(See also RUSP Final EIR, Chapter 4, Responses to Comments, pp. 4-91—4-92.) Under the circumstances, the County can confidently determine that 35,000 AFY from the Sacramento River Diversion, as an "anticipated source," will be available when it is needed as the last increment of new PCWA water supply necessary to serve full build-out of the local general plans in PCWA service area.

### Comment 4

(The RUSP did not adequately address cumulative demand of western Placer County, there is no support for the contention that in 2009 and 2010 there will be 35,000 acre feet from the Sacramento River diversion.)

This comment misconstrues Table 6.14-10 from the Placer Vineyards EIR. This Table demonstrates that PCWA is capable after construction of the Ophir Treatment Plant and with transmission pipeline construction to serve an additional 36,554 AFY of annual demand (approximately over 55,000 edu of demand) prior to needing the Sacramento River diversion project. The table further shows that this demand is not estimated to be reached until 2025. The impact of the current economic slowdown on the housing market and the related diminished water supply demand could extend that timeframe. P CWA has a policy of water availability on a first come, first served basis, which it closely monitors at each Board meeting as it approves water connections. It would not approve a water connection facilities agreement if it had reached any limitations in its facilities to divert, treat, or transmit the necessary water supply.

The claim that 70,500 AF will not be available in 2011 is incorrect. The commenter misreads Table 6.14-10. Roughly half of that amount – 35,000 AF – comes from the Yuba-Bear system. This water exists and is "wet," and is the potable component available for West Placer out of the overall Yuba-Bear supply of 100,400 AFY. That is wet water that currently exists and is being delivered. The other half – an additional 35,500 AF is from the permanent American River Pump Station, which is now complete and is capable of diverting that entire amount (from the Middle Fork Project supply) when the demand for it materializes. With construction of the Foothill II (Ophir Treatment) Plant, PCWA can treat this additional diversion. Transmission facilities in place today are capable of delivering a substantial portion of this water. New transmission facilities are planned to deliver the balance. PCWA intends to build a pipeline taking treated ARPS/Ophir water to the RUSP site after the treatment plant construction is complete.

The County acknowledges that the 35,000 acre feet predicted to come from the Sacramento River Diversion will not be available in 2009, a date that reflects PCWA's earlier estimates based on CEQA and NEPA timelines that have proven to be more optimistic than events have shown. In addition, the recent slow-down in development has pushed out in time the date on which the need for this new water supply will materialize. A revised water demand assessment was conducted in August 2007. Because the SRWRS environmental review process has proceeded more slowly than

originally envisioned, PCWA now anticipates releasing the draft EIR/EIS for that project in early 2009, with the hope of final approval by the end of 2009. Thereafter, several years will be needed to complete engineering work and to construct diversion and treatment facilities. This delay does not affect the initial water supply for the RUSP, however, because as discussed in the DEIR, the project's initial water supply needs will be met by current Middle Fork Project water entitlements and limited temporary and redundant groundwater use.

### Comment 5

(The only source of water available to the Regional University is the Sacramento River diversion because the West Roseville specific Plan and Placer Vineyards will take the other surface supplies from the PCWA. The Project EIR does not disclose a secondary source of the available water that is reasonably feasible.)

Due to the water availability monitoring done consistently and systematically by PCWA and the buildout projections analyzed in the DEIR, the DEIR presented ample evidence that, even prior to the Sacramento River Diversion coming on line, PCWA will have sufficient water from its existing facilities and entitlements, along with groundwater, to serve near-term growth in the Placer County region. Moreover, the West Roseville Specific Plan will not sequester all of PCWA's available water. Rather, the West Roseville Specific Plan relies entirely on water supplies that Roseville has under its control, and only some of those supplies are contracted from PCWA pursuant to its Middle Fork Project water rights. Neither PCWA nor the County anticipates the need for PCWA to call back from Roseville any of the 30,000 afy of Middle Fork Project water the City is currently purchasing from PCWA. So the RUSP is not competing with the West Roseville Specific Plan area for water supplies.

The RUSP will also use reclaimed water to offset potable water demand. Response to Comment 13-15 reads, in pertinent part, as follows:

The third paragraph on page 2-28 of the Draft EIR is revised as follows:

The build-out demand for the Plan Area would be 3,220 afy, which includes 772 afy of public-area irrigation demand. Approximately 650 afy of this irrigation demand could be served by recycled water from the PGWWTP. The City of Roseville has indicated that the amount of recycled water that would be generally made available to the proposed project would be based upon the average dry weather flow of wastewater from the proposed project. The 650 afy figure, therefore, assumes the peak day irrigation demand served by recycled water would be limited by the average dry weather flow of wastewater from the proposed project, which was determined to be 650 afy. The build-out demand for potable water and supplemental water sources, including the 120 afy needed to supplement the recycled water supply, would be 2,570 afy. Voluntary conservation measures could lead to a five percent reduction in the demand for potable water during dry and critical years.

The Master Facilities Agreement also addressed the certainty of water supplies. The Agreement embodies PCWA's commitment to serve the RUSP site despite the constraints in the Roseville pipeline and the lack of water piping from the Ophir Treatment Plant site to the project area:

". . . However, there are presently upstream transmission capacity limitations, and if other parties pay the Agency's WCC [water connection charge] and thereby reserve capacity in those upstream pipelines, the Agency may not be able to deliver to the Facilities the full amount of water needed to serve the Service Area. In that event, construction of additional transmission infrastructure will be needed to enable the Agency to deliver the full amount of water to serve the Service Area. It is the Agency's intent, but not an obligation under this Agreement, to insure that such additional transmission infrastructure is constructed in a timely manner so as not to restrict development the Service Area. If however, such additional transmission infrastructure is not constructed in time to prevent a delay in the development of the Service Area, the Agency will use its best efforts to supply groundwater from the Facilities on an interim basis until the Agency can complete the needed transmission for the Applicant or others unless or until the applicable WCC has been paid."

## (Agreement p. 7.)

Finally, Response to Comment 19-69 (FEIR p. 4-93) elaborates upon the extent to which surface water sources could be affected by drought conditions:

As discussed above, PCWA has three sources of surface water supplies: PG&E Yuba/Bear Project, Middle Fork American River Project, and CVP Project. PCWA's primary source of water in Zone 1 is a surface water supply contract with PG&E for diversions from the Yuba and Bear Rivers for up to 100,400 AFA. This water is delivered through PG&E's Drum-Spaulding hydroelectric system. This source has relatively high drought reliability. PCWA anticipates nearly full contract deliveries during mild multiple-dry scenarios, but cutbacks of up to 50 percent are possible during the most severe single dry year events. The commenter is incorrect in stating that the RUSP cannot be developed without CVP water; it is one of three potential surface water sources available to serve the RUSP.

#### Comment 6

(The EIR does not disclose the impact of constructing a pipeline to the Regional University Project on vernal pools, riparian habitat and threatened and endangered species.)

As discussed above, the certified Placer Vineyards Specific Plan EIR, incorporated by reference into the RUSP EIR and summarized at length in various places in the RUSP

EIR, has already addressed many of the commenter's concerns in this context. As of the present, this certified EIR may be presumed to have sufficiently addressed the environmental impacts it addressed, including those associated with off-site infrastructure related to the provision of surface water to the general area. This presumption arises from Evidence Code section 664, which creates a presumption that official governmental duties have been "regularly performed," and by Public Resources Code section 21167.3, which provides that EIRs are to be treated as legally adequate even while litigation against them is pending. In reviewing in the present the pertinent analysis previously prepared for the Placer Vineyards EIR, County staff finds the analysis to remain persuasive and complete, and thus the best available information on the subject. Relevant here is the fact that the Second Partially Recirculated Revised Draft EIR included a detailed discussion of the impacts of off-site infrastructure (e.g., pipelines) needed to deliver water from both the Ophir Treatment Plant and the Sacramento River Diversion to the Placer Vineyards site (which is close to the RUSP site). This discussion reads as follows, and addresses, among many other things, impacts to vernal pools, riparian habitat, and threatened and endangered species (see PVSPRRDEIR pp. 6.3-1—6.3-17):

#### ALTERNATIVE OFF-SITE UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE

Updated Revised Draft EIR Figure 6-14 shows the current proposed route of the pipeline. As indicated, portions of the first pipeline to deliver Middle Fork Project water have been constructed and remaining portions of this pipeline are incorporated in existing, planned and proposed projects, including Placer Ranch, Bickford Ranch and Regional University. Most of the pipeline facilities would be located in existing and proposed paved roadways. As noted in Section 4.3.5, in order to fully implement a long-term water supply from this source, it is proposed that a parallel pipeline be constructed. PCWA has indicated that the long-term water supply from the American River Pump Station source at Auburn would require constructing 16.8 miles of new 60-inch and 6.3 miles of new 48-inch treated water pipeline connecting to PCWA's existing water distribution system (Einar Maisch, PCWA Director of Strategic Affairs, March 2007). The American River Pump Station (which is still under construction) is expected to be functional by October 2007 and complete early in 2008, and will supply up to 35,500 acre-feet of water annually to Placer County (Maisch). If the 35,000 AFA CVP water entitlement that is currently proposed to be taken from the Sacramento River (not to be confused with the existing 35,500 AFA entitlement to divert Middle Fork Project water at Auburn) is shifted to the American River Pump Station, an enlargement of the pump station facility would be required, so that the total amount to be diverted for PCWA's purposes would be 70,500 AFA. This project is discussed under "Alternative Long Term Surface Water Supply", below.

The pipelines of interest would connect to the Ophir Water Treatment Plant, which is located on Ophir Road in the Newcastle/Ophir area.

PCWA is currently in the design phase of the proposed Water Treatment Plant project, which would supply a portion of the already approved 35,500 AFA for diversion at the American River Pump Station. Initially, the facility would provide 30 million gallons of water a day. The plant could be expanded to handle as much as 120 million gallons of water daily. The plant's design is about 95 percent complete and a Final Environmental Impact Report has been certified for the project. The next phase is acquisition of the various environmental permits that are required. Groundbreaking is scheduled for 2009 (Brian Martin, PCWA Director of Technical Services, March 2007). The Water Treatment Plant is scheduled for operation in 2011.

#### PIPELINE ROUTE DESCRIPTION

The water pipelines would be (portions of the first line have already been) installed generally from the Water Treatment Plant along Ophir Road, through the Ophir area, adjacent to a mixture of single-family residential and commercial uses.

Beyond Ophir, Ophir Road becomes Taylor Road. The water pipelines would be installed in Taylor Road, connecting to the transmission main from the Foothill Water Treatment Plant at Penryn. This stretch of Taylor Road is located in a rural, unincorporated area. The land uses along this stretch of Taylor Road consist of a mixture of single-family residential, agricultural land, and commercial development.

The proposed transmission system includes a water pipeline branching to the northwest before the Penryn connection, and runs through the Bickford Ranch planned development. Between Taylor Road and Bickford Ranch, the water pipelines would be installed in local roads through single-family residential areas. Bickford Ranch is located in Placer County and contains approximately 1,954 acres. The development is proposed to contain a mixed-use planned development with 1,890 residential units of varying densities and housing types, including an age-restricted component. The developer also proposes to construct an 18-hole golf course with driving range and clubhouses, and 9.7 acres of retail/office uses. The water pipelines would traverse Bickford Ranch in a generally east-west direction in proposed roadways.

After Bickford Ranch, the water pipelines would connect to the existing PCWA Zone 1 system just north of the Sunset Water Treatment Plant in Rocklin. Between Bickford Ranch and this point of connection, existing land uses consist primarily of single-family residential along with the Catta Verdera Country Club. The proposed water pipelines would then be constructed through the existing Whitney Ranch development within existing road right-of-ways. Whitney Ranch is in the City of Rocklin and

contains approximately 1,300 acres comprised of residential, recreational and education facilities.

Beyond Whitney Ranch, the water pipelines are proposed to cross under State Route 65, and extend westerly through a mixture of industrial and open space, crossing Industrial Avenue, and connecting to the Placer Ranch planned development. The Placer Ranch project consists of approximately 2,213 acres of proposed industrial, commercial, office and professional, educational uses, and 6,700 residential units (including campus housing). The proposal includes a California State University campus sized to accommodate 15,000 - 25,000 full time students at buildout. The proposed project is located north and adjacent to the Roseville City boundary and the West Roseville Specific Plan area, approximately one mile west of the State Route 65/Sunset Boulevard interchange, bisected by Fiddyment Road in Placer County.

To the west of Placer Ranch, a proposed water pipeline would be constructed through agricultural land, continuing to the south and connecting to the Regional University planned development project. The approximate 1,136 acre Regional University project includes two primary components: a university campus planned to accommodate approximately 6,000 students with 800 professors and staff (include approximately 1,155 residential units for students and faculty, as well as retirement housing); and an adjoining mixed-use community, with a variety of residential, commercial, employment, open space, parks, and public uses. The community would include 3,232 residential units of varying densities, commercial, open space, and recreation areas. Lastly, the water pipeline is proposed to be constructed through agricultural land, eventually ending at the intersection of Baseline Road and Watt Avenue, abutting the proposed Placer Vineyards project.

## Alternative Infrastructure to Deliver a Long-Term or Buildout Surface Water Supply Regulatory Environment

Information for the alternative long-term or buildout water supply infrastructure regulatory environment is excerpted from the Foothill Phase II Water Treatment Plant and Pipeline Draft and Final EIR, April 2005 (now Ophir Water Treatment Plant/Pipeline project). As is described above, the regulatory compliance phase is the next phase of activity for the Ophir Water Treatment Plant project and related water lines. This phase does not include construction of the second parallel pipeline necessary to deliver the alternative CVP replacement supply from the American River Pump Station to western Placer County. As described elsewhere, that project would only be pursued if the Sacramento River diversion became infeasible. A similar regulatory environment would, however, likely exist for the second parallel pipeline if and when it is pursued.

The following permits are deemed potentially necessary for components of the Ophir Water Treatment Plant and pipeline extensions:

- i) Placer County Planning Department issue a tree removal permit. Tree removal permit has been obtained.
- ii) Placer County Air Pollution Control District ensure compliance with rules concerning fugitive dust and control of fine particulate matter from construction activities; issue a permit to operate emergency generator. Cannot obtain permit until construction is underway and emergency generator is onsite.
- iii) Placer County Public Works encroachment permit for working within County roadways.
- iv) State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) issue a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for construction activities required under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act.
- v) Regional Water Quality Control Board issue a water quality certification under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. Application submitted waiting for permit.
- vi) General Order for Dewatering and Other Low Threat Discharge to Surface Waters Permit This permit is only needed in the event that groundwater is encountered during Water Treatment Plant or pipeline construction that cannot be contained on site or pumped into tank trucks and hauled off to a disposal facility. PCWA or its representative will need to apply for a General Order for Dewatering and Other Low Threat Discharges to Surface Water Permit (NPDES # CA0083356) from the Central Valley RWQCB. Plan and Specifications anticipates confinement of groundwater on site. General Order only required when groundwater is not confined on site during construction. This permit is not needed in special circumstances which are unknown until project is underway. Placer Vineyards Specific Plan 6.3-4 March, 2007 Second Partially Recirculated Revised Draft EIR
- vii) California Department of Fish and Game Streambed Alteration Agreement application submitted. Waiting for permit.
- viii) California Department of Health Services issue a Domestic Water Supply Permit

- ix) California Department of Transportation encroachment permit for the pipelines in the vicinity of State Highway 193.
- x) Toxics Preconstruction Review Policies The Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act of 1987 (AB 2588) provides for the regulation of over 200 air toxics and is the primary toxic air contaminant legislation in the state. Under the Act, sources emitting listed toxic air contaminants must estimate and report their toxic air emissions to the PCAPCD. The PCAPCD then prioritizes facilities on the basis of emissions. High priority facilities are required to submit a health risk assessment and communicate the results to the affected public if their health risk potential exceeds a specified threshold. The primary purpose of AB2588 is to identify and inventory toxic air emissions and to communicate the potential for adverse health effects to the public.
- xi) US Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Permit(s) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Requires consultation with the following agencies:
  - (1) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) currently participating in Section 7 consultation to comply with the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), which renders Section 10 inapplicable. Compliance with Section 7 of the federal ESA is required because suitable habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle was identified for the project area and field surveys indicated the presence of four elderberry shrubs meeting the definition of VELB habitat that would be affected by the Proposed Project. As document in the EIR, PCWA will compensate for loss of VELB or VELB habitat by complying with habitat creation and mitigation measures described in the United State Fish and Wildlife Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle. The results of a recent California redlegged frog survey and site assessment indicate that this species is unlikely to occur in the project corridor on the water treatment plant site; consequently, it would not be adversely affected by the Proposed Project. A copy of the survey report and habitat site assessment was submitted to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (Ms. Roberta Gerson) on October 18, 2005. After review of the report and site assessment, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service made the determination that it is unlikely that California red-legged frog will be affected by the proposed project.

- (2) National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) No habitat for federally listed fish species will be affected by an element of the proposed project. Consequently, consultation with NMFS is not required.
- (3) State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) currently consulting with SHPO.

# Alternative Infrastructure to Deliver a Long-Term or Buildout Surface Water Supply, Analysis of Environmental Effects

The project consists of water pipelines to connect to the Alternative Long-Term Surface Water supply. This alternative consists of new water transmission mains and assumes a future expansion of the Ophir Water Treatment Plant (see Alternative Long-Term Water Supply discussed below).

Agricultural Resource Impacts. Loss of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Farmland of Local Importance has the potential to occur. Where construction would occur within existing roadways, no impact would occur. Because construction would be limited to the utility line corridor, and the area of surface disturbance or loss of agricultural use of the surface soil due to construction would be temporary in nature, potential agricultural land impacts associated with utility line construction are considered less than significant (See Revised Draft EIR Impact 4.1-10).

Aesthetics/Light and Glare Impacts. Because water lines will be placed underground, visual impacts will be related to the period of construction and revegetation, with the potential exception of utility line access points and areas where some portion of the utility facilities may be visible above ground. Although impacts during construction are considered less than significant, impacts related to revegetation and permanent above ground structures are potentially significant. Mitigation measures included in the Revised Draft EIR (Mitigation Measures 4.2-6a and 4.2-6b) can reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Light and glare impacts related to construction would be temporary in nature, and nighttime construction activity would be restricted by mitigation measures included in the Section 4.9 (Noise) of the Revised Draft EIR. Potential impacts are considered less than significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts. Installation of the water supply line would not appreciably increase impervious surface area or increase runoff. Design and installation of pipelines in offsite infrastructure areas is anticipated to remove and replace existing

conditions with similar or in-kind surfaces and materials. Specific areas at intersections, crossings, or an unforeseen encountered condition may require permanent impervious cover and result in slightly higher impervious surface areas; however, these areas would be minimal. These impacts are considered less than significant. The proposed water supply line would bisect waterways and 100-year floodplains. Considering that off-site utilities will be buried and will be enclosed systems, there will be no impact to the hydrology of waterways or floodplains. Impacts from off-site utility line and roadway installation are, therefore less than significant.

Installation of utilities in off-site infrastructure areas could result in water quality degradation over the duration of construction. Grading operations result in a loss of vegetation, exposing the soils to erosion, particularly in steep areas. The exposed soils could be carried by storm runoff during the rainy season to downstream waters, resulting in sediment transport. These increased sediment loads could substantially degrade water quality in downstream areas. In addition, the operation and maintenance of construction vehicles and equipment, the loading and unloading of construction materials, and construction waste could release contaminants that would be washed off by stormwater discharges. This increase in sediment loads and turbidity in local stream courses and drainage areas would be considered a significant short-term water quality impact. However, mitigation measures included in the Revised Draft EIR (Mitigation Measures 4.3.4-7a through 4.3.4-7c) reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

Biological Resource Impacts. The construction of the alternative offsite utility water line could potentially impact habitats, wetlands, and special-status species not evaluated in the Revised Draft EIR (see Table 4.4-3 and Figures 4.4-5 and 4.4-6 in Volume 1, Section 4.4 of the Revised Draft EIR). The current configuration of the utility corridor places the western terminus of the corridor approximately west of the original design—passing through the Placer Ranch Specific Plan area and the eastern edge of the Regional University Specific Plan area. A CNDBB database search was conducted and no additional sensitive habitats or special-status species would be affected by this change in design. The eastern end of the current configuration of the alternative off-site utility corridor places it approximately 3 miles northeast of the previously designed corridor reported in the Revised Draft EIR. This change in location is also accompanied by an increase in elevation of approximately 350 feet. Although this spatial and elevational change is slight, it does increase the chance of encountering species not previously considered in the previous utility corridor design. Based on these conditions and a review of the Bickford Ranch Specific Plan EIR (through which the current design

passes), four additional special-status plant species should be considered. (See PVSPRRDEIR for Table 6.3.5-1 which lists these species.

Depending on the design and location of the alternative off-site infrastructure corridor, there is the potential to impact other biological resources such as: wetlands (including vernal pools) and other jurisdictional aquatic features, riparian habitat, native oak trees and their associated nesting substrate for raptors and other migratory birds, and elderberry shrubs providing habitat for the Valley elderberry longhorn beetle. Under this alternative, off-site utility corridors potentially cross several drainages and listed fish species could occur in these features. Mitigation measures included in the Revised Draft EIR for off-site infrastructure (Mitigation Measures 4.4-15 through 4.4-30c) would reduce these impacts, although not to a less than significant level.

Geology and Soils Impacts. Impacts related to geology and soils that could result from trench/pipeline construction within the alternative off-site utility corridor are similar to those for proposed utility improvements within the Specific Plan area. Those impacts include earthwork/grading or topographic alteration and erosion control impacts. These impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level by compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.5-4a through 4.5-4f included in the Revised Draft EIR.

Cultural Resource Impacts. To evaluate potential impacts to cultural resources along the proposed alternative route of the off-site water line, Ric Windmiller, Consulting Archaeologist, undertook a records search at the North Central Information Center, California Historical Resources Information System (March 2007). The records search consisted of examining the information center's 7.5 minute USGS quadrangles on which staff had plotted the location of previous cultural resource studies and separate USGS quadrangles on which staff had plotted the location of known cultural resources. The records search also included an examination of the information center's backlog files of studies, the results of which had not yet been charted on the center's USGS quadrangles. The research focused on those reaches of the proposed alternative water line route from Placer Vineyards north to Regional University, from Regional University to Placer Ranch, from Placer Ranch to Whitney Ranch and from Sunset Water Treatment Plant to Bickford Ranch.

<u>Placer Vineyards to Regional University Reach</u>. An estimated 90 percent of this reach of the proposed water line alternative was encompassed in previous cultural resource studies. As a result of these

studies, no cultural resources were recorded along the proposed route. However, two sites were plotted on the information center's maps within 1,000 feet of the proposed water line route: Site P-31-2874 (a poured concrete house foundation circa 1950 and associated barn foundation) and Site P-31-2876 (an isolated antique vehicle frame with solid rubber tires). No Native American archaeological sites are reported along this reach of the water line alternative. It is unlikely that any buried Native American sites exist along this reach of the proposed water line alternative except along the banks and near the two forks of Curry Creek over which the water line route passes.

Regional University to Placer Ranch Reach. An estimated 100 percent of this reach of the proposed water line alternative was the subject of previous cultural resource studies, according to information center maps. As a result of these studies, one isolated Native American artifact was recovered within approximately 700 feet of the proposed water line route (Site P-31-1170). The record for this isolate suggests that the find may indicate the presence of a seasonal gathering or processing site. The isolated find came from a low ridge with heavy grass cover. The 1967 Pleasant Grove 7.5 minute USGS quadrangle illustrates buildings at the northeast corner of Phillip Road adjacent to the proposed water line route. The buildings may be 50 years old or older. The proposed water line alternative crosses Pleasant Grove Creek and a tributary and traverses the same low ridge system on which the isolated Native American artifact was found. It is possible that buried Native American archaeological resources may be encountered along and near the creek banks. It is less likely that buried Native American archaeological resources would be encountered on the low ridges away from the creeks as any finds would probably be surface or near-surface finds in our opinion.

Placer Ranch to Whitney Ranch Reach. An estimated 100 percent of this reach was encompassed by previous cultural resource studies based on our inspection of information center maps. No cultural resources were identified on the information center's maps along or within 1,000 feet of this reach of the proposed water line alternative. It is unlikely that buried Native American archaeological resources would be encountered. It is our experience that Native American archaeological resources in areas such as this between Roseville and Lincoln tend to be surface finds, probably representing seasonal gathering areas.

Sunset Water Treatment Plant to Bickford Ranch Reach. An estimated 95 percent of this reach has been previously inspected for cultural resources based on our analysis of the information center's maps of cultural resource studies. The information center's site maps illustrate

two recorded cultural resources on or adjacent to the proposed alternative water line route in this reach: P-31-965 (CA-PLA-842-H) a low rock fence remnant approximately 480 meters long, 20-60cm wide and 20-30cm high and; P-31-773 (CA-PLA-647-H) a rock fence remnant reportedly a part of the network of fences on historic Whitney Ranch constructed by Chinese labor between 1875 and 1880. Both fence remnants may be part of the same network of ranch fences. The condition of such fences is generally poor, as reported for other segments of fencing located on the historic Whitney Ranch. Bickford Ranch to Ophir Water Treatment Plant Reach. The analysis of this reach focused solely on the information center's mapped location of previously recorded cultural resources and potential historical resources illustrated on the current USGS quadrangles. Of potential historical resources illustrated on current USGS maps, the proposed water line alternative crosses or is near the Caperton Canal, Antelope Canal, both east- and west-bound tracks of Southern Pacific Railroad's Donner Route, the Highway 40 Mine, the route of old Highway 40 and the highway tunnel at Newcastle, as well as historic buildings in the town of Newcastle. Recorded sites along or within 500 feet of this reach of the proposed water alternative include: P-31-1268 (CA-PLA-1002-H) a segment of the historic Penryn Canal, which was still in use by Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) according to the 1999 cultural resource record form; P-31-1240 (CA-PLA-982- H) the eastbound Donner Route tracks originally constructed circa 1909 by Southern Pacific; P- 31-964 (CA-PLA-841-H) the west-bound Donner Route tracks originally operated by the Central Pacific and upgraded by Southern Pacific circa 1909; P-31-1292 (CA-PLA-1003-H) old Highway 40; P-31-2962, the Highway 40 tunnel at Newcastle constructed in 1931; P-31-2624 (CA-PLA-1857) a single family residence and outbuildings at least 50 years old with limited historic integrity according to the record forms dated 2005.

Preliminary Conclusions. The mapped location of previous cultural resource studies archived at the North Central Information Center illustrate that most of the proposed water line alternative from the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan to the Ophir Water Treatment Plant has been the subject of previous cultural resource studies. Based on the results of these previous studies, remarkably, few archaeological and historic sites lie within or near the proposed water line corridor. Only one previously recorded Native American site lies near the proposed alternate water line route within the reaches covered by the present analysis. However, the Native American site was identified on the basis of a single artifact. The water line alternative would have no effect on Native American archaeological resources mapped by the information center within the above specified reaches.

The significance of the historic sites located on or near the proposed water line route would need to be assessed individually. For example, linear historic sites such as canals, railroads, roads and fences do not necessarily display the same integrity along their entire length. Some portions of a road or other historic linear site may retain the ability to convey their historical importance, while other portions may not. Integrity or the ability to convey historical significance is an important factor in evaluating the eligibility of any specific segment of a linear site for California Register eligibility or assessing the resource's significance as a "unique archaeological resource" under CEQA. The effect of the water line alternative on the above historic sites is unknown; however, the Mitigation Measure 4.6-14 contained in the Revised Draft EIR, or similar measure, would ensure that such resources are properly evaluated and protected, where warranted, during pipeline construction.

**Traffic/Transportation Impacts**. The only traffic-related impacts are those associated with construction. Construction-related impacts would be temporary in nature and are addressed under the discussion of Public Services/Infrastructure.

Air Quality Impacts. Exhaust and fugitive dust emissions would be generated by construction activities in the alternative off-site utility corridor, such as excavation and grading, construction vehicle traffic, and wind blowing over exposed earth. The degree of activity is unknown at this time, so average daily construction emissions have not been estimated for off-site infrastructure areas. During maximum construction activity, the primary emissions would be dust from earthmoving activities and NOx from construction vehicle exhaust. The direct air quality impacts of construction in the alternative off-site utility corridor are considered significant and unavoidable. No operational air quality impacts have been identified related to installation and maintenance of utilities in off-site infrastructure areas.

Noise Impacts. The only noise impact associated with the alternative off-site utility corridor is construction-related noise, which may affect adjacent noise-sensitive uses. Construction activities would be temporary in nature and would most likely occur only during the daytime hours. Construction noise impacts could result in annoyance or sleep disruption for nearby residents if nighttime operations were to occur, or if equipment is not properly muffled or maintained. These impacts are considered potentially significant, but compliance with the Placer County Noise Element standards, the Placer County Noise Ordinance and applicable mitigation measures included in Revised Draft EIR Section 4.9 as modified herein (see modification to Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 under "Alternative Long Term Surface

Water Supply Analysis") would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Public Service Impacts. The proposed water line is a public utility and would be operated by PCWA. The effects of the water supply on the environment are evaluated herein, as well as below under "Alternative Long-Term or Buildout Surface Water Supply". Construction activity related to installation of pipelines in the alternative off-site utility corridor could present an obstacle to movement which affects emergency response times for police and fire protection, access to schools, and interference with solid waste collection. However, this impact is considered less than significant because it would be temporary and subject to standard County and State traffic control and access procedures.

Hazards/Hazardous Material Impacts. Impacts in the off-site utility corridor could include the potential to encounter underground storage tanks, contaminated soils, refuse and other abandoned materials, abandoned wells, septic systems, and structures containing asbestos, similar to the Specific Plan area. Any construction would be subject to State and local requirements regarding underground storage tank removal, well and septic tank abandonment, wastewater treatment facilities operation, etc. NPDES requirements will also apply to all construction, including submission of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP), as administered by the State Water Resources Control Board. In addition, any construction will be under the oversight of a public agency, and ultimate owner of the improvements (PCWA). In addition, compliance with Revised Draft EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-21a through 4.12.21f would ensure reduction of any related impacts to a less than significant level.

#### ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM SURFACE WATER SUPPLY

This alternative consists of a long-term surface water supply provided by PCWA from its CVP American River water through an expansion of PCWA's new American River Pump Station, or a Folsom Reservoir diversion, and would be an alternative to the 11,500 AFA described in the Project Description that would be furnished by PCWA from the Sacramento River. The American River Basin Cumulative Report (Cumulative Report) was prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) in August 2001 as part of the PCWA Pump Station Project Draft EIS/EIR. It is intended to serve as an integral component of NEPA, CEQA, and ESA compliance documentation for Reclamation's CVP American River Division actions identified as reasonably foreseeable. The evaluation includes an assessment of the diversion-related and service area impacts of past and future water

diversions, CVP facility operations affecting those diversions, and land-based resources of the American River watershed. The Cumulative Report is incorporated by reference in its entirety (PCWA and Reclamation, 2002), although a summary is provided (see Revised Draft EIR Section 4.3). The alternative water supply analysis relies on the analyses and conclusions of the Cumulative Report, recognizing its collaboratively-based acceptance and recent updates to include all known Reclamation American River Division actions, including the proposed Specific Plan. All "Template Output" and "Technical Appendix" references used below refer to the modeling results described in Revised Draft EIR Section 4.3. These appendices and templates are available for review at the address shown in Section 2-18 of the Revised Draft EIR.

## Alternative Long-Term or Buildout Surface Water Supply Supplemental Analysis, American River Pump Station

The American River Pump Station Alternative includes the expansion of the pumping intake capacity of the water diversion facility that is currently under construction. Raw water diverted at the expanded American River Pump Station would be conveyed through the Auburn Tunnel (using existing available capacity) and pumped from the Auburn Tunnel through a new Auburn Tunnel Pump Station dedicated to pumping water into the Ophir Water Treatment Plant. The Ophir Water Treatment Plant would be expanded to process the additional 35,000 AFA for use in western Placer County. The following actions related to the water supply would be undertaken by PCWA. Quantities are reported in MGD rather than AFA; however, the flow factors used are equivalent to diversion and treatment of 35,000 AFA:

- Expanding the capacity of American River Pump Station on the northern bank of the American River near Auburn from 65 MGD up to 130 MGD;
- Constructing a new 65 MGD Pump Station to pump water from the existing Auburn Tunnel to the Ophir Water Treatment Plant;
- Constructing approximately 2,000 feet of 54-inch raw water pipeline from the Pump Station to the Ophir Water Treatment Plant;
- Expanding the treatment capacity of the Ophir Water Treatment Plant from 30 MGD to 95 MGD; and

• Constructing 16.8 miles of new 60-inch and 6.3 miles of new 48-inch treated water pipelines connecting to PCWA's existing water distribution system (this is the parallel pipeline discussed above under Alternative Infrastructure to Deliver a Long-Term or Buildout Surface Water Supply).

The Ophir Water Treatment Plant is located adjacent to the existing Auburn Wastewater Treatment Facility at the intersection on Ophir Road, north of Interstate 80 and east of the town of Newcastle (see Figure 6-15). An EIR was prepared for the Ophir Water Treatment Plant (previously called Foothill Phase II Water Treatment Plant and Pipeline Project). The Water Treatment Plant project is part of PCWA plans to augment existing water supplies with a new treated water supply and is one of several projects designed to secure a future water supply for the Lower Zone 1 Service Area of PCWA. The EIR evaluated the impacts related to the construction and operation of the following facilities:

- A new 54 inch in diameter raw water intake connecting to the planned 54 inch pipeline at the south end of the Auburn Tunnel Pump Station No. 2 transfer basin and extending to the proposed Water Treatment Plant;
- A new water treatment plant (30 mgd) to be constructed on a 35 acre site, which will include an operations building, pretreatment facilities for turbidity and organics reduction, filtration facilities, a chemical building, associated chemical feed systems, on-site storage facilities, and solids handling facilities;
- A new treated water transmission pipeline (ranging from 42 to 60 inches in diameter) that will connect the new Water Treatment Plant to PCWA's existing transmission system near the intersection of Taylor Road and Rock Springs Road (referred to as Phase I). Phase II of the pipeline segment will convey treated water at a point near the intersection of Taylor and Callison Roads and continue west to a pipeline to be constructed by the City of Lincoln connecting the Sunset 10 mg water storage tanks and the new Lincoln Storage Tank farm; and
- A new 12 inch treated water transmission pipeline that will connect to an 18 inch pipeline 350 feet east of Lozanos Road and continue southwest to the existing Newcastle water transmission system situated in Taylor Road.

In addition, the Ophir WTP EIR evaluated the potential impacts of the project's need for additional temporary construction easements (for staging areas, etc.) and permanent maintenance easements or property acquisitions that will be required from private property owners for pressure reducing stations.

Impact Summary. The findings of the Ophir WTP EIR were that Construction-Related Activities (including site grading) that would generate short-term emissions of criteria pollutants, including suspended and inhalable particulate matter and equipment exhaust emissions, would adversely affect air quality. These impacts to air quality were determined to be significant and unavoidable. However, impacts to the remaining issues analyzed by the EIR were found either to be less than significant, or if potentially significant with the implementation of mitigation measures were reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures. The Ophir WTP EIR proposed mitigation measures for the following subjects: Transportation and Circulation, Air Quality, Noise, Hazardous Materials and Public Health, Hydrology and Water Quality, Geology and Soils, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Visual Resources, and Public Services and Utilities. With the exception of Mitigation Measure 4.5.2 for Noise, these measures are similar to those for off-site infrastructure construction proposed in the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan Revised Draft and Final EIRs.

Ophir EIR Mitigation Measure 4.5.2 addresses the potential temporary increase in noise levels in noise-sensitive areas during construction-related blasting activities. For the proposed project, the implementation of this measure would reduce the potential impact to less than significant. Since blasting was not contemplated during buildout of the Placer Vineyard Specific Plan, no such mitigation measure was proposed; therefore, Revised Draft EIR Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 is hereby amended as follows (added language is shown underlined):

- 4.9-3a The hours of operation of noise-producing equipment shall comply with Placer County's "Standard Construction Noise Condition of Approval." Effective mufflers shall be fitted to gasand diesel-powered equipment to reduce noise levels as much as possible.
- 4.9-3b As part of the project plans and specifications, the construction contractor shall prepare and implement a blasting plan. Primary components of

the plan shall consist of the following applicable items:

- Identification of blast officer.
- Limits on blasting activities. Blasting activities will be limited to Monday through Friday.
- Scaled drawings of blast locations, and neighboring buildings, streets, or other locations that could be inhabited.
- Blasting notification procedures, lead times, and list of those notified Public notification to potential affected vibration receptors describing the expected extent and duration of the blasting.
- Description of means for transportation and on-site storage and security of explosives in accordance with local, State, and federal regulations.
- Minimum acceptable weather conditions for blasting and safety provisions for potential stray current (if electric detonation).
- Traffic control standards and traffic safety measures (if applicable).
- Requirement for provision and use of personal protective equipment.
- Minimum standoff distances and description of blast impact zones and procedures for clearing and controlling access to blast danger.
- Procedures for handling, setting, wiring, and firing explosives. Also, the plan should include procedures for handling misfires per Federal code.
- Type and quantity of explosives and description of detonation device. Sequence and schedule of blasting rounds, including general method of excavation, lift heights, etc.

- Methods of matting or covering of blast area to prevent flyrock and excessive air blast pressure.
- Description of blast vibration and air blast monitoring program.
- Dust control measures in compliance with applicable air pollution control regulation (to interface with general construction dust control plan).
- Emergency Action Plan to provide emergency telephone numbers and directions to medical facilities. Procedures for action in the event of injury.
- Material Safety Data Sheets for each explosive or other hazardous materials to be used.
- Evidence of licensing, experience, and qualification of blasters.
- Description of insurance for the blasting work. The blasting plan shall also include the following applicable noise reducing measures:
- The blasting plan shall establish vibration limits in order to protect structures form blasting activities and identify specific monitoring points. At a minimum, a pre-blast survey will be conducted at any potentially affected structures and underground utilities within 500 feet of a blast area, as well as the nearest commercial or residential structure, prior to blasting.
- The blasting plan shall include visual inspection of the structures that could be affected, documentation of structures by photographs, video, and a level survey of the ground floor of structures or the crown of major and critical utility lines. This document shall be reviewed with the individual owners prior to any blasting operations. PCWA and affected