

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

Introduction.....	E5-1
Sacramento Hearing, January 4, 2005 .....	E5-2
Sacramento Hearing-1 and -2 (Morin, Andy).....	E5-2
Sacramento Hearing-3 (Morin, Andy).....	E5-2
Sacramento Hearing-4 (Morin, Andy).....	E5-2
Sacramento Hearing-5 and -6 (Morin, Andy).....	E5-3
Sacramento Hearing-7 (Morin, Andy).....	E5-3
Sacramento Hearing-8 (Hodges, Will) .....	E5-3
Sacramento Hearing-9 (Hodges, Will) .....	E5-3
Folsom Hearing, January 5, 2005 .....	E5-4
Folsom Hearing-1 (Miklos, Steve) .....	E5-4
Folsom Hearing-2 (Miklos, Steve) .....	E5-4
Folsom Hearing-3 (Miklos, Steve) .....	E5-4
Folsom Hearing-4 (Miklos, Steve) .....	E5-5
Folsom Hearing-5 (Morin, Andy).....	E5-5
Folsom Hearing-6 (Morin, Andy).....	E5-5
Folsom Hearing-7 (Morin, Andy).....	E5-6
Folsom Hearing-8 (Moseley, Madeleine) .....	E5-6
Folsom Hearing-9 (Moseley, Madeleine) .....	E5-6
Folsom Hearing-10 (Moseley, Madeleine).....	E5-7
Folsom Hearing-11 (Moseley, Madeleine).....	E5-7
Folsom Hearing-12 (Story, Ed).....	E5-7
Folsom Hearing-13 (Story, Ed).....	E5-7
Folsom Hearing-14 (Sheldon, Ernie).....	E5-8
Folsom Hearing-15 (Sheldon, Ernie).....	E5-8
Folsom Hearing-16 (Sheldon, Ernie).....	E5-8
Folsom Hearing-17 (Setnik, Bob).....	E5-8
Folsom Hearing-18 (Setnik, Bob).....	E5-9
Folsom Hearing-19 (Setnik, Bob).....	E5-9
Folsom Hearing-20 (Setnik, Bob).....	E5-9
Folsom Hearing-21 (Setnik, Bob).....	E5-9
Folsom Hearing-22 (Baker, Steve) .....	E5-9
Folsom Hearing-23 (Baker, Steve) .....	E5-10
Folsom Hearing-24 (Baker, Steve) .....	E5-10
Folsom Hearing-25 (Baker, Steve) .....	E5-10
Folsom Hearing-26 (Baker, Steve) .....	E5-10
Folsom Hearing-27 (Baker, Steve) .....	E5-11
Folsom Hearing-28 (Baker, Steve) .....	E5-11
Folsom Hearing-29 (Kipp, Gail).....	E5-11
Folsom Hearing-30 (Kipp, Gail).....	E5-11
Folsom Hearing-31 (Seaman, Ed).....	E5-12
Folsom Hearing-32 (Seaman, Ed).....	E5-12
Folsom Hearing-33 (Uhler, Kirk) .....	E5-12
Folsom Hearing-34 (Uhler, Kirk) .....	E5-12
Folsom Hearing-35 (Uhler, Kirk) .....	E5-13
Folsom Hearing-36 (Lewis, Wayne).....	E5-13

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Folsom Hearing-37 (Lewis, Wayne)	E5-13
Folsom Hearing-38 (Lewis, Wayne)	E5-13
Folsom Hearing-39 (Lewis, Wayne)	E5-13
Folsom Hearing-40 (Lewis, Wayne)	E5-14
Folsom Hearing-41 (Lewis, Wayne)	E5-14
Folsom Hearing-42 (Lewis, Wayne)	E5-14
Folsom Hearing-43 (Radovich, Renae)	E5-14
Folsom Hearing-44 (Radovich, Renae)	E5-14
Folsom Hearing-45 (Radovich, Renae)	E5-15
Folsom Hearing-46 (Radovich, Renae)	E5-15
Folsom Hearing-47 (Cloud, Grant)	E5-15
Folsom Hearing-48 (Cloud, Grant)	E5-15
Folsom Hearing-49 (Cloud, Grant)	E5-16
Folsom Hearing-50 (Cloud, Grant)	E5-16
Folsom Hearing-51 (Richard, Gary)	E5-16
Folsom Hearing-52 and -53 (Richard, Gary)	E5-16
Folsom Hearing-54 (Richard, Gary)	E5-17
Folsom Hearing-55 (Cimaroli, Neva)	E5-17
Folsom Hearing-56 (Cimaroli, Neva)	E5-17
Folsom Hearing-57 (Cimaroli, Neva)	E5-17
Folsom Hearing-58 (Cimaroli, Neva)	E5-17
Folsom Hearing-59 (Holderness, Robert)	E5-18
Folsom Hearing-60 (Holderness, Robert)	E5-18
Folsom Hearing-61 (Holderness, Robert)	E5-18
Folsom Hearing-62 (Holderness, Robert)	E5-18
Folsom Hearing-63 (Holderness, Robert)	E5-19
Folsom Hearing-64 (Kuhl, Doug)	E5-19
Folsom Hearing-65 (Kuhl, Doug)	E5-19
Folsom Hearing-66 (Kuhl, Doug)	E5-19
Folsom Hearing-67 (Kuhl, Doug)	E5-20
Folsom Hearing-68 (Gagliardi, Joe)	E5-20
Folsom Hearing-69 (Gagliardi, Joe)	E5-20
Folsom Hearing-70 (Gagliardi, Joe)	E5-20
Folsom Hearing-71 (Walter, Benita)	E5-21
Folsom Hearing-72 (Walter, Benita)	E5-21
Folsom Hearing-73 (Coleman, Steve)	E5-21
Folsom Hearing-74 (Coleman, Steve)	E5-21
Folsom Hearing-75 (Coleman, Steve)	E5-22
Folsom Hearing-76 (Kerfeld, Paul)	E5-22
Folsom Hearing-77 (Kerfeld, Paul)	E5-22
Folsom Hearing-78 (Drew, Ramsey)	E5-22
Folsom Hearing-79 (Drew, Ramsey)	E5-23
Folsom Hearing-80 (Riedinger, Michael)	E5-23
Folsom Hearing-81 (Riedinger, Michael)	E5-23
Folsom Hearing-82 (Riedinger, Michael)	E5-23
Folsom Hearing-83 (Riedinger, Michael)	E5-23

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Folsom Hearing-84 (Riedinger, Michael)	E5-24
Folsom Hearing-85 (Mobley, Ed)	E5-24
Folsom Hearing-86 (Mobley, Ed)	E5-24
Folsom Hearing-87 (Mobley, Ed)	E5-24
Folsom Hearing-88 (Starsky, Jeff)	E5-24
Folsom Hearing-89 (Starsky, Jeff)	E5-25
Folsom Hearing-90 (Starsky, Jeff)	E5-25
Folsom Hearing-91 and -92 (Corda, Chris)	E5-26
Folsom Hearing-93 and -94 (Corda, Chris)	E5-26
Folsom Hearing-95 (Corda, Chris)	E5-26
Folsom Hearing-96 and -97 (Pearson, Kirk)	E5-26
Folsom Hearing-98 (Pearson, Kirk)	E5-26
Folsom Hearing-99 (Williams, James)	E5-27
Folsom Hearing-100 (Williams, James)	E5-27
Folsom Hearing-101 (Williams, James)	E5-27
Folsom Hearing-102 (Bernau, Jeremy)	E5-27
Folsom Hearing-103 (Bernau, Jeremy)	E5-28
Folsom Hearing-104 (Bernau, Jeremy)	E5-28
Folsom Hearing-105 (Bernau, Jeremy)	E5-28
Folsom Hearing-106 (Bernau, Jeremy)	E5-28
Folsom Hearing-107 (McNeil, Dan)	E5-29
Folsom Hearing-108 (McNeil, Dan)	E5-29
Folsom Hearing-109 (Mitchell, Nancy)	E5-29

### ALPHABETICAL TABLE OF COMMENTERS

Baker, Steve	E5-9
Bernau, Jeremy	E5-27
Cimaroli, Neva	E5-17
Cloud, Grant	E5-15
Coleman, Steve	E5-21
Corda, Chris	E5-26
Drew, Ramsey	E5-22
Gagliardi, Joe	E5-20
Hodges, Will	E5-3
Holderness, Robert	E5-18
Kerfeld, Paul	E5-22
Kipp, Gail	E5-11
Kuhl, Doug	E5-19
Lewis, Wayne	E5-13
McNeil, Dan	E5-29
Miklos, Steve	E5-4
Mitchell, Nancy	E5-29
Mobley, Ed	E5-24
Morin, Andy	E5-2, E5-5
Moseley, Madeleine	E5-6
Pearson, Kirk	E5-26

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

Radovich, Renae .....	E5-14
Richard, Gary .....	E5-16
Riedinger, Michael .....	E5-23
Seaman, Ed .....	E5-12
Setnik, Bob .....	E5-8
Sheldon, Ernie .....	E5-8
Starsky, Jeff .....	E5-24
Story, Ed .....	E5-7
Uhler, Kirk .....	E5-12
Walter, Benita .....	E5-21
Williams, James .....	E5-27

## **Appendix E5 Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

Two public hearings were held to provide forums for public comments and input on the EIS analysis. These hearings were advertised in local newspapers, on a Web site set up to provide information and facilitate public input on the project, and in the Federal Register (Vol. 69, No. 232: 70278–70279). The first hearing was held on January 4, 2005, at the Tsakopoulos Library Galleria at 828 I Street in Sacramento. The second hearing was held on January 5, 2005, at the Folsom Community Center at 52 Natoma Street in Folsom.

Comments identified from the official transcripts for each hearing are summarized in the following sections. Reclamation's response follows each comment. Within the responses to comments from each hearing, individual responses are labeled numerically and by commenter name.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**SACRAMENTO HEARING, JANUARY 4, 2005**

**Comment: Sacramento Hearing-1 and -2 (Morin, Andy)**

The commenter stated that his restaurant on Sutter Street had a 15 percent decline in business following the road closure, and other nearby businesses had similar declines due to traffic congestion.

**Response: Sacramento Hearing-1 and -2 (Morin, Andy)**

The statement that the commenter's business experienced a decline following the Folsom Dam Road closure is noted. In Section 3.4.2 (under "Socioeconomic Effects Since 2003"), the EIS describes the economic effects that have occurred since the emergency closure of Folsom Dam Road in February 2003. The analysis demonstrates that, for reasons including the redirection of traffic in the vicinity, some businesses have been adversely affected by the road closure. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. Economic impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2 are described in Section 3.4.2.2.

Sections 3.1.1.2 and 3.1.1.3 describe the traffic conditions before and after the February 2003 road closure. The discussion provides an overview of the various factors that have contributed to increased traffic volumes in the area over time.

**Comment: Sacramento Hearing-3 (Morin, Andy)**

An alternative that allows public access to Folsom Dam Road for 3 hours in the morning and the evening at a rate of 1,500 vehicles per hour is needed to accommodate commuters.

**Response: Sacramento Hearing-3 (Morin, Andy)**

The commenter's recommendation is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated the Preferred Alternative. This alternative, described in Section 2.2.2 of the EIS, would have operating hours and hourly volumes within the range that the commenter mentioned.

**Comment: Sacramento Hearing-4 (Morin, Andy)**

Reclamation should work with the City of Folsom, the Folsom Police Department, and other State security agencies to address security concerns about Folsom Dam facilities.

**Response: Sacramento Hearing-4 (Morin, Andy)**

Reclamation notes the statement concerning the need for interagency collaboration with the Folsom Police Department and other security agencies. Through the process established by NEPA, the EIS evaluates the impacts of each alternative on resources such as police and fire protection (see Section 3.10) in order to select a Preferred Alternative that considers all interests and concerns while still maintaining the purpose and need of the action (Section 1.1).

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Comment: Sacramento Hearing-5 and -6 (Morin, Andy)**

Traffic accidents have increased, and movement of emergency response vehicles has become impaired due to traffic congestion.

**Response: Sacramento Hearing-5 and -6 (Morin, Andy)**

Reclamation notes the commenter's statements about an increase in accidents and impacts to emergency response vehicle movement due to the traffic congestion that has occurred since the road closure. Section 3.1.1.3 of the EIS provides data about the increases in accidents. Section 3.10.2.2 states that delays due to traffic congestion affect response times for emergency events and emergency vehicle access. Although Folsom Dam Road remains accessible to fire and police service vehicles, California Department of Parks and Recreation vehicles, and California Highway Patrol, Folsom police and fire department personnel have identified a reduction in average emergency response times within the city. See Master Response to Comment-5 in Appendix E for further discussion of impacts to emergency response times. The Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2 in the Final EIS allows for continued emergency access to Folsom Dam Road at all times. The emergency response times under the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative will vary based on the routes taken by emergency vehicles and by time of day.

**Comment: Sacramento Hearing-7 (Morin, Andy)**

The quality of life in Folsom has decreased.

**Response: Sacramento Hearing-7 (Morin, Andy)**

The commenter's statement is noted. For a discussion of intangible effects to quality of life following the road closure, see Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Sacramento Hearing-8 (Hodges, Will)**

Eight thousand residents in the commenter's area would be endangered by a dam failure.

**Response: Sacramento Hearing-8 (Hodges, Will)**

The commenter's observation about the potential effects of a failure of Folsom Dam are noted.

**Comment: Sacramento Hearing-9 (Hodges, Will)**

Reopening the road during commute hours could expose dam facilities to security risks. Traffic congestion could hinder emergency response.

**Response: Sacramento Hearing-9 (Hodges, Will)**

The comment is noted. The potential impacts to emergency access are addressed in Section 3.10.2 and in Master Response to Comment-5 in Appendix E.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**FOLSOM HEARING, JANUARY 5, 2005**

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-1 (Miklos, Steve)**

The Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS should be changed to Restricted Access Alternative 2.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-1 (Miklos, Steve)**

Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been identified as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-2 (Miklos, Steve)**

Folsom Dam Road is an important regional roadway. Mitigation for its closure could include a temporary pontoon bridge.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-2 (Miklos, Steve)**

Reclamation recognizes the importance of Folsom Dam Road to local communities. Section 1.2.3 describes the road's function as a traffic artery. In regard to the use of a pontoon bridge to improve traffic circulation, see Response to Dopson-1 in Appendix E4.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-3 (Miklos, Steve)**

The commenter stated that the EIS is incorrect in saying that the Folsom Historic District Traffic Calming Program has had a detrimental effect on business. Traffic statistics show reduced wait times.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-3 (Miklos, Steve)**

To the extent that data are available, traffic impacts that have occurred as a result of the Folsom Historic District Traffic Calming Program are described in Section 3.1.1.3 of the EIS. The traffic analysis includes the conditions before and after implementation of the Traffic Calming Program. As described in Section 3.1, traffic congestion has been increasing over time, and the closure of Folsom Dam Road combined with the implementation of the Traffic Calming Program further exacerbated delays in parts of Folsom including the Rainbow Bridge, the Lake Natoma Crossing, Folsom-Auburn Road between Folsom Dam Road and Greenback Lane, and Natoma/East Natoma Street between Folsom Boulevard and Folsom Dam Road. As described in Section 3.4.2 ("Socioeconomic Effects Since 2003"), businesses in the impact area were surveyed, and managers were interviewed regarding changes in their operations since early 2003. A number of businesses indicated that their revenues had declined.

As the EIS states, it is difficult to associate economic effects felt in the community to a single cause, such as the closure of Folsom Dam Road. The Traffic Calming Program is only one of a number of potential factors that may contribute to business impacts in the downtown area.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-4 (Miklos, Steve)**

The area of economic effect is greater than that evaluated in the EIS. For example, at Broadstone Marketplace on East Bidwell, some businesses have experienced declines of 5 to 15 percent. People have changed their traffic patterns and have started to shop elsewhere.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-4 (Miklos, Steve)**

As described in Section 3.1, much of the traffic that had been using Folsom Dam Road prior to its closure diverted to Folsom-Auburn Road and Natoma/East Natoma Street, causing traffic changes on many other roadways in the vicinity. The study area for the transportation analysis was selected based on the roadways most affected by the proposed alternatives in the vicinity of Folsom Dam Road. Section 3.1.2 discusses regional effects including vehicle miles traveled, vehicle hours traveled, and vehicle hours of delay for each alternative. Daily traffic volumes and levels of service under existing conditions and under each alternative for study year 2013 were also compared for several roadway segments outside of the study area. The projected volumes for 2013 were similar for the No Action Alternative and the Long-Term Closure Alternative (see Response to City of Folsom-50 in Appendix E3 for more details). Therefore, it was concluded that the study area contains a sufficient geographic area to assess relative effects.

The commenter's opinions about the effect of the traffic pattern changes on Folsom businesses are noted. In Section 3.4.2 (under "Socioeconomic Effects Since 2003"), the EIS describes the socioeconomic effects that have occurred since the emergency closure of Folsom Dam Road in February 2003. The analysis demonstrates that, for reasons including the redirection of traffic in the vicinity, some businesses have been adversely affected by the road closure.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-5 (Morin, Andy)**

The commenter stated that his business has declined by 15 to 20 percent following the road closure.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-5 (Morin, Andy)**

The commenter's description about the effect of the Folsom Dam Road closure on his business is noted. Section 3.4.2 (under "Socioeconomic Effects Since 2003") states that revenue declines reported by interviewed owners of businesses in the affected area ranged from zero to 60 percent and averaged 21 percent. Section 3.4.2 also states that revenue declines in any business may be attributable to many factors other than relative inaccessibility to customers, including competitive conditions and industry trends.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-6 (Morin, Andy)**

Traffic accidents have increased, and movement of emergency response vehicles has become impaired due to traffic congestion.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Response: Folsom Hearing-6 (Morin, Andy)**

An increase in traffic accidents after the closure of Folsom Dam Road in February 2003 has been documented, as described in Section 3.1.1.3 of the EIS. 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.

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, California Department of Parks and Recreation vehicles, and California Highway Patrol, Folsom police and fire department personnel identified a reduction in average emergency response times within the city. See Master Response to Comment-5 in Appendix E for further discussion on impacts to emergency response times.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-7 (Morin, Andy)**

At minimum, Folsom Dam Road should be reopened during commute hours until the new bridge is open.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-7 (Morin, Andy)**

The commenter's suggestion that Folsom Dam Road should be reopened during commute hours is noted. The Final 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 (identified as the Preferred Alternative) and Restricted Access Alternative 3. A final selection will be made in the Record of Decision.

The Folsom Bridge Project (referred to in the Draft EIS as the Folsom Bypass Project) is discussed in Sections 2.3.2, 3.1, and 3.11.2 of the EIS. As described in Section 2.3.2, this is a separate project being undertaken by the USACE and therefore was not considered as an alternative in the EIS.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-8 (Moseley, Madeleine)**

Folsom streets are blocked by traffic congestion and people are detouring and getting lost trying to get through town.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-8 (Moseley, Madeleine)**

The EIS evaluated traffic conditions and identified declines in levels of service and increases in delay times. The extent of the congestion that has occurred since the February 2003 closure of Folsom Dam Road described by the commenter is noted.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-9 (Moseley, Madeleine)**

The road closure is adversely affecting Folsom businesses.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Response: Folsom Hearing-9 (Moseley, Madeleine)**

The commenter's opinions about the effects of the Folsom Dam Road closure on businesses in Folsom are noted. As discussed in Section 3.4.2 (under "Socioeconomic Effects Since 2003"), for reasons including the redirection of traffic in the vicinity, some businesses have been adversely affected by the road closure.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-10 (Moseley, Madeleine)**

The City of Folsom should reopen the downtown streets that were closed to reduce traffic.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-10 (Moseley, Madeleine)**

The commenter's opinion that the Folsom Historic District Traffic Calming Program should be discontinued is noted. The City of Folsom implemented the program in response to changes in traffic patterns that resulted from the closure of Folsom Dam Road in February 2003. As discussed in Section 3.1.1.3, the program has received support from residents of the neighborhood streets off of Riley Street from which traffic has been diverted, but others have commented that the program limits access to their business establishments. The decision to reopen those streets would be made by the Folsom City Council and not by Reclamation.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-11 (Moseley, Madeleine)**

The new bridge downstream of Folsom Dam is needed now.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-11 (Moseley, Madeleine)**

The Folsom Bridge Project (referred to in the Draft EIS as the Folsom Bypass Project) is discussed in Sections 2.3.2, 3.1, and 3.11.2 of the EIS. As described in Section 3.11.2, the USACE is evaluating alternatives for a new bridge over Lake Natoma, and the crossing is scheduled to open in 2007/2008.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-12 (Story, Ed)**

Folsom Dam Road could be used on a part-time basis to alleviate traffic congestion until the new bridge is built.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-12 (Story, Ed)**

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road on a part-time basis is noted.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-13 (Story, Ed)**

Folsom businesses, especially on Sutter Street, have been adversely affected by the road closure.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Response: Folsom Hearing-13 (Story, Ed)**

The commenter's opinion about the effects of the road closure on local businesses is noted. As discussed in Section 3.4.2 (under "Socioeconomic Effects Since 2003"), for reasons including the redirection of traffic in the vicinity, some businesses have been adversely affected by the road closure.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-14 (Sheldon, Ernie)**

Trying to get across the river to attend a meeting in downtown Folsom is an experience.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-14 (Sheldon, Ernie)**

The commenter's description of the traffic congestion that has resulted from the closure of Folsom Dam Road is noted. The EIS evaluated traffic conditions and identified declines in levels of service and increases in delay times.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-15 (Sheldon, Ernie)**

Restricted Access Alternative 2 is preferable to the Long-Term Closure Alternative.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-15 (Sheldon, Ernie)**

The commenter's support for reopening Folsom Dam Road under Restricted Access Alternative 2 is noted. Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been identified as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-16 (Sheldon, Ernie)**

Folsom businesses have been affected by the road closure.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-16 (Sheldon, Ernie)**

Section 3.4.2 of the EIS discusses effects to businesses following the closure of Folsom Dam Road.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-17 (Setnik, Bob)**

The commenter described adverse effects of the road closure on his Sutter Street business, including revenue declines of approximately 30 percent per year.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-17 (Setnik, Bob)**

The commenter's statement about adverse effects to his business over the last 3 years is noted. A number of businesses have reported that revenues have declined. These changes are reflected in the analysis presented in Section 3.4.2. Also see Master Response to Comment-2 in Appendix E.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-18 (Setnik, Bob)**

The commenter stated that Reclamation was unconcerned about the EIS when it closed Folsom Dam Road.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-18 (Setnik, Bob)**

The closure of Folsom Dam Road in February 2003 was an emergency action taken following the recommendation of independent security assessments of Reclamation's facilities between 2001 and 2002. The objective of the road closure was to provide immediate security to Folsom Dam facilities. The EIS has been prepared in compliance with NEPA to evaluate environmental impacts of the four alternatives for public access to Folsom Dam Road. See Response to Kane-1 in Appendix E4 for further discussion.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-19 (Setnik, Bob)**

The commenter expressed the opinion that a vehicle could not seriously damage Folsom Dam.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-19 (Setnik, Bob)**

Regarding the commenter's opinion about risks to Folsom Dam facilities from vehicle access, see Master Response to Comment-3 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-20 (Setnik, Bob)**

Development in Folsom, western El Dorado County, and southern Placer County has aggravated regional traffic congestion.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-20 (Setnik, Bob)**

As the commenter notes, regional development in the area has contributed to traffic congestion and subsequent environmental and socioeconomic issues identified in the EIS. This factor is one of the data limitations in accurately determining the direct impact of the Folsom Dam Road closure on the community. These limitations are addressed in Section 3.4.2.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-21 (Setnik, Bob)**

Opening Folsom Dam Road during commute hours would help.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-21 (Setnik, Bob)**

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

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-22 (Baker, Steve)**

The quality of life in Folsom has decreased.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Response: Folsom Hearing-22 (Baker, Steve)**

The commenter's opinion about quality of life in the area is noted. See Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E for a discussion of quality-of-life issues.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-23 (Baker, Steve)**

Traffic has been excessive since the road closure.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-23 (Baker, Steve)**

The analysis presented in Section 3.1.1.3 of the EIS discusses the extent of the traffic congestion that has occurred since the Folsom Dam Road closure in February 2003.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-24 (Baker, Steve)**

Air quality has decreased and noise has increased since the road closure.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-24 (Baker, Steve)**

The potential impacts to air quality from each of the four alternatives are analyzed in Section 3.2.2 of the EIS. The existing and forecasted future traffic volumes described in Section 3.1 were used to calculate the air quality impacts from the four alternatives. As described in Section 3.2.2, the full or partial closure of Folsom Dam Road results in an increase in emissions regionally, but none of the proposed alternatives would result in exceedances of Federal or State ambient air quality standards, which were established to protect sensitive populations such as children and the elderly.

The noise analysis discusses environmental consequences and mitigation for each of the alternatives in Sections 3.3.2 and 3.3.3, respectively.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-25 (Baker, Steve)**

Employee recruitment has been hampered by the road closure, a business impact not reflected in revenue projections or reports.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-25 (Baker, Steve)**

Reclamation notes the commenter's statement that traffic conditions in Folsom have affected the attractiveness of his business to potential employees from outside of the area. See Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E for a discussion of intangible effects of the road closure, including concerns about inability to attract new people to the city.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-26 (Baker, Steve)**

Statistics show accidents but do not reflect road rage.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Response: Folsom Hearing-26 (Baker, Steve)**

The City of Folsom has reported a 16 percent increase in traffic accidents in the 12 months following the February 2003 road closure, as described in Section 3.1.1.3. For a discussion of road rage and other intangible effects, see Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-27 (Baker, Steve)**

A possible decrease in response time for police, fire, and safety responders is of concern.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-27 (Baker, Steve)**

The EIS describes the effects of the road closure on emergency response access in Section 3.10. See Master Response to Comment-5 in Appendix E for further discussion.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-28 (Baker, Steve)**

An alternative that allows access to Folsom Dam Road based on the water level of Folsom Lake should be considered.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-28 (Baker, Steve)**

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. Damage to the dam 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.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-29 (Kipp, Gail)**

To fully secure Folsom Dam would require restrictions on fishing, swimming, and the airspace above dam facilities.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-29 (Kipp, Gail)**

See Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E for a discussion of the assessment of security risks to Folsom Dam facilities.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-30 (Kipp, Gail)**

Folsom Dam Road should be reopened because the closure divides the community and causes people to shop elsewhere.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Response: Folsom Hearing-30 (Kipp, Gail)**

The commenter's recommendation to reopen Folsom Dam Road is noted. See Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E for a discussion of quality-of-life issues, including choices people make about where to shop.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-31 (Seaman, Ed)**

The commenter questions why vehicles are prohibited on Folsom Dam Road but boaters still have access to the dam.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-31 (Seaman, Ed)**

The statement about water access to Folsom Dam is noted. See Master Response to Comment-3 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-32 (Seaman, Ed)**

The EIS should be revised to state that bicyclists are allowed access to Folsom Dam Road.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-32 (Seaman, Ed)**

Pedestrians and bicyclists were not allowed on Folsom Dam Road before 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 on Folsom Dam Road.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-33 (Uhler, Kirk)**

The commenter and his family and friends now go outside of Folsom for shopping, dining, and entertainment.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-33 (Uhler, Kirk)**

The comment is noted. See Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E for additional discussion.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-34 (Uhler, Kirk)**

The commenter stated that Folsom Dam is endangered by boat traffic on the lake.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-34 (Uhler, Kirk)**

The statement about the security risk to Folsom Dam from water access is noted. See Master Response to Comment-3 in Appendix E.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-35 (Uhler, Kirk)**

The restricted access alternatives would be acceptable until a new bridge is built.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-35 (Uhler, Kirk)**

The recommendation is noted. Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-36 (Lewis, Wayne)**

The commenter stated that the EIS implies that Folsom Dam Road is not needed as a regional facility.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-36 (Lewis, Wayne)**

Reclamation recognizes the importance of Folsom Dam Road to local communities. Sections 1.2.1 and 1.2.3 describe the road's function as an important traffic artery.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-37 (Lewis, Wayne)**

The road closure has economic effects on the entire regional area, including Placer, El Dorado, and Sacramento Counties.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-37 (Lewis, Wayne)**

The comment is noted. As discussed in Section 3.4, economic effects of the Folsom Dam Road closure are difficult to quantify and analyze on a larger regional level.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-38 (Lewis, Wayne)**

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) supports an alternative that provides traffic relief.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-38 (Lewis, Wayne)**

The comment is noted.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-39 (Lewis, Wayne)**

The road closure has affected regional transportation and contributed to out-of-direction travel and extended congestion periods.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-39 (Lewis, Wayne)**

The EIS evaluated traffic conditions and identifies declines in levels of service and increases in delays. Section 3.1.1.3 discusses the extent of the traffic changes following the closure of Folsom Dam Road.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-40 (Lewis, Wayne)**

The road closure has increased energy demand and decreased air quality.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-40 (Lewis, Wayne)**

More fuel would be consumed under some alternatives because of additional miles that would be traveled, but the difference was not determined to cause a significant effect to air quality or the environment. As shown in the air quality analysis, none of the proposed alternatives would result in exceedances of Federal or State ambient air quality standards. See Sections 3.2 and 3.7 for additional discussion.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-41 (Lewis, Wayne)**

The road closure has affected the general quality of life in the area.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-41 (Lewis, Wayne)**

See Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E for a discussion of quality-of-life issues.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-42 (Lewis, Wayne)**

Restricted Access Alternative 2 is preferable because it allows road access in both directions.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-42 (Lewis, Wayne)**

The recommendation on behalf of Caltrans to adopt Restricted Access Alternative 2 is noted. Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-43 (Radovich, Renae)**

Folsom has become a thoroughfare for surrounding communities, and the road closure has exacerbated the situation.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-43 (Radovich, Renae)**

The comment is noted. See Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-44 (Radovich, Renae)**

Rainbow Bridge, Oak Avenue Parkway, and other roadways are seriously backed up during commute times.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-44 (Radovich, Renae)**

Section 3.1.1.3 discusses the traffic changes that occurred after the closure of Folsom Dam Road. The extent of the congestion described in this comment is noted.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-45 (Radovich, Renae)**

The commenter stated that airplanes and boats also pose a security risk to Folsom Dam.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-45 (Radovich, Renae)**

In regard to boat and aircraft access to Folsom Dam facilities, see Master Response to Comment-3 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-46 (Radovich, Renae)**

Restricted Access Alternative 2 should be selected.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-46 (Radovich, Renae)**

The commenter's recommendation is noted. Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-47 (Cloud, Grant)**

The EIS does not consider engineering measures to help protect the dam or access restrictions based on lake levels.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-47 (Cloud, Grant)**

The subject of the EIS, as defined by the purpose and need (Section 1.1), is limited to public access to Folsom Dam Road.

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. 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.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-48 (Cloud, Grant)**

The commenter described changes to his business, including loss of employees and revenue, since September 11, 2001.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-48 (Cloud, Grant)**

The comment is noted. Section 3.4.2 states that revenue declines reported by business owners and operators in the areas affected by the Folsom Dam Road closure averaged 21 percent.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-49 (Cloud, Grant)**

The traffic congestion in Folsom was caused by bad planning, and the road closure exacerbated the situation.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-49 (Cloud, Grant)**

As described in Section 3.1.1.2, many roadways and intersections in downtown Folsom already approached or exceeded capacity before the February 2003 closure of Folsom Dam Road. Various factors including population increases and residential and commercial growth both before and after the closure have resulted in changes in traffic patterns and congestion. Section 3.1.3 discusses measures that could be implemented to improve roadway and intersection capacities.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-50 (Cloud, Grant)**

An alternative that would reopen Folsom Dam Road during the afternoons would help businesses and alleviate traffic congestion.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-50 (Cloud, Grant)**

The comment is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2, which allows public access to Folsom Dam Road during commute hours, has been designated as the Preferred Alternative.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-51 (Richard, Gary)**

Boat traffic on Folsom Lake and flight paths over dam facilities have not been addressed as security risks.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-51 (Richard, Gary)**

In regard to boat and aircraft access to Folsom Dam facilities, see Master Response to Comment-3 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-52 and -53 (Richard, Gary)**

The human toll of the road closure, such as business losses and road rage, has not been addressed.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-52 and -53 (Richard, Gary)**

Reclamation notes the commenter's statement about the human toll of the road closure. See Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E for a discussion of quality-of-life issues and Master Response to Comment-2 in regard to traffic impacts on local businesses.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-54 (Richard, Gary)**

The commenter questioned whether any decision makers were present at the hearing.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-54 (Richard, Gary)**

Decision makers were present at the public hearing.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-55 (Cimaroli, Neva)**

Prior to the construction of Folsom Dam, there were more routes crossing the river. Several routes were inundated and not replaced.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-55 (Cimaroli, Neva)**

Section 1.2 describes the background and history of Folsom Dam Road. The road was intended to serve as maintenance access for the dam facility. As such, the construction and design features of the road are deemed inadequate for public traffic use.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-56 (Cimaroli, Neva)**

The road closure has created delays in response time between Pinebrook Village and the local hospital.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-56 (Cimaroli, Neva)**

The commenter's statement is noted. See Master Response to Comment-5 in Appendix E for further discussion of effects of the four proposed alternatives on emergency response times.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-57 (Cimaroli, Neva)**

The commenter questioned the conclusion that air quality has not decreased.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-57 (Cimaroli, Neva)**

The potential impacts to air quality from the each of the four alternatives are analyzed in Section 3.2.2 of the EIS. The existing and forecasted future traffic volumes described in Section 3.1 were used to calculate the air quality impacts from the four alternatives. As described in Section 3.2.2, the full or partial closure of Folsom Dam Road results in an increase in emissions regionally, but none of the proposed alternatives would result in exceedances of Federal or State ambient air quality standards, which were established to protect sensitive populations such as children and the elderly.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-58 (Cimaroli, Neva)**

Vacancies have increased and some businesses have experienced declines in a commercial strip described by the commenter.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Response: Folsom Hearing-58 (Cimaroli, Neva)**

As the commenter notes, some business owners and operators have reported declines in revenue following the road closure. Business impacts are discussed further in Master Response to Comment-2 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-59 (Holderness, Robert)**

The commenter recommended Restricted Access Alternative 2.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-59 (Holderness, Robert)**

The comment is noted. Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-60 (Holderness, Robert)**

Reclamation has not built an evidentiary basis for security concern about Folsom Dam.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-60 (Holderness, Robert)**

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 and 2002. Among the recommendations made in the assessments, closing Folsom Dam Road to public access was a top priority. The objective of the February 2003 closure was to provide immediate security to Folsom Dam facilities.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-61 (Holderness, Robert)**

Reclamation has not built an evidentiary basis that there are no adverse traffic impacts from the road closure.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-61 (Holderness, Robert)**

The EIS evaluated traffic conditions and identified declines in levels of service and increases in delay times. Section 3.1.1.3 discusses traffic conditions following the Folsom Dam Road closure. Section 3.1.2 discusses impacts associated with each proposed alternative.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-62 (Holderness, Robert)**

Reclamation has not built an evidentiary basis that there are no adverse air quality impacts from the road closure.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-62 (Holderness, Robert)**

Section 3.2.2 describes impacts on air quality as a result of additional miles traveled by vehicles in the Folsom area due to the road closure. As shown in Table 3.2-5, the difference in emissions is less than 1 pound per day across the Folsom regional area for most pollutants (reactive organic

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

gases, sulfur dioxide, and particulate matter) and 1 to 3 pounds per day for nitrogen oxides, depending on alternative. Carbon monoxide shows the greatest difference at 4.7 to 18.7 pounds per day, depending on alternative, and was modeled to determine predicted full or partial road closure concentrations to compare against air quality standards. Concentrations would increase by less than 1 part per million under the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2 as compared to the No Action Alternative. The analysis concluded that none of the action alternatives would not cause any exceedances or add to any exceedances of the ambient air quality standards for nitrogen oxides, particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in diameter, and ozone. The analysis demonstrates that the predicted worst-case concentrations would not result in exceedances of Federal or State standards, which were designed to protect sensitive populations such as children and the elderly.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-63 (Holderness, Robert)**

Reclamation has not built an evidentiary basis that there are no adverse economic impacts from the road closure.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-63 (Holderness, Robert)**

In Section 3.4.2 (under "Socioeconomic Effects Since 2003"), the EIS describes the socioeconomic effects that have occurred since the emergency closure of Folsom Dam Road in February 2003. The analysis demonstrates that, for reasons including the redirection of traffic in the vicinity, some businesses have been adversely affected by the road closure. Impacts associated with Restricted Access Alternative 2 (identified as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS) are described in Section 3.4.2.2.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-64 (Kuhl, Doug)**

The road closure has affected traffic on Folsom-Auburn Road and all other Folsom streets.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-64 (Kuhl, Doug)**

Traffic changes on a number of different roadway segments and intersections following the closure of Folsom Dam Road are discussed in Sections 3.1.1.3 and 3.1.2.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-65 (Kuhl, Doug)**

Development in Folsom had already caused traffic congestion, and the road closure exacerbated the situation.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-65 (Kuhl, Doug)**

The comment regarding the effect of the road closure on traffic conditions is noted. See Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-66 (Kuhl, Doug)**

Hundreds of people in northern Folsom have stopped shopping in Folsom, but the economic analysis in the EIS doesn't reflect this because local people were not surveyed.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Response: Folsom Hearing-66 (Kuhl, Doug)**

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 described in Section 3.4.2, changes in traffic patterns caused by the road closure were cited as one of the contributing factors for a number of businesses that experienced a decline in revenues. See Master Response to Comment-2 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-67 (Kuhl, Doug)**

Allowing traffic on Folsom Dam Road during commute hours would help traffic circulation.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-67 (Kuhl, Doug)**

In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2, which allows public access to Folsom Dam Road during commute hours, has been designated as the Preferred Alternative.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-68 (Gagliardi, Joe)**

The EIS economic analysis does not account for the long-term effects of changing traffic patterns and shifts in shopping habits. Measuring such changes takes a long time.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-68 (Gagliardi, Joe)**

The comment is noted. As the commenter points out, in order to accurately describe economic impacts and establish trends, more data for periods following the road closure would be required. This issue is discussed in more detail in Responses to Riedinger-5 and Riedinger-6 in Appendix E4. Quality-of-life effects resulting from post-closure congestion are discussed in Master Comment Response-1 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-69 (Gagliardi, Joe)**

The EIS takes a reverse approach to the concept of No Action in that it would seem to indicate that the road is open, but in fact it is closed.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-69 (Gagliardi, Joe)**

The closure of Folsom Dam Road in February 2003 was an emergency action taken following the recommendation of independent security assessments of Reclamation's facilities between 2001 and 2002. The No Action Alternative, an alternative that is required for evaluation under NEPA, would reopen Folsom Dam Road to provide access at pre-February 2003 levels, essentially reversing the closure action (hence "No Action").

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-70 (Gagliardi, Joe)**

Opening Folsom Dam Road during commute times would only provide limited traffic relief. Opening the road all the time would be better.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Response: Folsom Hearing-70 (Gagliardi, Joe)**

The recommendation is noted.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-71 (Walter, Benita)**

In the area near the Rainbow Bridge and the Lake Natoma Crossing, some blocks are backed up 6 hours per day.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-71 (Walter, Benita)**

The analysis of traffic conditions presented in Section 3.1 identifies declines in levels of service and increases in delay times. The extent of the traffic congestion described by the commenter is noted.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-72 (Walter, Benita)**

The commenter described health effects that she and her son were experiencing on their heavily traveled street, including headaches and asthma attacks.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-72 (Walter, Benita)**

The commenter's statement about the health effects of emissions caused by increased traffic is noted. As described in Section 3.2.2, potential impacts to air quality were determined from traffic volumes using total vehicle miles traveled and average speed. As the total vehicle miles increase for the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, Restricted Access Alternative 3, and the Long-Term Closure Alternative over those for the No Action Alternative, the modeling shows an increase in total emissions for the study year 2005. This increase in emissions is shown in Table 3.2-5 and described in Section 3.2.2. 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 air quality standards. See Response to Walter-2 in Appendix E4.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-73 (Coleman, Steve)**

Traveling to Historic Folsom for shopping, rental property upkeep, and family visits has become difficult due to bridge traffic.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-73 (Coleman, Steve)**

The commenter's statement is noted. Quality-of-life issues resulting from changes in traffic patterns are discussed in Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-74 (Coleman, Steve)**

Traffic congestion is preventing the commenter from getting Folsom residents to patronize his business on Greenback Lane.

**Appendix E5**  
**Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Response: Folsom Hearing-74 (Coleman, Steve)**

The intersection of Greenback Lane and Folsom-Auburn Road was one of the study intersections evaluated in the traffic analysis. As discussed in Section 3.1.1, the EIS evaluated changes in traffic conditions and identifies decreased levels of service and increased delays for many downtown intersections and roadways.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-75 (Coleman, Steve)**

Reopening Folsom Dam Road would help traffic circulation.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-75 (Coleman, Steve)**

The comment is noted. Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been identified as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-76 (Kerfeld, Paul)**

The increased traffic congestion and its associated effects have adversely impacted the quality of life for residents of Historic Folsom.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-76 (Kerfeld, Paul)**

The comment is noted. See Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-77 (Kerfeld, Paul)**

The commenter questioned why Folsom Dam is not under military surveillance and why boat access is still allowed on the lake.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-77 (Kerfeld, Paul)**

In regard to boat access to Folsom Dam facilities and other potential security measures, see Master Response to Comment-3 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-78 (Drew, Ramsey)**

Other traffic studies have been done, and Reclamation has never indicated that those traffic analyses should not have included Folsom Dam Road.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-78 (Drew, Ramsey)**

To the extent that related completed and/or planned actions are likely to contribute to cumulative impacts when combined with the effects of the Folsom Dam Road Access Restriction, the effects of those actions are evaluated in the EIS analysis. Folsom Dam Road was factored into the traffic analysis of environmental impacts presented in Section 3.1.

**Appendix E5**  
**Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-79 (Drew, Ramsey)**

Reclamation should work with the community to find a way to temporarily reopen Folsom Dam Road until the new bridge is operational.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-79 (Drew, Ramsey)**

The comment is noted. Reclamation has a responsibility to protect its facilities, as well as the people and resources around its facilities. As demonstrated by the analysis presented in the EIS, Reclamation has reviewed the environmental consequences of all four alternatives and the nature and extent of their impacts. In the Final EIS, Reclamation has designated Restricted Access Alternative 2, which would allow public access to Folsom Dam Road during peak commute times, as the Preferred Alternative.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-80 (Riedinger, Michael)**

The air quality analysis in the EIS does not adequately address traffic-related emissions on Natoma Street.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-80 (Riedinger, Michael)**

Air quality on Natoma Street and other roadways in Folsom was analyzed and is evaluated in Section 3.2. The commenter's statement is addressed in Response to Riedinger-9 in Appendix E4.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-81 (Riedinger, Michael)**

The road closure has created a physical and cultural divide in the community.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-81 (Riedinger, Michael)**

Effects to the culture of the local community and other quality-of-life issues are discussed in Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-82 (Riedinger, Michael)**

Any alternative that would reopen Folsom Dam Road during designated periods should be extended to include the time that schools let out, because that is when traffic starts backing up.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-82 (Riedinger, Michael)**

In regard to the hours of operation of the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2 and Restricted Access Alternative 3, see Response to Riedinger-3 in Appendix E4.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-83 (Riedinger, Michael)**

The commenter stated that several of his clients have gone out of business because of the road closure.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Response: Folsom Hearing-83 (Riedinger, Michael)**

The statement is noted. See Master Response to Comment-3 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-84 (Riedinger, Michael)**

The commenter questioned the security risk to dam facilities and the security measures that are being implemented.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-84 (Riedinger, Michael)**

The assessment of security risks to Folsom Dam is discussed in Master Response to Comment-2 in Appendix E. Additional measures to protect the dikes and other dam facilities are discussed in Response to Riedinger-2 in Appendix E4.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-85 (Mobley, Ed)**

Commute times to nearby cities dramatically increased following the road closure.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-85 (Mobley, Ed)**

The commenter's statement about the increase in traffic congestion is noted. As discussed in Section 3.1.1, the EIS evaluated changes in traffic conditions and identifies decreased levels of service and increased delays for many downtown intersections and roadways.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-86 (Mobley, Ed)**

The commenter and his neighbors avoid visiting and shopping in Folsom due to the traffic.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-86 (Mobley, Ed)**

Several commenters have stated that the road closure has affected their decisions about where to shop and dine. See Master Responses to Comments-1 and -2 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-87 (Mobley, Ed)**

Folsom Dam Road should be reopened to public access.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-87 (Mobley, Ed)**

The recommendation is noted. In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2, which allows public access to Folsom Dam Road during commute hours, has been designated as the Preferred Alternative.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-88 (Starsky, Jeff)**

The air quality analysis in the EIS does not consider that, due to wind patterns, Folsom bears the brunt of the region's air quality problems.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Response: Folsom Hearing-88 (Starsky, Jeff)**

The EIS discusses air quality in Section 3.2 and summarizes current Federal and State air quality regulatory standards in Table 3.2-3. As noted at the end of the discussion of "National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards": "The air district is a nonattainment area for O<sub>3</sub> and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> only; the area is unclassified for PM<sub>2.5</sub>)." Monitoring data for the criteria pollutants have been added to Appendix B in Section B.2. Five years of monitoring data are shown for each of the pollutants, along with the number of days per year that a pollutant was in violation of an air quality standard. The monitoring data show no violations of carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, or sulfur dioxide pollutants for the last 5 years at the stations that monitor for those pollutants. Ozone and particulate matter are shown to have recorded violations for each year since 1998.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-89 (Starsky, Jeff)**

The road closure has forced traffic through the City of Folsom, where congestion results in residents being exposed to additional nitrogen oxides and other emissions. The EIS does not account for this in the analysis. Senior citizens and children are being impacted by the decrease in air quality.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-89 (Starsky, Jeff)**

The commenter's description of changes in traffic conditions is noted. The road closure has changed traffic patterns and increased traffic delays, as described in Section 3.1. Most of the intersections and roadways affected by the road closure and studied in the EIS were not functioning at free-flow conditions, however, prior to the closure. When traffic increases at an intersection or roadway that is functioning at level of service E or F, further delays will result. The total amount of pollutants, including nitrogen oxides, emitted by vehicular traffic was estimated for each of the alternatives and is shown in Section 3.2, Table 3.2-5. In the year 2005, nitrogen oxide emissions from all vehicle traffic in the Folsom region would increase by an additional 0.82 to 3.27 pounds per day from the Preferred Alternative—Restricted Access Alternative 2, Restricted Access Alternative 3, and the Long-Term Closure Alternative. (The increase in emissions is with respect to the No Action Alternative.) Again, none of the proposed alternatives would result in exceedances of Federal or State ambient air quality standards, which were established to protect sensitive populations such as children and the elderly.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-90 (Starsky, Jeff)**

Restricted Access Alternative 2 should be implemented immediately.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-90 (Starsky, Jeff)**

The commenter's recommendation is noted. Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-91 and -92 (Corda, Chris)**

The commenter stated that traffic congestion is preventing potential customers from accessing his restaurant and neighboring businesses.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-91 and -92 (Corda, Chris)**

The commenter's statement about effects to his business due to traffic congestion is noted. This issue is discussed in Section 3.4.2 of the EIS and Master Response to Comment-3 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-93 and -94 (Corda, Chris)**

The commenter avoids making trips into Folsom during the afternoon/evening commute period because of traffic congestion and the associated frustration.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-93 and -95 (Corda, Chris)**

The comment is noted. The effects of traffic congestion on shopping habits and other quality-of-life issues are discussed in Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-95 (Corda, Chris)**

Folsom Dam Road should be reopened during peak commute hours.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-95 (Corda, Chris)**

In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2, which allows public access to Folsom Dam Road during commute hours, has been designated as the Preferred Alternative.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-96 and -97 (Pearson, Kirk)**

The commenter describes having to stop traffic to allow employees, vendors, and purveyors to enter or exit his lot.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-96 and -97 (Pearson, Kirk)**

The traffic analysis presented in Section 3.1 identifies declines in levels of service and increases in delay times. Reclamation notes the extent of the congestion that has occurred since the road closure and its adverse effects on patron and employee access to the commenter's business.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-98 (Pearson, Kirk)**

Traffic conditions on Rainbow Bridge have become dangerous due to congestion.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-98 (Pearson, Kirk)**

As described in the EIS, approximately 9,000 additional cars per day have been diverted to the Rainbow Bridge and Lake Natoma Crossing as a result of the Folsom Dam Road closure. The

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

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

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-99 (Williams, James)**

Traffic conditions in Folsom make it difficult to see family members.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-99 (Williams, James)**

The comment is noted. Master Response to Comment-1 in Appendix E discusses disruption of activities and other quality-of-life issues.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-100 (Williams, James)**

The commenter questioned Reclamation's assessment of security risks to Folsom Dam.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-100 (Williams, James)**

In regard to the commenter's opinion about security risks to Folsom Dam, see Response to Spires-1 in Appendix E4.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-101 (Williams, James)**

Folsom Dam Road should be reopened to alleviate traffic congestion.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-101 (Williams, James)**

In the Final EIS, Restricted Access Alternative 2, which allows public access to Folsom Dam Road during commute hours, has been designated as the Preferred Alternative.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-102 (Bernau, Jeremy)**

The EIS does not fully address economic impacts of the road closure. The analysis suggests that the impacts cannot be fully identified, but they should be.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-102 (Bernau, Jeremy)**

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 were 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 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 (under "Socioeconomic Effects Since 2003") provides a detailed discussion of the range of impacts reported by individual businesses. These impacts are summarized in Table 3.4-9. Therefore,

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

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.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-103 (Bernau, Jeremy)**

The EIS should address economic mitigation measures such as reopening Folsom Dam Road during commute hours.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-103 (Bernau, Jeremy)**

Mitigation for economic impacts of each alternative is discussed in Section 3.4.3. The EIS evaluates two alternatives, Restricted Access Alternatives 2 and 3, that would reopen Folsom Dam Road to public access during commute hours. A detailed description of each alternative is provided in Section 2.2. Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-104 (Bernau, Jeremy)**

The commenter questioned why, if Folsom Dam is at risk of a security threat, people have been able to graffiti the top of the dam.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-104 (Bernau, Jeremy)**

Reclamation closed Folsom Dam Road to public access in February 2003 in response to security recommendations. Based on these recommendations, Reclamation began formulating a comprehensive security plan, which continues to be developed and implemented. The security plan will provide additional safety and security for all Folsom Dam facilities.

The subject of the EIS, as defined by the purpose and need (Section 1.1), is limited to public access to Folsom Dam Road. If, or as, other security measures are identified that are separate from and independent of any roadway restrictions, they would also be subject to review and further action.

In addition to installing physical barriers, Reclamation has stationed patrols to monitor entry points. Reclamation is unaware of any security breaches at these locations.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-105 (Bernau, Jeremy)**

Reopening Folsom Dam Road during commute hours would improve security because more law enforcement would be on hand to monitor for security risks.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-105 (Bernau, Jeremy)**

The comment is noted. Restricted Access Alternative 2 has been designated as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-106 (Bernau, Jeremy)**

The EIS does not fully address economic impacts of the road closure.

**Appendix E5  
Public Hearing Comments and Responses**

**Response: Folsom Hearing-106 (Bernau, Jeremy)**

See Response to Folsom Hearing-102, above, and Master Response to Comment-3 in Appendix E. Mitigation for economic impacts of each alternative is discussed in Section 3.4.3.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-107 (McNeil, Dan)**

Since the road closure, the commenter's business has experienced a decline in retail sales and new clients.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-107 (McNeil, Dan)**

Reclamation notes the commenter's statement.

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-108 (McNeil, Dan)**

Folsom Dam Road should be reopened during commute hours.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-108 (McNeil, Dan)**

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

**Comment: Folsom Hearing-109 (Mitchell, Nancy)**

Reclamation should consider allowing access to Folsom Dam Road when lake levels are low, so that the community will no longer be divided.

**Response: Folsom Hearing-109 (Mitchell, Nancy)**

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.