to turn it into a toll road, with users paying. This fee could/would/should support toll takers, and maintenance. I did not submit a dollar amount. It appears that if 18,000 cars a day (or more) pay only \$1.00 a trip a day, for 365 days a year, we could change the name to: CASH COW FOLSOM DAM ROAD. By figuring on my calculator, and estimating, it looks like over \$5.5 million could enter the coffers of the cash-strapped State or County. It's not everything, but it could certainly take the pain out of opening this much-needed and formerly much-used road.

Sincerely, Laura Strain citizen of El Dorado County

RESPONSE: STRAIN, LAURA

Strain, L.-1

The commenter's proposal to turn Folsom Dam Road into a toll road to offset costs associated with maintenance and operations is noted. See Response to Armstrong-1.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: CAMPBELL, ROBERT

>>> "B CAMPBELL" <rwcappraisals@covad.net> 1/18/2005 10:29:31 AM >>>

Campbell & Associates
100 Van Elgort Court
Folsom, CA 95630
916-989-3144
January 18, 2005

Dear Mr. Schroeder,

I live and work out of a home office on Van Elgort Court which is located in the city of Folsom approximately 2 blocks north of the intersection of Folsom/Auburn Road and Greenback Lane.

1 I am asking your support for opening the Folsom Dam Road during peak commuter hours until the new bridge can be constructed. Anyone who lives in the western portion of Folsom or who commutes on the Folsom Boulevard – Folsom/Auburn Road corridor is well aware of the adverse impact that closing the Dam Road has had on our lives, including increased noise pollution, increased exhaust pollution, increased commute time, increased gasoline expenditure, decreased emergency vehicle response time, decreased revenue for local businesses, and decreased quality of life.

2 We are well aware of the security concerns. However, in other portions of our country major security concerns have been met without closing prime transportation facilities, e.g., the road over Boulder Dam is still open, all major airports are still open, all major bridges are still open, all railroads are still operating. Surely we are able to provide adequate security measures for the Dam Road.

3 One of the primary stated objectives of the terrorists is to adversely disrupt our quality of life and economic wellbeing. Without even having to travel to our community they have succeeded. The effect of closing the Dam Road has adversely affected our quality of life and economic wellbeing.

4 The Dam Road is a major American River crossing road for our area. My understanding is that the Dam Road was originally mandated as an alternate river crossing to compensate for the loss of river crossings which were flooded when the dam was constructed. Obviously, with increased population, that crossing has become significantly more important in the half century since the dam was constructed.

I'm sure that keeping the Dam Road closed is the easiest way for the bureau to deal with the situation. I, and my fellow citizens are asking you to look beyond the easy solution and work with us to provide this much needed preferred alternative solution. Please open the Dam Road during peak commute hours with special security measures.

Sincerely,

Robert Campbell

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

RESPONSE: CAMPBELL, ROBERT

Campbell, R.-1

The commenter's opinion that Folsom Dam Road should be reopened during peak commute hours, with security measures, is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Changes in traffic (described in Section 3.1.1.3 and in Sections 3.1.2.1 through 3.1.2.3) have affected other resources including air quality, energy use, noise levels, emergency response times, and economic and social conditions. The nature and extent of these impacts are described in Sections 3.2.2, 3.7.2, 3.3.2, 3.10.2, and 3.4.2, respectively.

For further discussion of impacts to commute times, energy use, and noise and air pollution following the closure of Folsom Dam Road, also see Responses to Jani-1, Riedinger-7, and Riedinger-9. See Master Response to Comment-5 for additional discussion on impacts to emergency response times.

These impacts and their relative magnitude vary with each alternative, and they are being taken into account in Reclamation's decision-making process along with the security issues at hand.

Campbell, R.-2

Risks and vulnerabilities associated with each of the facilities cited by the commenter are unique. Reclamation conducted multiple in-depth security assessments of its facilities to determine the appropriate and necessary actions for each facility. The differences in actions reflect the different security-related issues at the facilities.

Campbell, R.-3

For a discussion regarding intangible effects to quality of life, see Master Response to Comment-1.

Campbell, R.-4

That Folsom Dam Road had become an important roadway that several communities came to rely upon is noted in Section 1.2.3. As stated in Section 1.2.1, the road was originally constructed for maintenance and repair of the Folsom Dam facilities. However, Reclamation did allow public access on the road since its construction. As the volume of vehicles on the road increased, Reclamation continued to provide access with the exception of intermittent closures that were required for dam maintenance and repair activities.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: DELP, BOB

January 18, 2005

8912 Sutters Gold Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826
(916) 368-8122

Robert Schroeder, Central California Area Office
Bureau of Reclamation
7794 Folsom Dam Road
Folsom, CA 95630
Via Email to: rschroeder@mp.usbr.gov

Subject: Comments re: Folsom Dam Road Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

I have reviewed the subject Draft EIS and believe that issues associated with bicycle transportation have not been adequately addressed in the document. The assessment fails to identify certain impacts to bicycle mobility and safety within the City of Folsom that will continue to occur as a result of closure of the dam road. The document also fails, therefore, to identify opportunities for addressing these impacts through feasible mitigation. Opening Folsom Dam Road to bicycle use during periods when public motor vehicle use is not occurring (which would be at all times under the proposed action) would greatly alleviate adverse impacts to bicycle transportation and safety. Please consider the observations and recommendations herein when preparing the Final EIS.

City Ordinance Incorrectly Interpreted

Discussion in Draft EIS Section 2.3.3, *Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Alternative*, eliminates the consideration of bicycle and pedestrian use of Folsom Dam Road by stating that, "This alternative was not considered feasible because it violates a city ordinance on bicycle and pedestrian safety." Upon review of the City of Folsom Ordinance Code, I have identified only one code that suggested use of the road by bicyclists would not be allowed. Chapter 10 of the City of Folsom Municipal Code reads in its entirety:

1

Code 10.24.075 Folsom Dam Road riding prohibition. When signs are in place giving notice thereof, it shall be unlawful for any person to ride a bicycle on Folsom Dam Road between Folsom-Auburn Road and East Natoma Street. The violation of this section shall be an infraction and shall be punishable as provided in Government Code Section 36.900(b). (Ord. 618 § 1, 1988)

The Bureau's conclusion that this ordinance prohibits the consideration of bicycle use of the dam road is clearly flawed. The ordinance simply states that "when signs are in place" it would be unlawful to ride on the road. Presumably, if the Bureau were to open the road to bicyclists the Bureau would also remove any such signs and would therefore eliminate the potential for violation of this ordinance. Because this inaccurate representation of the City ordinance was the only stated reason for eliminating consideration of bicycle use of the dam road, it is incumbent upon the Bureau to reconsider this opportunity. However, I believe that opening the dam road to bicycle use would be more appropriately considered as mitigation, and not as a project alternative.

Dam Road Use by Bicycles as Mitigation for Project Impacts

I do not support opening Folsom Dam Road to bicycle use *as an alternative to the proposed action*, and instead I **strongly urge the Bureau to consider opening Folsom Dam Road to bicycle use as mitigation for impacts directly caused by the proposed action.**

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

Impacts to bicycle transportation and recreation resulting from the proposed action are significant. The importance of the American River Parkway Trail (Trail) as a major non-motorized transportation corridor within the region must be emphasized in the Final EIS to accurately portray its context in bicycle transportation within the City of Folsom. The Trail provides a literal thoroughfare for bicyclists within the greater Sacramento region, providing an over 30-mile link between the City of Folsom and the City of Sacramento and elsewhere. Bicycle commute traffic is abundant on the Trail both on weekday mornings and evenings, and its use as a combined transportation and recreation facility throughout the week is readily evident. Many users ride to the Trail on surface streets, including those within the City of Folsom. However, motor vehicle traffic, barrier and curb placements, and other impediments to safe bicycle operation have adversely affected opportunities for bicycle movement within and through the downtown area of Folsom as a result of the Folsom Dam Road closure.

The transportation section of the Draft EIS states that:

2 *Under the No Action Alternative, existing motor vehicle traffic would increase on Natoma Street, Folsom-Auburn Road, and Folsom Boulevard, which provide pedestrian and bicycle facilities. This is noted as an impact with respect to potential pedestrian/bicycle facilities, but no planned existing or planned future facilities will be physically affected. (Page 3.1-28)*

And then goes on to state that:

Potential effects to these modes [including bicycles] of transportation for all remaining alternatives and all study years would be the same as those described for 2005 conditions. (Page 3.1-29)

These findings indicate no regard for the true bicycle transportation and safety impacts that are associated with the closure of Folsom Dam Road. To suggest that all alternatives result in the same impacts is completely contrary to the findings of the traffic study and, moreover, this suggestion disregards the direct affect that congested traffic has on bicycle transportation and safety within the City of Folsom. These impacts must be identified in the EIS and feasible mitigation must be considered.

Because the assessment does not identify the actual bicycle-related impacts of the project, the document also fails to identify very feasible methods of reducing impacts to bicycle transportation. Opening Folsom Dam Road to bicycle use would enable an important non-motorized transportation link between the American River Parkway Trail and the cities/communities of Roseville, Granite Bay, Folsom and El Dorado Hills and interspersed residential areas that would avoid the traffic congestion and elevated risk of bicycle / motor vehicle collision that clearly exist under the proposed action.

Opening Folsom Dam Road to bicycle traffic would enable Folsom residents (note existing Class II bike lanes and City of Folsom plans to improve bicycle facilities along Natoma Street near the southern end of Folsom Dam Road) and other area cyclists to more safely access the north side of Folsom Lake, including the American River Parkway Trail, Beal's Point, and the many miles of both paved and dirt trails on the north side of the American River.

3 Increased air pollution and traffic and other associated impacts on bicycle safety in the City of Folsom have created a barrier to bicycle opportunities that adversely affects both recreation and transportation. These impacts could be partially alleviated with the opening of the dam road to bicycle traffic, while still achieving the Bureau's security requirements.

2

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

Numerous options exist for ensuring security and obtaining funding for costs that may be associated with the maintenance of bicycle-related infrastructure that could be necessary to enable bicycle use of Folsom Dam Road. It would not be appropriate, therefore, for the Bureau to eliminate this mitigation opportunity without fully soliciting public input on the feasibility of a full array of options. Nor would it be appropriate for the Bureau to eliminate this mitigation opportunity by suggesting that a potential future bridge crossing the American River would provide bicycle facilities. Such a conclusion would be speculative and would also not provide mitigation for ongoing impacts associated with the dam road closure.

Cumulative Impacts

4 Finally, related actions and the associated cumulative impacts assessment presented in the Draft EIS focuses on projects that would, by definition of the selection criteria used, not cause cumulative impacts. The focus of the cumulative impacts evaluation should consider projects that would contribute to the adverse impacts of the proposed action (i.e., federal, state, local and private actions that would increase traffic on Folsom-Auburn Road and surface and connector streets within the City of Folsom). Instead, by considering projects that would require closure of Folsom Dam Road, the cumulative impacts analysis falls short of addressing actual cumulative impacts.

Specifically with regard to bicycle transportation, existing traffic, future traffic increases associated with community growth, bicycle movement impediments including increased traffic and the placement of traffic control devices (e.g., curbs in *weird* places) by the City of Folsom, all contribute cumulatively to the proposed action impacts on bicycle transportation within the project area and should be considered in the cumulative impacts assessment in the EIS. Again, opening the dam road to bicycle use and allowing bicyclists to avoid downtown Folsom would serve to reduce these impacts.

Conclusion

Please remember that "approximately 90 percent of users [of Folsom Lake SRA] are from the local region" (Draft EIS, page 3.8-1) and that although the Draft EIS fails to recognize the importance of bicycle transportation within the project area (see Page 3.8-12 where only automobile routes are listed), the American River Parkway Trail and its safe accessibility for residents of surrounding communities must be fully considered in the environmental review process. Opening Folsom Dam Road to bicyclist would provide an important bicycle route option that would serve to minimize the adverse impacts of the proposed action on bicycle safety and transportation.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need additional input/information to enable your full consideration of these issues. I look forward to reviewing the revised EIS.

Sincerely,
Bob Delp
VIA EMAIL

3

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

RESPONSE: DELP, BOB

Delp-1

As stated in Code 10.24.075 of the City of Folsom's Municipal Code (as cited by the commenter), bicycles are not allowed on Folsom Dam Road when signs are in place giving notice thereof. Signs prohibiting bicycle access on Folsom Dam Road predate the February 2003 road closure. Following security review of public access on the road, Reclamation determined that any uncontrolled public access would constitute an unacceptable risk to security. Therefore, under all alternatives considered in the EIS, bicycles and pedestrians would not be allowed across Folsom Dam Road. Section 2.3.3 has been modified to clarify the rationale for not including an alternative that allows for bicycle and pedestrian access.

Delp-2

Section 3.1.1.1 of the EIS identifies the American River Parkway Trail as an important part of the existing environment for bicycle use. The discussion provides a description of the existing trail and planned improvements. The commenter identified impacts to bicycle movements within and around downtown Folsom with "barrier and curb placements, and other impediments to safe bicycle operation." These barrier and curb placements were done by the City of Folsom as part of their Traffic Calming Program.

Section 3.1.2 identifies traffic impacts on affected city streets for all alternatives. As cited by the commenter, under the No Action Alternative traffic congestion would continue to increase on streets that provide bicycle facilities. Although no bicycle facilities would be directly affected, the increase in traffic congestion would impact bicycle use and safety. As noted in the same section, increases in traffic congestion are associated with increases in accidents. Although specific accident data were not available to distinguish impacts to bicycle users, the correlation identified holds true for motor vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. Section 3.1.2 has been modified to provide clarification.

In the 2013 study year, the traffic analysis accounts for planned projects being operational. The Folsom Bridge Project is expected to be operational by 2008. Traffic relief provided by the Folsom Bridge Project would reduce potential accident risks faced by motor vehicles and bicycle users.

Delp-3

Section 3.2.2 of the EIS describes the impacts on air quality as a result of additional miles traveled by vehicles in the Folsom area. See Response to Riedinger-9. Traffic impacts on bicycle use and safety are addressed in Response to Delp-3. As stated in Response to Delp-1, following security review of public access on the road, Reclamation determined that any uncontrolled public access would constitute an unacceptable risk to security. Therefore, under all alternatives considered in the EIS, bicycles and pedestrians would not be allowed across Folsom Dam Road.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

Delp-4

Section 3.11.2 identifies planned or approved projects that would contribute to cumulative impacts described in the EIS analysis. Some of these projects – including the Lake Natoma Crossing, Folsom Historic District Traffic Calming Program, Folsom Bridge Project, and local transportation network improvements – have traffic impacts. Traffic impacts associated with these projects are not singled out because they are incorporated into the assumptions made in the traffic analysis presented in Section 3.1. Because cumulative traffic impacts are part of the traffic analysis, and traffic impacts result in impacts to other resource areas, the cumulative impacts of related projects are accounted for in the analysis of all resource area impacts in the EIS.

COMMENT: GRAGG, ERIC

>>> <ERICLG39@aol.com> 1/18/2005 3:02:39 PM >>>

I am a resident of Folsom, & have served in a US Army combat Division, Engineering Battalion, who specilized in bridge construction and demolition. It would take much more than a few cars or even a few trucks full of explosives to do serious damage to the dam road!

1 [Please reopen the Dam Road, the traffic congestion and restricted flow of traffic over the dam road, and into the center of the city is doing very serious harm to the entire city.
Please reconsider opening the Dam Road, all of the City of Folsom, would be very grateful to both the Bureau and Home land security if this could happen before Feb, 1, 2005. We all just dont feel any of this makes any sense.
Thanks for listening.
Eric Gragg

RESPONSE: GRAGG, ERIC

Gragg-1

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road to help relieve the impact of traffic congestion on the City of Folsom is noted.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: KING, LORRAINE

>>> Lorraine King <lorraine.king@sbcglobal.net> 1/18/2005 3:19:01 PM >>>

Dear Mr. Schroeder,

I understand you are asking for public comments regarding the Folsom Dam Road closure and the consideration of whether it should remain closed or be opened on some basis and I would like to have my comments included.

1 [I live in El Dorado Hills and as an independent business owner, I frequently need to travel around the greater El Dorado, Sacramento and Placer counties to meet with customers. The traffic backups that frequently occur, due to the Dam Road closure, are irritating at the least and can add significant travel time to my travel schedule. It is my sincere hope that your committee give serious consideration to opening the Dam road to reduce the traffic congestion in the area surrounding Folsom. Even if the road is opened just during peak commute times, that would significantly ease the traffic problem.

2 [I know that you are concerned about public safety and terrorist threats, but our community is suffering a great deal from the road closure, especially the companies that have had significant loss of business and residents in the Old Folsom area where the traffic congestion is greatest.

I urge you to open the Dam Road asap, even if it is only during commute times. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lorraine King

--
Lorraine Vogel King
Mary Kay Independent Consultant
916.941.1753 / lorraineking@marykay.com / www.marykay.com/lorraineking

RESPONSE: KING, LORRAINE

King-1

The comment regarding the increase in traffic congestion and commute time that has occurred since the road closure is noted. Sections 3.1.1.2 and 3.1.1.3 compare traffic conditions before and after the February 2003 closure of Folsom Dam Road, and Section 3.1.2 evaluates the traffic impacts of each of the four alternatives. The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road if only during the peak commute hours is also noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

King-2

The comment that businesses and the community have suffered losses from the road closure is noted. See Master Response to Comment-2.

COMMENT: MILLER, JEFFREY

>>> "Jeffrey J. Miller" <jeffrey_miller@pacbell.net> 1/18/2005 2:28:07 PM >>>

Dear Sir(s) and Ladies of the Bureau of Reclamation,

1 [I understand and appreciate the Bureau's long standing desire to close the Folsom Dam road. However, it is my firm belief that the Bureau is criminally negligent and morally bankrupt to use the "terrorist card" to further it's self-serving, lazy, lathargic, ego-centered agenda at the expense of the life, liberty and happiness of not only the residents of the City of Folsom but the entire tri-county area and beyond.

I am appalled and ashamed of this particular branch of my Federal Government that has the gall to "spin" the rhetoric that the Folsom Dam could in any way be damaged by terrorist activity using motor vehicles. Even a layman engineer or primitive criminal can plainly see that damaging The Dam would have to be done by air or water, not by motor vehicle. It is pure lunacy and the perveyors of this rhetoric should be removed from office and detained for prosecution to the full extent of the law for aiding and abetting an enemy of the United States.

The EIR that produced the "preferred" alternative of permanently closing our Dam is a sham and a rip-off of my tax dollars.

2 [I demand that the Dam Road be reopened forthwith, without any conditions whatsoever, and that the Bureau repent of its sins and focus its resources and attention on building a new bridge. Then your wish to close the road could then perhaps be granted.

Jeffrey J. Miller, CFS
Financial Advisor / Financial Network
916-638-6899
millerj2@financialnetwork.com
www.jeffreyjmiller.com

RESPONSE: MILLER, JEFFREY

Miller, J.-1

The commenter's opinion that life, liberty, and happiness have been impacted by the closure of Folsom Dam Road is noted. See Responses to Spires-1, Darrah-2, and Master Response to Comment-1.

Miller, J.-2

The commenter's opinion that Folsom Dam Road should be reopened until a new bridge is built is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

COMMENT: MUNGER, CURT

>>> "Munger, Curt" <cmunger@ccarey.com> 1/18/2005 2:51:05 PM >>>

Dear Schroeder,

- 1 [I am a resident off of Auburn-Folsom Road and I feel strongly that measures should be taken to, at a minimum, re-open the Dam Road during peak hours if not at all times. Speaking from an outsiders perspective with a mere lay knowledge of the situation seemingly after this lengthy period of time I would have expected some more definitive direction achieved. Nonetheless, I would like to see this issue resolved with the massive traffic this has created behind us all.
- 2 [

Curt Munger
Vice President
cmunger@ccarey.com
CORNISH & CAREY COMMERCIAL
1601 Response Road, Suite 160
Sacramento, CA 95815
916.569.2321 Direct / 916.920.0854 FAX

RESPONSE: MUNGER, CURT

Munger-1

The comment that Folsom Dam Road should be reopened at all times or at least during peak commute hours is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Munger-2

The effects of the Folsom Dam Road closure on traffic congestion for each of the alternatives are discussed in Section 3.1.2 of the EIS.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: STETSON, LAURENE

>>> "Laurene Stetson" <laurene@seqpacbuilders.com> 1/18/2005 8:07:55 AM >>>

- 1 [Please open the Folsom Dam Road.....It is a crucial link between El Dorado Hills, Folsom, and Roseville during commute hours. We desparately need it!

Laurene Stetson, Controller
Sequoia Pacific Builders, Inc - (916) 784-8400

RESPONSE: STETSON, LAURENE

Stetson-1

The comment that Folsom Dam Road should be reopened during commute hours to help link El Dorado Hills, Folsom, and Roseville is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: STORER, DAVID

>>> <storer.das@comcast.net> 1/18/2005 4:28:01 AM >>>
Dear Mr. Schroeder:

Please find attached my comments on the DEIS for the proposal to close Dam Road.

One thing that i have been able to discover since i wrote the attached letter is that the City of Folsom has had growth at the following rates for the past few years...

1999 - 7.2%
2000 - 11.7%
2001 - 9.0%
2001 - 7.4%
2002 - 5.1%
2003 - 2.7%

My citation is the State Department of Finance...

<http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/repndat.htm#estimates>

You will find a wealth of information here on Folsom's actual growth...

I hope the bureau will direct the preparers of the DEIS to use better information rather than using a historical average of 4% (not sure how they came up with it) and modify the DEIS accordingly.

Sincerely,



David Storer damroadDEIS.wpc

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

January 18, 2005

Mr. Robert Schroeder
US Bureau of Reclamation
Central California Area Office
7794 Folsom Dam Road
Folsom, CA 95630

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the DEIS for the Folsom Dam Road Access Restriction. I appreciate you making a copy available for me to pick up just before the holidays.

Provided below are some comments I have on the DEIS as well as some comments generally about the proposal to keep Dam Road open.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1 1) I found the DEIS very difficult (more "awkward", really) to read as I am sure many people have. The document has been prepared asking the public to understand that the "No action" alternative really means to do something that the public wants and that is to actually open Dam Road. Surely the document should have been prepared for the benefit of the public where the "project" - in NEPA terms - is to keep Dam Road closed with two alternatives to the proposed project. It would be less confusing. So, my request is to have the DEIS re-written to be of more help to the public.
- 2 2) I could not determine where in the DEIS it states which alternative (or project) is the best in terms of impacts to the environment. I did see that impacts were identified but mitigation were provided because they were not practicable. I request that the DEIS be very clear in specifying which alternative (or project) is the least harmful to the environment in terms of traffic and air quality.
- 3 3) The DEIS should address if the risk of dam failure increased somehow between Sept 01 to Feb 03. This would perhaps help the public and myself understand why the Bureau took the action to close Dam Road permanently. It is my understanding that the road has been open for almost 50 years and every day it has been open there has been the same risk (failure) as there is today. It is only the method to cause the failure that has changed. Perhaps this information that I have requested is already included in Appendix D of which I am unable to review?
- 4 4) I am not sure who will be using this DEIS to make a determination for a Record of Decision. The DEIS should be very clear who this person (or body) is. I would also appreciate knowing if there is a public opportunity to speak to this person or body regarding the FEIS prior to its certification or adoption. That information should also be provided in the DEIS.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENTS ON THE DEIS

- 5 [1) Page 1-2: When did the road become “considered inadequate for general traffic use”? It has been open for almost 50 years. The DEIS should explain how this conclusion was made and by whom.
- 6 [2) Page 1-2: The DEIS states that “neither the State or local government” has contributed funds for the maintenance and operation of Folsom Dam Road”. Has the City of Folsom or any other nearby local agency been asked to provide funds for its maintenance and operation? This should be stated in the DEIS.
- 7 [3) Page 1-2: Correction. El Dorado Hills does not “lie immediately downstream of the dam”. The DEIS should be corrected.
- 8 [4) Page 1-2: The DEIS states that “In the event of a dam breach or failure, extensive damage and adverse environmental effects can be expected to result within a short period of time”. I believe that this risk has existed since 1956 when the dam was constructed. The DEIS should address why the concern for the environment was not a concern when for those 50 years since the dam road was open for public use. And more importantly, the DEIS should address why the road was open to vehicular traffic post 2001 if the damage to the region could “result in a short period of time”.
- 9 [5) Page 1-2: The DEIS states that an independent security review revealed that uncontrolled access to the top of the road was a “clear and severe risk”. Did the same review state that controlled access was also a “clear and severe risk?” The DEIS should provide this data.
- 10 [6) Page 1-9: The DEIS should provide the source to substantiate the statement that Placer County “is the fastest-growing county in the nation”.
- 11 [7) Page 1-9: I believe the Folsom General Plan was adopted in 1988. Amendments have been made to the Housing Element since then. I do not believe 1995 is the correct year. The DEIS should be amended to correct if this is inaccurate. See also p. 3.1-17
- 12 [8) Page 2-1: The DEIS states that the City of Folsom should be responsible for maintenance costs along with Reclamation. The DEIS should state why it is that the City of Folsom should be the only local agency identified. Surely Folsom is in Sacramento County. Surely other jurisdictions have residents that contribute to the regional traffic that would benefit from the road being opened? See also same type of comment on Page 2-7.
- 13 [9) Page 2-2: The DEIS should be amended to address the emergency road access discussions that have been conducted between Reclamation and the City of Folsom. How do I know that the discussions have resulted in a continuation of the safety factor that existed prior to closure? Has safety for the public been maximized?

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

- 14 [10) Page 2-4: The DEIS states that the annual cost for maintenance is \$75,000. The DEIS should explain why there is a difference from \$54,000 on page 2-1.
- 15 [11) Page 2-5: The DEIS should state the location for a reader to view where “Reclamation has identified potential environmental, economic, and quality of life effects of full closure of Folsom Dam Road that may occur before the new bridge over the American Bridge can be opened to the public”.
- 16 [12) Page 2-8: The DEIS should be modified to address why the bicycle and pedestrian access alternative was not discussed. The closure of Dam Road may violate the city General Plan as it was prepared with Dam Road being used as an arterial to the city. Please provide the citation for the City ordinance that is being violated that prohibits bicycle and pedestrian access. Maybe the City would consider repealing it if it allows some access should Reclamation close the road forever.
- 17 [13) Page 3.1-1: The traffic counts are not accurate. The DEIS should be amended to include traffic counts before 2001 and also traffic counts post 2001 and pre 2003. The numbers will need to be re-evaluated because commercial traffic of some kind was diverted from the road, even though there are no numbers to document the extent of this diversion. Surely, there were trucks that obeyed the Reclamation access restriction at that time?
- 18 [14) Page 3.1-5: Penultimate paragraph: is the road “Briggs Ranch Drive”. I have not heard of “Ranch Drive”?
- 19 [15) Page 3.1-9: Last Paragraph. Please have the DEIS describe the method used to quantify “some congestion”. Also, I am sure the City of Folsom would be happy to provide traffic counts for Folsom Blvd/Greenback Lane. Surely they have it so you can determine a LOS calculation?
- 20 [16) Page 3.1-11: Table 3.1-2. The data for traffic counts is outdated. Many of the count dates are pre 2001 and 2003. They are over ten years old in one case (1994). The traffic numbers are undercounted and subsequently the impacts are not correctly addressed. Also, the numbers for post 2001 do not have commercial traffic included. They have counts for commercial traffic that would otherwise be going over Dam Road.
- 21 [17) Page 3.1-12: Table 3.1-3. Here the data are seven years old. Most are at least 3-4 years old. The DEIS should have better data.
- 22 [18) Page 3.1-13: Penultimate paragraph. A four percent growth rate is very conservative for Folsom. The DEIS should be modified to include growth levels that are accurate. They can be obtained from the State Dept. of Finance. Over the last few years I am sure that Folsom has experienced growth rates much higher. As a result, the DEIS undercounts the traffic and associated impacts to the road network and air quality. This is a major error in the DEIS and better information is easily available. See DEIS page 3.4-6 for a reported annual growth rate of 5.7% .
- 23 [19) Page 3.1-17: The DEIS should be amended to explain how “regional traffic” has been compromised by the traffic calming program adopted by the city of Folsom.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

- 24 [20) Page 3.1-18: The DEIS states that annual growth rates are between 3.5 and 4.5 percent. Again, this range is low and undervalues the impact of the traffic counts and forecasts. The DEIS needs to include a more realistic growth rate. See DEIS page 3.4-6 for a reported annual growth rate of 5.7% .
- 25 [21) The DEIS states that the forecasting methodology for 2001, 2013 and 2025 land use sets are in Appendix B. See also Page 3.1-24 where it states that a detailed discussion is found for the land use projections. The appendix does not provide how the land use assumptions were derived. It simply splits the TAZ' s and no land use projections can be found for 2013. The DEIS should describe the modifications and those lands uses that are anticipated for completion for 2013. "Modifications were made to the model to reflect recently approved projects and other land uses anticipated for completion by 2013.
- 26 [22) Further, projections for 2025 failed to include the Folsom SOI (3600 acres) and the SunRidge and Easton projects within the region. These errors are fatal and again undercounts the traffic impacts. The DEIS needs to evaluate these projects. The City of Folsom would be happy to assist in providing this information.
- 27 [22) Page 3.1-28: Is the second paragraph written correctly? What are "planned existing" facilities? There is no period at the end of the sentence??? The DEIS should be amended to be clearer.
- 28 [23) Page 3.2-1: The DEIS (Air Quality section) needs to be re-written to incorporate the accurate traffic numbers after that section has been re-written to include accurate growth projections. Also, the section needs to include air quality impacts that go beyond the jurisdiction of Sacramento County, unless the impacts stop at the County line.
- 29 [24) Page 3.2-7: The DEIS should be modified to address transportation planning and air quality conformity to areas that are not covered by SACOG that are impacted by the closure of Dam Road.
- 30 [25) Page 3.3-9: The DEIS needs to have a new noise analysis prepared based on the new traffic numbers that will be derived from using correct growth numbers. The DEIS states that "The most important variable in the traffic noise exposure for the access restriction and its alternatives is the projected traffic volume". Also, the study should use CNEL for its calculations as this is more sensitive than LDN.
- 31 [26) Page 3.3-15: The DEIS should be amended to remove the suggestion that the City of Folsom needs introduce other calming strategies that result from the proposed Federal action (the Preferred Alternative).
- 32 [27) Page 3.3-15: The DEIS clearly states what the problems are that will result from the Preferred Action. The DEIS should state what mitigations can be implemented rather than those that can not.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

Again, thank you for the opportunity to review the DEIS. I will be back in the country on January 24th, 2005, should you wish to call me for clarification on any of these comments.

Sincerely,

David A. Storer, AICP
103 Riggins Court,
Folsom, CA 95630

RESPONSE: STORER, DAVID

Storer-1

The February 2003 closure of Folsom Dam Road was an emergency action taken to provide security until such time that a long-term decision could be finalized. The subject of the EIS is the long-term decision regarding public access on Folsom Dam Road, and is separate from the interim action. As such, the No Action Alternative is defined as restoration of conditions that existed prior to February 2003. Three action alternatives that meet the purpose and need of the project are also evaluated.

The pre-February 2003 conditions establish the baseline conditions against which impacts of the actions under consideration are measured in the EIS. Therefore, rewriting the EIS to change the definition of the No Action Alternative would not be appropriate.

Storer-2

The EIS provides an analysis of all impacts to environmental resources as required by the National Environmental Policy Act and describes them in relative terms against the No Action Alternative. A list of impacts and feasible mitigation is provided at the conclusion of the Executive Summary.

In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. However, this is not necessarily the environmentally preferred alternative. The distinction is described in Section 2.2.2. Reclamation will identify the environmentally preferred alternative in the Record of Decision.

Storer-3

Security risks to Folsom Dam facilities may or may not have changed after September 2001. However, security assessments conducted between 2001 and 2003 identified risks that had not previously been identified. Therefore, Reclamation's information regarding the risks did change between 2001 and 2003. As noted in Response to Storer-1 above, the February 2003 road closure was an interim emergency action, and does not constitute a permanent road closure. The long-term decision regarding public access on the road is the subject of this EIS. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS. The final selection of an alternative will be made in the Record of Decision.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

Storer-4

The Record of Decision will be prepared and signed by Reclamation's Central California Area Office. The Regional Manager will be the signatory of the Record of Decision. There are no further public opportunities to speak to officials involved in the decision-making process. However, with comments provided during the public scoping process, in public hearings, and through written comments, the public is able to communicate with Reclamation decision makers and participate in the decision process.

Storer-5

The Federal Highway Administration sets design standards for public roads and highways with federal involvement. These design standards incorporate safety features (minimum shoulder widths, for example) and are built to withstand heavy traffic use. Because Folsom Dam Road was originally built to be used as a maintenance road, it does not necessarily conform to design standards set forth for heavy public-use roads. Over the years, this has led to high maintenance and repair costs to Reclamation as described in Section 1.2.1.

Storer-6

Folsom Dam Road is owned and operated by Reclamation. Therefore, it has borne the costs associated with road maintenance and repairs. The City of Folsom has committed to bear all capital, operational, and maintenance costs associated with implementation of any restricted access alternative. This is described in Section 2.1.2.

Storer-7

A correction has been made to the statement referenced by the commenter in Section 1.2.2 of the Final EIS. The word "immediately" has been deleted.

Storer-8

See Response to Storer-3 above.

Storer-9

Based on the information and recommendations provided in the security assessments, Reclamation determined that controlled access, when coupled with specific security measures, can reduce some of the security risks at dam facilities. This determination is reflected in the purpose and need for the proposed action, which includes controlling access on Folsom Dam Road and minimizing security risks. The discussion in Section 2.2 indicates that Restricted Access Alternatives 2 and 3 meet the purpose and need. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative.

Storer-10

According to the California Department of Finance's demographic data, Placer County has been among the fastest-growing counties in the nation. In 2004, Placer County ranked second to

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

Riverside County, with a growth of 4.13 percent from the previous year. The text in Section 1.2.3 has been corrected to reflect that Placer County is one of the fastest-growing counties in the nation, and not necessarily the fastest.

The reference material used is cited in the Section 4 of the EIS.

Storer-11

The commenter is correct in that the City of Folsom's General Plan was adopted in 1988 and amended several times through 1993. The text of Section 1.2.3 of the EIS has been corrected.

Storer-12

Although Folsom Dam Road is located entirely on federally owned land, it is surrounded by the City of Folsom. Furthermore, East Natoma Street (eastern terminus of Folsom Dam Road) and Folsom-Auburn Road (western terminus of Folsom Dam Road) are not County roads. Therefore, the City of Folsom would be the appropriate local agency to share in maintenance costs. This does not preclude Reclamation from requesting other jurisdictions to share in maintenance costs.

Storer-13

Section 3.10.1.2 specifies that emergency vehicles are permitted across Folsom Dam Road. This includes local fire and police service vehicles, California Department of Parks and Recreation personnel, and California Highway Patrol. By continuing to allow access to Folsom Dam Road, Reclamation has attempted to maximize public safety without compromising the security of the dam facilities or related resources.

Storer-14

Reclamation has verified that the estimated annual cost of maintaining Folsom Dam Road has been \$75,000. Section 2.1.2 of the EIS has been corrected.

Storer-15

The EIS analyzes the effects of full closure of Folsom Dam Road in Sections 3.1 through 3.11 under the Long-Term Closure Alternative. These impacts include environmental, economic, and quality of life impacts. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Storer-16

The text of Section 2.3.3 of the Final EIS has been modified to clarify why an alternative allowing bicycle and pedestrian access was not considered as a viable alternative.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

Storer-17

Traffic count data was collected to describe the existing traffic conditions of the affected environment. New AM and PM peak-period turning movement counts were conducted at all of the study intersections and most of the study roadway segments at commencement of the traffic analysis. The study was started in the Spring 2004 after Folsom Dam Road had been closed and the City's traffic calming program had been implemented. Historic traffic count data was obtained from the City of Folsom and from traffic studies for other projects in the area to describe pre-closure and post-closure but pre-implementation of the City's traffic calming program. Some of the counts were from pre-2001 conditions. However, the City does not have an exhaustive set of traffic count data that would be needed to evaluate the conditions cited.

Storer-18

As the commenter correctly notes, the road is Briggs Ranch Drive. The text has been corrected in Section 3.1.1.1 of the Final EIS.

Storer-19

Reclamation's traffic consultant contacted the City to obtain their historical traffic counts and the City provided what they had. The historical traffic count data did not include a count of the intersection of Folsom Boulevard/Greenback Lane. "Some congestion" means that some of the vehicles during peak traffic periods were not able to clear the intersection during a single signal cycle.

Storer-20

The traffic analysis used the best data available. New traffic counts were conducted at the outset of the study to describe existing conditions. However, a full set of pre-closure and post-closure/pre-traffic calming program traffic counts were not available. Traffic volumes were adjusted to account for growth to 2005 and 2013 conditions.

Storer-21

See Response to Storer-20 above.

Storer-22

The 4 percent growth rate cited on Draft EIS page 3.1-13 was applied to the 2003 counts on the Riley Street and Folsom Road crossings to obtain 2004 volumes for those locations. This growth rate was obtained by comparing 2001 and 2013 traffic projections from the SACMET model. The growth data provided by the commenter shows declining growth rates in Folsom of 5.1 percent in 2002 to 2.7 percent in 2003. Therefore 4 percent is appropriate.

The 5.7 percent annual growth rate referenced from Draft EIS page 3.4-6 is the compound rate of population growth in Folsom between 1990 and 2000. The 4 percent annual growth rate referenced on Draft EIS page 3.1-13 is not comparable to the 5.7 percent growth rate data.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

Storer-23

Traffic volumes and congestion has increased on regional facilities, such as Folsom Boulevard/Folsom-Auburn Road, as traffic has been diverted from downtown Folsom by the traffic calming program.

Storer-24

The 5.7 percent growth rate cited in the comment refers to the population compounded annual growth rate in the City of Folsom between 1990 and 2000. The same table presents Sacramento County's annual growth rate for the same period at 1.6 percent. Therefore, the region was growing at a lower rate.

The growth rates described on page 3.1-18 of the Draft EIS were used to expand existing (2003 and 2004) volumes to 2005 traffic projections. These growth rates were developed by comparing 2001 to 2013 traffic projections using the SACMET model. The SACMET model includes adopted population and employment projections for the regional study area shown on the map in Draft EIS Appendix B.

Storer-25

The land use projections for 2013 are presented as population and employment projections for Folsom and the rest of the region on Figure 1 in Appendix B. The cumulative traffic volume forecasts for 2013 conditions were based on future land use projections developed by SACOG. The SACOG land use forecasting process considers all entitled land use projects within each City and County in the SACOG region based on the applicable general plans of each jurisdiction. The SACOG land use forecasts are reviewed and approved by each City and County and consider all of the potential individual projects that could occur under the general plans.

Storer-26

The 2025 projections were not included in the EIS.

Storer-27

The sentence in Section 3.1.2.1 of the EIS has been modified as follows: "This is noted as an impact with respect to potential pedestrian/bicycle facilities, but no existing or planned future facilities will be physically affected."

Storer-28

As noted in Response to Storer-22, Reclamation stands by the growth rates used in the traffic analysis. Since traffic information was used to derive air quality impacts, air quality impacts do not have to be revised.

Storer-29

As stated in Section 3.2.2.2, the difference in emissions is less than 1 pound per day across the Folsom regional area for most pollutants (reactive organic gases, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

and particulate matter) and 4.7 pounds per day for carbon monoxide for the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2. Predicted maximum CO concentrations (existing CO monitored levels plus the predicted worst-case increase with Long-Term Closure Alternative traffic changes) were calculated at 8.6 to 9.9 ppm for the 1-hour measurement period. (The California standard is 20 ppm for CO, and the Federal standard is 35 ppm.) For the 8-hour measurement period, the predicted maximum CO levels range from 5.3 to 6.2 ppm (the California and Federal standard for CO is 9 ppm). These levels are well below the applicable standards. Therefore, the analysis concluded that implementation of any of the proposed action alternatives would not cause any exceedances or add to any exceedances of the ambient air quality standards for oxides of nitrogen, particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in diameter, and ozone.

Although Reclamation recognizes that air quality may be temporarily affected to a greater extent in areas experiencing high levels of congestion during a short period of time, the analysis demonstrates that the predicted worst-case concentrations would not result in exceedances of Federal or State standards and would not present sustained risks to public health.

Storer-30

Regarding traffic data used in the traffic impact analysis, see Responses to Storer-22 and Storer-28. L_{dn} (day/night noise level) is the average A-weighted noise level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of 10 decibels to levels measured in the night between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. CNEL is the average A-weighted noise level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of 5 decibels to levels measured in the evening between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. and the addition of 10 decibels to levels measured in the night between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. For typical environments the CNEL is 0 to 1 dBA higher than the L_{dn} . Therefore, the noise calculations would be comparable between L_{dn} and CNEL. The City of Folsom uses both L_{dn} and CNEL in the Noise Element of its General Plan.

Storer-31

NEPA requires the identification of feasible mitigation within and beyond the authority of the lead agency. Reclamation has considered mitigation measures that could reduce the impacts to traffic quickly as feasible mitigation. The City of Folsom may or may not choose to implement mitigation measures that Reclamation has identified.

Storer-32

All mitigation measures that were considered have been identified in the relevant sections of the EIS. If they were not deemed feasible, the EIS so states. Mitigation measures are listed in the Executive Summary in Table ES-2.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: CIMAROLI, NEVA



7900 Folsom-Auburn Road
Folsom, California 95630
(916) 959-4300
FAX (916) 959-1102

RECEIVED	
JAN 18 2005	
COMM. REVIEW	PREP. REVIEW

January 17, 2005

Robert Schroeder, Project Manager
U. S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation/Central California Area Office
7794 Folsom Dam Road
Folsom, CA 95630

VIA FAX

Dear Mr. Schroeder,

1 I have carefully read the Executive Summary of the Draft Environment Impact Statement relating to the potential opening of Folsom
2 Dam Road. The closure has had a major negative impact on a daily basis related to the increases of time and fuel required to cross the American River. The long-term impact related to the loss of business sustained by business owners has been disastrous.

3 It is noted that all of the possible negative impacts related to the opening are prefaced by the word "may", while staff has correctly identified but have given little expansion to the problems related to having the roadway closed. These are real people who have had their livelihood eliminated in the case of layoffs and loss of their businesses and retirement savings for the owner's of the impacted businesses.

Life is loaded with risks and we do not expect government to eliminate all risks. If the Department were truly trying to totally protect the population they would be more concerned with pedestrian and boat access. Reclamation should be paying more attention to the Mormon Island wing dam that has been leaking for years and would be a logical and easy target.

As is true of many long-term Folsom residents, we recall when there were many alternatives to get across the American River. These bridges were eliminated when the Dam was constructed. I find it ludicrous to reference the fact that the State of California did not then or has not since considered the Dam Road a part of the State Highway system. Folsom was a sleepy little town over fifty years ago prior to the influx of construction workers for the Dam. This status was restored until these workers were replaced by Aerojet employees. Folsom then reverted to normal population growth until Intel joined our business community. The availability of the roadway across the Dam helped us cope with the loss of crossings flooded when Folsom Dam was constructed.

Under the conditions, which must be met on ES-4, the first four bullets set forth by Reclamation are responsive to danger that may exist. The final two items are, in the minds of long term Folsom citizens, the result of a long standing feud between the Bureau and Folsom regarding who is responsible for maintenance. Today's actual circumstances need a joint resolution in answer to the Bureau's repressive moves. We now have totally new leadership and the Bureau should be fair and reasonable to ameliorate the circumstances created by the Dam roadway closure.

The fifth bullet addresses mitigation to the Bureau for liability resulting from use of the crossing. If motorists choose to cross at this location, they should be personally responsible.

4 Bullet six, which addresses maintenance costs, rightfully should be absorbed by the Bureau as mitigation for having eliminated other river crossings. Most of the eliminated crossings tied El Dorado County to Placer County. Closure of the Dam Road has created a regional problem and created excessive maintenance costs throughout Folsom. Costs related to utilization of the Dam roadway should not be a further burden on the taxpayers of Folsom when the major benefit involves El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Granite Bay, Roseville, and points north and west.

We ask that rather than relying upon technical studies, you rely upon the real life impacts we have all felt. The "what if" discussions in the report do not warrant the closure. We are prepared to accept the risk in the interest of the many people adversely affected in so many ways by the closure.

Sincerely,

Neva J. Cimaroли

cc: Martha Lofgren, City Manager
Mayor Steve Miklos, City of Folsom

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE • 8022 FOLSOM — AUBURN ROAD • FOLSOM, CA 95630 • (916) 959-4300 • Fax (916) 959-1102

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

RESPONSE: CIMAROLI, NEVA

Cimaroli-1

The comment regarding the additional commute time and added fuel consumption associated with the Folsom Dam Road closure is noted. Modeling of commute times is presented in Table 3.1-4 for 2005 and Table 3.1-8 for 2013 for each of the alternatives. See Response to Jani-1 for a discussion of impacts to fuel and energy consumption.

Cimaroli-2

The comment regarding business losses associated with the Folsom Dam Road closure is noted. This issue is discussed in Master Response to Comment-2.

Cimaroli-3

The commenter's statement regarding social and economic conditions since the road closure is noted. See Master Response to Comment-1.

Cimaroli-4

The comment that Reclamation should absorb maintenance costs for Folsom Dam Road as mitigation for eliminating and not replacing the river crossings flooded by the construction of the dam is noted.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

COMMENT: GAGLIARDI, JOSEPH (1 OF 2)

January 18, 2005

Robert Schroeder, Project Manager
Bureau of Reclamation
Central California Office
7749 Folsom-Auburn Road
Folsom, CA 95630-1799

Re: Public Comment on Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Folsom Dam Road Access Restriction

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

- 1 [The Folsom Chamber of Commerce, who represents more than 1,200 businesses in the Folsom area, asks that Alternative 2 be identified as the preferred alternative in the Final EIS report.

Many factors related to the impacts of the closure of Folsom Dam Road were understated in the draft EIS.

- 2 [- Traffic impact: 20,000 cars per day detoured.
3 [- Air Quality impact: additional miles and congested alternative routes lead to much greater impact than estimated in your draft.
4 [- Negative Economic impact: Loss of business, business closings and lost jobs due to disrupted traffic patterns and congestion region-wide.
5 [- Deterioration of Quality of Life impact: increased commute times, congested streets and problems getting to and from everyday family events lead to a lower quality of life for all.
6 [- Public Safety impact: Longer response times for both police and fire response.

According to the Executive Summary of the "Draft Environmental Impact Statement", page ES-1, the purpose and need for closure of the Folsom Dam Road is:

- Control access to Folsom Dam... and;
- Minimize the security risks and maximize the safety of Folsom Dam...

We firmly believe that opening the road to peak period two-way traffic under Alternative 2 with security, including vehicle inspections, by the Folsom Police Department could provide equal, and possibly superior security to that contemplated under the present Preferred Alternative.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

If security is truly the goal, armed police officers on the road are a much greater deterrent than passive barriers.

Further, it appears that a feasible alternative route to the Folsom Dam Road may be available within 24–30 months...a new Folsom Dam Bridge. Through cooperation between the Bureau and the city, this could be a reality within the shortest possible time.

After 50 years of Folsom Dam being used as a major route linking burgeoning communities of El Dorado, Sacramento and Placer Counties, it seems quite reasonable for the City of Folsom and the Bureau to cooperate on a restricted flow of traffic (Alt. 2) over Folsom Dam for two more years while cooperating on getting the replacement bridge built. This would be an exemplary example of good governance.

Your security objectives will be achieved in Alternative 2 and at the same time mitigate some of the impacts being endured by Folsom businesses, residents and area commuters.

Thank you,

Joseph Gagliardi,
President, Folsom Chamber of Commerce

RESPONSE: GAGLIARDI, JOSEPH (1 OF 2)

Gagliardi (1)-1

The commenter's recommendation that Restricted Access Alternative 2 be designated the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Gagliardi (1)-2

As stated in Section 3.1.1.3, "Prior to the road closure, approximately 18,000 vehicles used Folsom Dam Road on a daily basis. Approximately 9,000 vehicles per day shifted to Rainbow Bridge and Lake Natoma Crossing, resulting in increased volumes on Folsom-Auburn Road and Riley Street through the center of the Folsom Historic District. The already poor existing operating conditions on these roads (LOS D or worse) were therefore further impacted by the closure action." The traffic analysis provided the projected operations of intersections and roadway segments for 2005 conditions with the No Action (road open), and the three action alternatives. Cumulative roadway segment impacts were also evaluated for the four alternatives.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

Gagliardi (1)-3

The commenter's opinion that air quality impacts are much greater than stated in the EIS is noted. Section 3.2.2 of the EIS describes the impacts on air quality as a result of additional miles traveled by vehicles in the Folsom area. See Response to Riedinger-9.

Gagliardi (1)-4

The statement that the business losses, business closures, and job losses due to traffic congestion are nationwide is noted. See Master Response to Comment-2.

Gagliardi (1)-5

In regard to increased commute times, congested streets, difficulty traveling to and from everyday family events, and other quality-of-life issues, see Master Response to Comment-1.

Gagliardi (1)-6

Section 3.10.2.2 states that delays due to traffic congestion affect response times for emergency events and emergency vehicle access. While Folsom Dam Road remains accessible to fire and police service vehicles, State parks, and California Highway Patrol, city police and fire departments have indicated a reduction in average emergency response times within the City of Folsom. See Master Response to Comment-5 for further discussion of impacts to emergency response times.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: GAGLIARDI, JOSEPH (2 OF 2)

Robert Schroeder, Project Manager
Bureau of Reclamation
Central California Office
7749 Folsom-Auburn Rd.
Folsom, CA 95630-1799

Jan. 18, 2005

Re: Public comment on draft EIS
Folsom Dam Road Assess Restriction

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

The impacts to the City of Folsom due to the closing of the Folsom Dam Road have been monumental. While many of the direct impacts can be seen and felt by both businesses and residents, the long-term effects of the traffic congestion in our city have caused damages that will take years to overcome.

At the Folsom Visitor's Center, which is managed by the Folsom Tourism Bureau, we receive complaints daily from both residents and visitors. Comments such as "I will never come back – it was too hard to get here," to "I almost didn't come to Folsom because of the traffic congestion," and "I can't get a view of the lake without entering the State Park anymore."

1

Other comments we have received include "It took me 45 minutes to cross the river and before the Folsom Dam Road was closed, it only took me 15 minutes," and "I do not shop in Folsom anymore as it is too difficult to get there."

2

These are just a few of the comments that demonstrate the long term image problems the Folsom Dam Road closure has caused Folsom. This negative image impedes the development of a tourism program vital to the city's long-term economic stability.

3

Many of our affiliate organizations have already stated the direct economic impacts but even more critical is the impact on a market-driven program such as tourism. No dollars spent in promoting Folsom as a destination is fiscally sound if these resources such as recreation and waterways are not accessible. Mitigation of these effects are not even mentioned in the draft EIS and need to be correctly measured. By researching these

4

considerations, we believe alternative 2 is the best solution for the impacts created by the closure of the Folsom Dam Road.

I look forward to your analysis.

Sincerely,

Joseph Gagliardi,
President, Folsom Tourism Bureau

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

RESPONSE: GAGLIARDI, JOSEPH (2 OF 2)

Gagliardi (2)-1

The commenter's statements regarding tourists' reactions to the traffic congestion are noted. The analysis of traffic conditions presented in Section 3.1 of the EIS indicates an increase in the periods of time that congested traffic conditions occur as a result of the road closure.

Gagliardi (2)-2

The comment that the road closure is creating an image problem for Folsom, impacting the development of a tourism program and economic stability of the area, is noted. Impacts of the road closure on recreation and businesses are described in Sections 3.8.2 and 3.4.2 of the EIS, respectively.

Gagliardi (2)-3

The statement that there is no mention of a mitigation measure in the EIS for impacts the road closure will have on tourism is noted.

Gagliardi (2)-4

The commenter's recommendation of the Restricted Access Alternative 2 is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: GARNICA, ALICIA

Alicia Garnica
Sol Xteca Mexican Cuisine
409 Natoma Street
Folsom, Ca. 95630
January 15, 2004

Folsom Dam Road Access Restriction Draft EIS

To whom it May Concern,

The Bureau of Reclamation recently released a draft Environment Impact Statement (EIS) that recommends the permanent closure of Folsom Dam Road as the preferred alternative. If the Bureau closes the Dam Road permanently, traffic conditions will continue to worsen until the new bridge below the dam is completed in late 2007 or early 2008.

1

It is important that you understand what you are doing to small businesses in Folsom. There is a lack of business on Natoma Street because the roads are so congested. It is making it hard for us to stay in business and make a profit. There is backed up traffic on Natoma Street all day and night and our customers are having a very hard time driving into or out of our restaurant. Because of this congestion, many of customers decide it is not worth the trouble of fighting the traffic.

2

There are also environmental impacts that should be considered. All the traffic on Natoma Street is causing poor air quality, more noise and less availability to the recreational parks. It also affects our energy, power supply and water resources.

3

The City of Folsom should take a proactive role in convincing the Bureau of Reclamation to change it views. The closing of Folsom Dam Road affects all the residents of Folsom, future Folsom Board Members and our schools. The City of Folsom has already had enough bad raps with numerous deaths of our local students with diseases such as meningitis.

I ask you to hear the small businessman/woman and pick alternative #1: the No Action alternative that would reopen the road. Thank you for taking my comments into consideration when making this decision.

4

Sincerely yours,

Alicia Garnica
Owner of Sol Azteca Mexican Cuisine
Phone: 916 351-9083, Fax 916 351-1649, Email Lichaz2@msn.com

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

RESPONSE: GARNICA, ALICIA

Garnica-1

The comment that traffic will worsen until a new bridge is build in 2007–2008 is noted. Traffic congestion under each of the alternatives has been modeled and projected for 2005 and 2013 in Section 3.1.2 of the EIS.

Garnica-2

In regard to the impact of traffic congestion on downtown businesses, see Master Response to Comment-2.

Garnica-3

The commenter's statement that environmental impacts of the road closure on Natoma Street, including those to air quality and noise, must be addressed is noted. The EIS describes the environmental effects of each alternative for air quality (Section 3.2), noise (Section 3.3), water resources (Section 3.5), energy and power supply (Section 3.7), and recreation (Section 3.8).

Garnica-4

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road under the No Action Alternative is noted.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: HEILMAN, SHARON

Comment Sheet for the
Folsom Dam Road Access Restriction Draft EIS

Written comments can be submitted tonight at the Comment Table or are due to the Bureau of Reclamation by close of business on Monday, January 18, 2005.

If you do not submit your comments tonight, please mail them to the address on the back, or fax your comments to 916 989-7208, or e-mail your comments to rschroeder@mp.usbr.gov. Thank you.

(Please print clearly)

Name Sharon Heilman

Organization and Address 113 North Falls Dr.
Folsom, Ca 95630

Phone (916) 988-5684 FAX () _____ E-mail _____

Comment here: 1-13-05
Date

Please allow for the opening of the Dam Road if not completely (24 hours/day) then during the mornings and afternoon commute. (6-9am and 4-7pm). As a citizen who used the Dam Road daily and would if it were reopened, I would be willing to disclose information about my employment, or whatever would qualify me to obtain a sticker for my car that would allow me to use the Dam Road. Those people who want to use the road, and if they are willing to assure their responsible use of the road, should BE ALLOWED TO USE THE FOLSOM DAM ROAD.

The traffic congestion in the peaceful town of Folsom that has resulted from the closure of this road has created more problems for Folsom's citizens than it has solved! Thank you.

All comments become part of the public record.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

RESPONSE: HEILMAN, SHARON

Heilman-1

Reclamation notes the commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road 24 hours a day (the No Action Alternative) or during morning and afternoon/evening commute hours (Restricted Access Alternative 2 and Restricted Access Alternative 3). In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Heilman-2

The commenter's opinion that the congestion resulting from the road closure has caused more problems than it has solved is noted. See Master Response to Comment-1.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: KRAKOW, MONICA

**Comment Sheet for the
Folsom Dam Road Access Restriction Draft EIS**

Written comments can be submitted tonight at the Comment Table
or are due to the Bureau of Reclamation by close of business
on Monday, January 18, 2005.

If you do not submit your comments tonight, please mail them
to the address on the back, or fax your comments to 916 989-7208,
or e-mail your comments to rschroeder@mp.usbr.gov. Thank you.

(Please print clearly)

Name Monica Krakow

Organization and Address Pak Mail (Owner)
6610 Folsom-Auburn Rd, Ste 5
Folsom, CA 95630

Phone (916) 990-9007 FAX (916) 990-9007 E-mail ---

Comment here: 1/14/05
Date

Dear Mr. Schroeder,

I attended the public hearing on January 5th
because as a resident of El Dorado Hills and as a business
owner in Folsom, I have been doubly impacted by
the road closure.

Now while I did not stay for the entire meeting,
for the time I was there, I did not hear our voice of
support to keep the Road closed. I urge you to listen
to our voices.

While a complete opening of the road would be
preferred, a partial opening (ie during commuter
hours) would go a long way as a measure of good faith
in willing to work with the community. As someone stated
during the meeting, we should ~~work~~ together on this, not be
on opposite sides. Sincerely, Monica Krakow

All comments become part of the public record.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

RESPONSE: KRAKOW, MONICA

Krakow-1

The commenter's recommendation to either fully or partially reopen Folsom Dam Road is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

COMMENT: ROSS, BRUCE

To Robert Schroeder
RE: Dam Road

1 I read in the news paper that I should voice my opinion on the use of the dam
road. So here it comes, I work in Antelope and live in just the other side of
Rescue. My commute when I took this job 40-45 minutes. Then 9/11 now my
commute is 60minutes on a good day and 75-80 minutes on a Friday when we
used the short cut that was also closed due to traffic and we had to use riley thru
2 old town which added another 5-10 minutes. Since this closure I have been put
on meds for to suppress the road rage and anger that has become part of my daily
commute I understand the business's don't want the commute traffic going thru
3 there area it clogs it up and really makes shopping and or eating in the effected
areas unappealing. You can get the traffic reports from Folsom police the show
the many accidents due to the traffic congestion.

I don't believe closing the dam road really makes it any safer than before here
is why. I believe the terrorist are for one ready willing and able to be suicide
bombs if need be they believe its going to give them a place in Allah land with
plenty of virgins. So why wouldn't they just drive a large truck thru the pipe rail
that close's the road? Do you think the security guards would be able to stop
them with a little ranger pick up? Or a pistol? Could they protect themselves from
a terrorist that pulls up to them and opens fire on them with a machine gun? Are
they ready for there lives to be taken by someone willing to die for there beliefs?
Could any of them stop these terrorist and keep themselves from danger if it
really came to it? How fast can you react to a semi or two coming at a gate full
speed willing to die for there beliefs. Or how hard would it be to fill a boat or
boats armed with these terrorist with explosives and guns drive it into the dam?
Would the security guard be able to react to that boat in time to be able to stop it
with a rifle? Obviously the terrorist are very resourceful and if it was there plan I
really doubt that it can be prevented. I think the resources spent on keeping it
closed could better be spent on a plan to handle the event if it did get targeted, by
giving down stream areas an alert if it would be possible to evacuate in time.

Please consider the peoples lives that have been changed since closing the
road. Traffic has become almost unbearable and certainly a very dreadful event
that keeps me on medication to cope. I don't know if your commute has the same
congestion or not but if you were able to relievce the congestion on your commute
I'm sure you would. Consider the commute of those as myself that must navigate
thru the traffic every day.

Thank You for your Consideration

Sincerely Bruce Ross

RESPONSE: ROSS, BRUCE

Ross-1

In regard to traffic congestion worsening and commute times increasing since the road closure,
see Response to Miller, L.-1.

Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses

Ross-2

See Master Response to Comment-1 for a discussion regarding quality of life issues since closure
of the Folsom Dam Road.

Ross-3

The comment regarding accident rates following the road closure is noted. As discussed in
Section 3.1.1.3, a 16 percent increase in traffic accidents was reported citywide by the City of
Folsom Police Department in the 12 months following the road closure.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: THAYNE, SANDY

January 17, 2005

Robert Schroeder, Project Manager
Bureau of Reclamation
Central California Office
7749 Folsom-Auburn Road
Folsom, CA 95630-1799
City of Folsom

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Mr. Schroeder,

1 As a resident of El Dorado County for over 20 years, I have many occasions to use the road across Folsom Dam in the course of normal day to day activities. I not only use this route for commuting to my job near the Placer County line, but also to help care for my elderly mother-in-law in the Roseville area. Recently however, I had occasion to take my husband to the Roseville Kaiser emergency room for an irregular heartbeat. While this was a drop in case, this time, it did make me pause to reflect on how much closer it would be and how much more expeditious the trip would have been if I could have used the route across Folsom Dam. This trip, fortunately, or otherwise, was done at 10:00 P.M. and it took approximately 60 minutes to arrive at my destination. I can't imagine the consequences if the circumstances had been more serious and I would have encountered the back log of traffic that is more normal on the same route.

2 A few months ago I did have occasion to try to shop in Folsom during the course of my work day and upon leaving a central Folsom location, was met with absolute gridlock in front of the School District offices. The traffic diversions installed to try to route commuter traffic away from residential streets (due to the dam road being closed) caused unbelievable snarls and close calls. Too many cars had to navigate through heavy traffic to get to the Natoma Crossing recommended by city officials as the "route for commuters". Suffice it to say this process took over 25 minutes to accomplish. While I feel badly about the negative impact it has on the businesses in Folsom, I now avoid shopping altogether in Folsom. All this traffic congestion must be having a negative impact on the air quality as well. I have read studies that offered that idling cars were a large contributor to air pollution.

3 My experience is only ONE TRIP for ONE PERSON on ONE DAY. This scenario is repeated thousands of times a day. This is life for those of us who have to cross the river to get to work, school, services, and shopping. The dam road closure has dramatically impacted the way I conduct business and where I spend my leisure time. The first thing I think of now when planning a trip out is what a time is it? When is the best time to not get caught up in the traffic in Folsom? Can I get what I want elsewhere? People need as many options and routes as possible to lessen the impact of the ever increasing traffic, not the opposite. Giving cars less access to public roadways will only increase traffic congestion in Folsom and perpetuate the negative impact the businesses are now feeling.

4 The Natoma Crossing is too far out of the way to use to access Folsom businesses, let alone those traveling to Placer County from anywhere east of Folsom on Highway 50. I feel it only makes sense to re-open the dam road. I have yet to read a plausible reason for closure other than for "security" and to "protect the water supply". I would be interested to know what studies are available, what a "threat" constitutes and what magnitude it would have to be to really affect the water supply? This closure has made and continues to make a monumental impact on the lives and quality of life of thousands of people daily, and the perceived potential risk for attack should be weighed against this. It is my understanding that the City has prepared and presented a proposed security plan for the road patterned after that of Hoover Dam. If the road across Hoover Dam is open, why can't we keep Folsom Dam road open? I have also heard that the Dam road was intended as a service road only. This route has been established as a major part of our transportation system for at least as many years as I have been an adult and it should not be abandoned until it can be replaced.

Sincerely,



Sandy Thayne
4240 Cothrin Ranch Road
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
(916) 989-4300 Days, (530) 677-4234 Eves.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

RESPONSE: THAYNE, SANDY

Thayne-1

The commenter's concern over the time it would take for her to drive to Kaiser Hospital in an emergency during in traffic congestion is noted. The EIS describes the effects of the road closure on emergency medical response in Section 3.10.2. Since the closure of Folsom Dam Road in February 2003, emergency medical, fire, and police responders have had access to the road during emergencies. Also see Master Response to Comment-5.

Thayne-2

The extent of the traffic congestion following the road closure as noted by the commenter is discussed in Sections 3.1.1.3 and 3.1.2. Also see Response to Cronin-1.

Thayne-3

The effects of the road closure on businesses are described in Section 3.4.2 of the EIS. Also see Master Response to Comment-2.

Thayne-4

The road closure's effects on air quality are described in Section 3.2.2 of the EIS. Also see Responses to Jani-1 and Riedinger-9.

Thayne-5

Reclamation notes the description of how the road closure has affected where the commenter shops and spends leisure time. For a discussion of these and other quality of life issues, see Master Response to Comment-1.

Thayne-6

See Master Response to Comment-4 for a discussion of the basis for security concerns with respect to Folsom Dam facilities.

Thayne-7

The commenter's opinion that Folsom Dam Road should be reopened and not abandoned before it can be replaced is noted.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: DEBRUIN, ROBERT

Robert DeBruin, M.D.

FAM VISATHEP, F.N.P.

1600 CREEKSIDE DRIVE, SUITE 3800
FOLSOM, CA 95630
TELEPHONE: (916) 984-7930
FAX: (916) 984-7987

December 27, 2004

Robert Schroeder
Project Manager
Bureau of Reclamation
Central California Office
7794 Folsom Dam Road
Folsom, CA 95630-1799

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

I am writing to you regarding recommendation for permanent closure of Folsom Dam Road. I have been a physician in Folsom over the past 23 years and have had an opportunity to meet and care for many patient living in the surrounding area. As I know you are most thoroughly aware, many residents of Folsom, particularly those living on the other side of Folsom Lake, have found the closure of the dam to be a significant burden. I am an internist/intensive care doctor taking care of many ill patients, as do my seven partners. Many of our very ill patients that live on the other side of the lake have found it particularly onerous to attempt to cross into Folsom, where they receive their care both at our offices as well as at Mercy Folsom Hospital. Without a doubt, I feel closure of the dam clearly limits Folsom city residents access to health care within their own city.

I appreciate your consideration of these facts and hope we will continue to be able to provide high quality health care at Mercy Folsom Hospital to all the residents of the City of Folsom.

Sincerely Yours,

Robert DeBruin

Robert DeBruin, M.D.
RD:db

cc: Steve Miklos, Mayor, City of Folsom
Don Hudson, CEO, Mercy Folsom Hospital

RESPONSE: DEBRUIN, ROBERT

DeBruin-1

The commenter's statement regarding access to medical services since the closure of the Folsom Dam Road is noted.

See Master Response to Comment-5 for further discussion of traffic impacts to emergency services.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: CARSON, KEVIN



John Laing Homes
Hand crafted since 1848

January 19, 2005

Robert Schroeder
Bureau of Reclamation
Central California Office
7749 Folsom-Auburn Road
Folsom, CA 95630-1799

Dear Robert:

1 I am writing to ask you to approve Alternative 2 to the Environmental Impact Statement. Opening the Folsom Dam Road during peak commute hours with special security measures is necessary for the City of Folsom.

2 We are in full agreement with our fellow Folsom Chamber of Commerce Members that this will increase a smoother traffic flow for the City residents and its greater Sacramento area commuters. John Laing Homes has built several communities located in the Parkway, and we believe the opening of this road is necessary for their everyday way of life. Please consider alternative 2 as the preferred alternative to the closure of Folsom Day Road.

Thank you for your consideration. Please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Kevin Carson

Kevin Carson
Sacramento Division President
John Laing Homes
(916) 780-1222 x236

cc: Folsom Chamber of Commerce

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

RESPONSE: CARSON, KEVIN

Carson-1

The commenter's opinion that Restricted Access Alternative 2 should be selected is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Carson-2

Under the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, access to Folsom Dam Road would be permitted for 3-hour periods during the morning and afternoon/evening peak commute periods from Monday to Friday. The road would be closed to public access at all other times. As described in Section 3.1.2.2 of the EIS, relative to the Long-Term Closure Alternative and Restricted Access Alternative 3 (which would allow public access for 2 hours in the morning and afternoon/evening commute periods from Monday to Friday), a greater volume of vehicles would cross Folsom Dam Road. As a result, there would be less congestion and fewer delays during hours that the road is open than under the Long-Term Closure Alternative or Restricted Access Alternative 3.

COMMENT: JEFFREY, DEBBIE

>>> "Maternal Expressions" <matexps@onemain.com> 1/19/2005 10:12:20 AM >>>

1 I know there is a risk to all things. closing of the Dam road has hurt folsom's business's it also has made the commute for some many miles longer and out of the way. I manage a business in Folsom and see recovery in business but it would help bring people back to the area if you open the road. I appreciate your time. Sincerely, Debbie Jeffrey @ Maternal Expressions in Folsom

RESPONSE: JEFFREY, DEBBIE

Jeffrey-1

The commenter's opinion that Folsom Dam Road should be reopened is noted. See Master Response to Comment-2.

**Appendix E4
Public Comments and Responses**

COMMENT: MEYER, TONY

>>> "Tony Meyer" <ibtonymeyer@hotmail.com> 1/19/2005 11:21:33 AM >>>

Dear Robert Schroeder,

Hello my name is Tony Meyer. I am a co-owner of the SpeeDee Oil Change & Tune Up located on the corner of Auburn-Folsom and Greenback Ln. Immediately after the closing of the Dam road we noticed a sharp decline in business (aprox. 20-25%). Massive traffic in front of the store has further decreased business. Customers do not want to turn in and out of the plaza for fear of
1 being hit. This was further aggravated by the city removing a turn lane into the plaza so that another turn lane could be created to go over the already crowded Rainbow bridge. The Folsom Pavillions Plaza is finally starting to fill up, however, if businesses can't survive till the new bridge is built, then they will close and leave. This has already happened to one business
2 (Granite Bay Jewlers). Opening the Dam road, if only for limited times, may help traffic and local business. Most of my customers are very upset about the closing of the Dam road and feel
3 the security reasons are just an excuse. Other customers have let me know that they are sorry but do not frequent my store because it is too much of a hassle to drive through town and fight the traffic to come to my store. My business is being handed to my competitors. I hope this letter reviewed and concidered. Thank you for your time.

Anthony W. Meyer II

SpeeDee Oil Change & Tune Up
6604 Folsom-Auburn Rd.
Folsom, CA 95630
(916)988-0531

RESPONSE: MEYER, TONY

Meyer-1

The statement that the commenter's business revenues have declined 20 to 25 percent following the Folsom Dam Road closure due to traffic that prevents customers from accessing the business is noted. The effect of road closure on traffic congestion for each of the alternatives is discussed in Section 3.1.2 of the EIS.

Meyer-2

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road if only for limited times to relieve traffic congestion and help local businesses is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. For a complete description of Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, please see Section 2.2.2 of the Final EIS.

Meyer-3

The comment that customers are taking their business elsewhere because of the traffic congestion is noted. See Master Response to Comment-2.