

## **6.10 PUBLIC SERVICES**

---

## 6.10 PUBLIC SERVICES

---

### INTRODUCTION

The following section addresses public services in Placer County potentially affected by development of the Regional University Specific Plan (RUSP), including law enforcement, fire protection, public schools, recreation, and libraries. The existing levels of service are described and the ability of each service provider to accommodate the project is evaluated.

Information from the Placer County General Plan and environmental documents prepared for other projects in the vicinity of the project site were used to prepare this section.

Comments raised in response to the Notice of Preparation (see Appendix B) identified safety issues related to the provision of service by the highway patrol to the growing population, impacts on the Placer County Sheriff's office, and the ability of the County to provide adequate public services for such a large scale development.

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Placer County Sheriff's Department is the primary provider of law enforcement services to the project site. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) responds to traffic-related incidents and the Sheriff's Department provides all other law enforcement services.

The Sheriff's Department is staffed by one sheriff, one under-sheriff, four captains, 224 sworn officers, and 157 non-sworn civilians and support staff. The Department's equipment includes 40 vehicles, ten K-9 units, three aircraft, and three boats.<sup>1</sup>

The South Placer Service Center, located in Loomis at the intersection of Horseshoe Bar Road and Interstate 80, is the sheriff service center nearest to the project site. The Department may construct a new service center in the currently proposed Placer Vineyards development, two miles south of the project site.<sup>2</sup>

The South Placer Service Center, which serves western Placer County south of Newcastle, is staffed with approximately 28 sworn officers (including three detectives and one lieutenant), ten volunteers, and five civil officers and administrative staff. From July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2001 the response times from the station averaged 2:32 minutes for Priority 1 calls and 10 minutes for Priority 2 calls<sup>3</sup> to Reporting District #121 (which includes the project site).<sup>4</sup> The South Placer Service Center is currently under expansion and the number of staff may increase.<sup>5</sup>

The project site is in District # 121 and Area 1, Sector II of the Sheriff's "Ocean Beat", which is bound by Sacramento County, Sutter County, Yuba County, and the City of Roseville. The Sheriff's Department has mutual aid agreements with each of these agencies. One deputy is currently assigned to patrol this area.<sup>6</sup>

The General Plan requires an officer-to-resident ratio of one officer per 1,100 residents in unincorporated Placer County.<sup>7</sup> Based on the staffing levels described above and the 2005 population estimate for unincorporated Placer County (104,689 residents<sup>8</sup>), the current officer-to-resident ratio is approximately 2.3 officers per 1,100 residents.

---

1 Sworn, non-sworn, and equipment numbers may fluctuate. Amanda Rogers, Community Services Officer II, Placer County Sheriff's Department, personal communication, December 16, 2004.

2 Amanda Rogers, Community Services Officer II, Placer County Sheriff's Department, personal communication, December 16, 2004.

3 Priority 1 calls are emergency life threatening; Priority 2 calls are crimes in progress.

4 Amanda Rogers, Community Services Officer II, Placer County Sheriff's Department, Personal Communication, December 16, 2004.

5 Amanda Rogers, Community Services Officer II, Placer County Sheriff's Department, Personal Communication, December 16, 2004.

6 Amanda Rogers, Community Services Officer II, Placer County Sheriff's Department, Personal Communication, December 16, 2004.

7 Amanda Rogers, Community Services Officer II, Placer County Sheriff's Department, Personal Communication, December 22, 2004.

8 Department of Finance, *E-1: City/County/State Population Estimates with Annual Percent Change January 1, 2004 and 2005*, May 2, 2005.

The CHP handles traffic related enforcement in Placer County. The nearest CHP offices are the Auburn Area Office (located in Newcastle) and the North Sacramento Area Office (located at 5109 Tyler Road, Sacramento).

## **REGULATORY SETTING**

### **Federal Regulations**

There are no federal regulations applicable to the provision of law enforcement services to the project site.

### **State Regulations**

There are no State regulations applicable to the provision of law enforcement services to the project site.

### **Local Regulations**

#### **Placer County General Plan**

The following goals and policies from the Placer County General Plan are applicable to the provision of law enforcement services:

**Goal 4.H To provide adequate sheriff's services to deter crime and to meet the growing demand for services associated with increasing population and commercial/industrial development in the County.**

#### Policies

- 4.H.1. Within the County's overall budgetary constraints, the County shall strive to maintain the following staffing ratios (expressed as the ratio of officers to population):
  - a) 1:1,100 for unincorporated areas
  - b) 1:7 for jail population
- 4.H.2. The County Sheriff shall strive to maintain the following average response times for emergency calls for service:
  - a) 6 minutes in urban areas
  - b) 8 minutes in suburban areas
  - c) 15 minutes in rural areas
  - d) 20 minutes in remote rural areas
- 4.H.3. Within the County's overall budgetary constraints, the County shall provide sheriff facilities (including substation space, patrol, and other vehicles, necessary equipment, and support personnel) sufficient to maintain the above service standards.
- 4.H.4. The County shall strive to require new development to develop or fund sheriff facilities that, at a minimum, maintain the above standards.
- 4.H.5. The County shall consider public safety issues in all aspects of commercial and residential project design, including crime prevention through environmental design.

Placer County recognizes that service level standards in the General Plan have not fully considered the implications of the intensity and land uses proposed with this and other projects within the South

Placer area or service levels consistency with surrounding jurisdictions. Therefore, urban service level studies have been completed to more clearly define staffing, equipment, services, and other resource allocation needs. These standards have been presented to the County policy makers and are reflected in the EIR in the form of ranges of standards. Those standards related to law enforcement are shown below.

- 1.10 to 1.42 sworn officers per 1,000 residents;
- 1.1 non-sworn officer per 10,000 residents;
- 1 support staff per 12,000 to 18,000 residents; and
- 1 patrol vehicle per sworn officer.

## **IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

### **Methods of Analysis**

Placer County has developed staffing ratio ranges for sworn officers, non-sworn officers and support staff based on urban service level studies presented to County policy makers. The County recommends 1.10 to 1.42 sworn officers per 1,000 people, 1.1 non-sworn officer per 10,000 people and 1 support staff per 12,000 to 18,000 people. Additionally, the County Sheriff standard is one patrol vehicle per sworn officer. Based on these standards, the estimated staffing demands were generated using projected population for the proposed project. As discussed in Chapter 5, Demographics, a total of 10,037 Community and University residents are anticipated within the proposed project.

### **Standards of Significance**

Under criteria based on the State CEQA Guidelines, for the purposes of this EIR, impacts to law enforcement services are considered significant if implementation of the proposed project would:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered law enforcement facilities;
- Result in the need for new or physically altered law enforcement facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives; or
- Be inconsistent with the goals and policies in the *Placer County General Plan*.

### **Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

#### **6.10-1 The proposed project could increase the demand for police protection services requiring additional personnel.**

The proposed Specific Plan would include a total buildout of 4,387 dwelling units. According to persons-per-household rates (see Chapter 5, Demographics), the project would house approximately 10,037 people at buildout. This addition to the County's population would require between 11.0 and 14.3 sworn officers, 1.1 non-sworn officers, and between 0.6 and 0.8 support staff. An estimated total of 12.7 to 16.2 employees will be needed at full buildout. Table 6.10-1

TABLE 6.10-1					
SHERIFF PROTECTION PERSONNEL REQUIRED TO SERVE SPECIFIC PLAN AREA AT BUILDOUT					
Year	Units	Population	Sworn Officers Needed	Non-Sworn Officers Needed	Support Staff Needed
Buildout	4,387	10,037	11.0 to 14.3	1.1	0.6 to 0.8

describes the County's staffing needs for the Specific Plan area based on the County's staffing ratio requirements.

It should also be noted that the University would likely provide public safety services for the campus. A full-time campus security staff could provide general patrol, front gate operation, emergency response and dispatch, and parking enforcement. However, local law enforcement services would be required for major emergencies, criminal investigations, and other specialized services. Nonetheless, to ensure a conservative analysis, the University's residential population was included in the impact analysis as a conservative estimate of law enforcement resources needed to serve the entire project.

Development pursuant to the Specific Plan would increase the demand for additional sworn and non-sworn officers and support staff to adequately serve the Specific Plan area. This demand for sworn and non-sworn officers, and support staff is a *potentially significant impact*.

### Mitigation Measure

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a ***less-than-significant level***:

6.10-1 *The staffing ratios contained in Table 6.10-1, or ratios as otherwise approved by the Board of Supervisors, shall be maintained for the Specific Plan area. The applicants shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to assure adequate funding for the ongoing maintenance and operation of law enforcement services, with funding responsibilities imposed on residential and commercial properties within the Specific Plan area, including the costs for services required to satisfy the staffing standards set forth above and General Plan standards now in existence or as later amended. The funding mechanism shall be subject to the prior review and approval of Placer County.*

**6.10-2 The urban response time standards set forth in the Placer County General Plan could be unattainable from the existing Sheriff's service center in Loomis. Development of the proposed project could require new facilities, including a Sheriff's service center, equipment, and patrol vehicles.**

The proposed project will ultimately result in an increase in population of 10,037 residents. The demand for between 11.0 and 14.3 sworn officers, 1.1 non-sworn officers, and 0.6 to .08 support staff will result in a need for between 12 and 15 vehicles as well as equipment and new law enforcement facilities to house the additional personnel.

The closest service center to the site, the South Placer Service Center in Loomis, would not have enough officers and equipment to adequately serve the proposed project and may not be capable of responding to emergency calls within the County's response goal of eight minutes. The Sheriff's Department is currently planning a new service center in the proposed Placer Vineyards development, two miles south of the project site, to serve the multiple new developments in the area. Physical impacts associated with the construction of a new service center in the Placer Vineyards development are being analyzed in the Placer Vineyards EIR.

As currently proposed, the RUSP could co-locate a Sheriff Service Center with the fire station on the land designated for public or quasi-public use. However, the demand for additional personnel, equipment, and facilities is considered a *potentially significant impact*.

### Mitigation Measure

Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a ***less-than-significant level***:

- 6.10-2 a) *The project developer(s) shall comply with Placer County Policy 4.H.4, which requires that all future development either fund or develop law enforcement facilities. Compliance with Policy 4.H.4 shall include formation of a County Service Area (CSA) or Community Facilities District (CFD) for the construction or cost of a 2,500-square-foot equipped Sheriff's service center prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.*
- b) *The project developer(s) shall enter into a Development Agreement with Placer County prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map for facilities, staffing, and the purchase and scheduled replacement of the number of equipped vehicles needed as determined by the Sheriff in the same frequency and manner currently used by the County in its patrol vehicle replacement program. All patrol vehicles shall include the necessary equipment to accomplish the mission of the Placer County Sheriff's Department or as otherwise required by the Sheriff.*

### **6.10-3 Public safety could be compromised if the Specific Plan does not adequately consider public safety issues in its design.**

General Plan Policy 4.H.5 calls for project design to consider public safety issues, including crime prevention through environmental design. The Specific Plan Design Guidelines do not include specific guidance or provisions with regard to public safety considerations. In the absence of such guidance, Specific Plan development could result in improvements that do not provide adequate access and visibility for law enforcement personnel, or that otherwise degrade public safety. This is a *potentially significant impact*.

### Mitigation Measures

Implementation of the following mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a ***less-than-significant level***:

- 6.10-3 *Law enforcement personnel shall have access to and visibility of schools, parks and open spaces; pedestrian areas shall be well lighted and designed in such a manner as to maximize the safety of pedestrians, and buildings shall be designed and sited to provide a*

*safe environment. Improvement plans submitted for review and approval by the Placer County Planning Department shall be accompanied by a written explanation regarding the manner in which the design of the improvements achieves compliance with these requirements.*

#### **6.10-4 Construction of a sheriff's service center and related facilities within the Specific Plan area could lead to physical impacts on the environment.**

As currently proposed in the RUSP, a sheriff Services Center would be co-located with the fire station proposed on the land designated for public or quasi-public use. The physical impacts associated with the development of any sheriff facilities within the Plan Area are analyzed in the technical sections of this EIR.

If the Sheriff's Department determines that another site for the service center outside of the Plan Area is more appropriate, further environmental review would be required to determine any potential impacts. The physical environmental impacts associated with the provision of a sheriff service center in the Plan Area are addressed in this EIR and no additional impact is identified. Therefore, the impact would be ***less than significant***.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

*None required.*

#### **Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Future development in unincorporated areas of Placer County would increase demand for law enforcement services. The cumulative context for law enforcement services would be development within the areas served by the Placer County Sheriff's Department. In the vicinity of the proposed project, the cumulative context would include the following projects: Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, Placer Ranch Specific Plan, and Curry Creek Community Plan.

#### **6.10-5 Cumulative impacts on law enforcement services could occur due to development of the proposed project.**

Development in the South Placer region would increase the population and increase the demand for law enforcement and public safety services. In order to maintain adequate staffing levels and response times, additional Sheriff's Department staff, equipment, and facilities would be required. Consistent with the adopted General Plan policies, each development project would be required to contribute its fair share of funds toward the provision of these services.

Cumulative development, including the proposed project, would require the construction of new or expansion of existing sheriff facilities in order to continue to meet County service standards. As noted previously, a service center could be co-located with the fire station to provide sheriff services to the Plan Area. The physical environmental impacts of providing the Plan Area service center are addressed in this EIR.

Law enforcement services are provided based on established service standards and goals. Cumulative development in western Placer County would be subject to standards outlined in the *Placer County General Plan*. Given current policies, implementation measures, and the mitigation

measures outlined in this section (Mitigation Measures 6.10-1, 6.10-2a, 6.10-2b, and 6.10-3), the cumulative impact on police protection would be ***less than significant***.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

## ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site receives fire protection services from the Placer County Fire Department, which operates under a full service contract with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) to provide fire protection services, including structural and wildland fire protection, dispatch services, fire inspections, first response emergency medical services, disaster response, all hazards response, inspections, and development review.

The closest fire station to the project site is the Dry Creek Station (CDF Station #100), at 8350 Cook Riolo Road, approximately 5 miles from the project site. The Dry Creek Station is currently staffed with two CDF firefighters on duty on a 24-hour basis and 20 on-call volunteers. Equipment at the station includes the following:<sup>9</sup>

- two Type 1 engines for structural fires
- one Type 2 engine for rural structure fires
- one Type 3 engine for wildland fires
- one Type 4 pick-up pumper

CDF maintains mutual aid agreements with the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District, the Pleasant Grove Fire Protection District, and the Roseville Fire District; response times to the project site range from 12-15 minutes.<sup>10</sup>

## Insurance Services Office Ratings

The Insurance Services Office (ISO) rates fire department services for insurance purposes. ISO ratings are based on a Public Protection Classification rating from 1 to 10. Class 1 represents the best public protection, while Class 10 indicates the minimum recognized protection. Each score is dependent on three factors: how well the department receives and dispatches fire alarms (10%), the personnel, training and equipment used by the department (50%), and the Community water supply and availability of water for fire suppression (40%). The Placer County Fire Department received a rating of 5 for areas within 1,000 feet of a fire hydrant and 8 in rural areas (including the project site).<sup>11</sup>

## REGULATORY SETTING

### Federal Regulations

There are no federal regulations applicable to the provision of fire protection services to the project site.

---

9 Guyan, Greg, Placer County Fire Department Battalion Chief, written communication, November 15, 2004.

10 Guyan, Greg, Placer County Fire Department Battalion Chief, written communication, November 15, 2004.

11 Guyan, Greg, Placer County Fire Department Battalion Chief, written communication, November 15, 2004.

## **State Regulations**

There are no State regulations applicable to the provision of fire protection services to the project site.

## **Local Regulations**

### **Placer County General Plan**

The following goals and policies from the Placer County General Plan are applicable to the provision of fire protection services:

**Goal 4.I To protect residents of and visitors to Placer County from injury and loss of life and to protect property and watershed resources from fires.**

Policies

- 4.I.1. The County shall encourage local fire protection agencies in Placer County to maintain the following minimum fire protection standards (expressed as Insurance Service Organization (ISO) ratings):
  - a) ISO 4 in urban areas
  - b) ISO 6 in suburban areas
  - c) ISO 8 in rural areas
- 4.I.2. The County shall encourage local fire protection agencies in the County to maintain the following standards (expressed as average response times to emergency calls):
  - a) 4 minutes in urban areas
  - b) 6 minutes in suburban areas
  - c) 10 minutes in rural areas
- 4.I.3. The County shall require new development to develop or fund fire protection facilities, personnel, and operations and maintenance that, at a minimum, maintains the above service level standards.
- 4.I.9. The County shall ensure that all proposed developments are reviewed for compliance with fire safety standards by responsible local fire agencies per the Uniform Fire Code and other County and local ordinances.
- 4.I.11. The County shall encourage local fire protection agencies to provide and maintain advanced levels of emergency medical services (EMS) to the public.

**Goal 8.C To minimize the risk of loss of life, injury, and damage to property and watershed resources resulting from unwanted fires.**

Policies

- 8.C.1. The County shall ensure that development in high-fire-hazard areas is designed and constructed in a manner that minimizes the risk from fire hazards and meets all applicable State and County fire standards.
- 8.C.2. The County shall require that discretionary permits for new development in fire hazard areas be conditioned to include requirements for fire-resistant vegetation, cleared fire breaks, or a long-term comprehensive fuel management program. Fire hazard reduction measures shall be incorporated into the design of development projects in fire hazard areas.

- 8.C.3. The County shall require that new development meets State, County and local fire district standards for fire protection.
- 8.C.10. The County shall continue to implement State fire safety standards through enforcement of the applicable standards contained in the Placer County Land Development Manual.
- 8.C.12 The County shall support annexations and consolidations of fire districts and services to improve service delivery to the public.

Placer County recognizes that service level standards in the General Plan have not fully considered the implications of the intensity and land uses proposed with this and other projects within the South Placer area or service levels consistency with surrounding jurisdictions. Therefore, urban service level studies have been completed to more clearly define staffing, equipment, services, and other resourcing needs. These standards have been presented to the County policy makers and are reflected in the EIR in the form of ranges of standards.

- 1 firefighter per 900 to 1,150 residents; and
- 2 support staff per 10,000 to 25,000 residents.

## **IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

### **Methods of Analysis**

This impact analysis determines whether the proposed project would affect the ability of the Placer County Fire Department (CDF) to respond to emergencies within four minutes and maintain an ISO rating of 4, in accordance with adopted policy, thus requiring facilities that would result in physical environmental effects. Information for the analysis was obtained from the Placer County Fire Department. Placer County has developed staffing ratio ranges for staff based on urban service level studies presented to County policy makers. The following County urban service levels would apply to the proposed project: one firefighter per 900 to 1,150 and two support staff per 10,000 to 25,000 residents. These were multiplied by the estimated 10,037 Plan Area residents to determine the number of firefighters and support staff needed to serve the proposed development.

### **Standards of Significance**

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, Placer County has determined that a significant environmental impact could occur if the proposed Specific Plan would:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities;
- Result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives;
- Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or other residences are intermixed with wildlands; or
- Be inconsistent with the goals and policies in the *Placer County General Plan*.

## Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

### **6.10-6 Development of the proposed project could require additional personnel to serve new fire stations.**

The proposed Specific Plan, at full buildout, would include 4,387 dwelling units, which would generate a population of 10,037. This development would convert the Specific Plan area from agriculture to urban uses over the next 10 to 15 years. Development pursuant to the Specific Plan would result in the need for additional personnel to provide fire protection and emergency medical services to serve the Specific Plan area. Table 6.10-2 describes County staffing ratios for fire protection personnel needed to serve the Specific Plan area.

<b>FIRE PROTECTION PERSONNEL REQUIRED TO SERVE SPECIFIC PLAN AREA</b>				
Year/Phase of Development	Dwelling Units	Population	Fire Fighters Needed	Support or Planning Personnel Needed
Buildout	4,387	10,037	8.7 to 11.2	0.8 to 2

Staffing of the proposed fire stations in the Specific Plan area may not meet Placer County level of service standards; therefore, this impact is *potentially significant*.

### Mitigation Measure

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the impact of increased demand on fire services and personnel to a ***less-than-significant level***:

6.10-6 *The staffing ratios contained in Table 6.10-2 shall be maintained for the Specific Plan area, concurrent with demand, during all phases of development. The applicants shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to assure adequate funding for the ongoing maintenance and operation of fire protection and related services, with funding responsibilities imposed on residential and commercial properties within the Specific Plan area, including the costs for services required to satisfy Placer County Fire Department staffing requirements set forth above. The funding mechanism shall be subject to the prior review and approval of Placer County, and shall be approved by the affected landowners prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. It shall be maintained until such time as the County determines that property tax revenues are adequate to maintain the required staffing.*

**6.10-7 Development of the proposed project could require additional fire protection infrastructure including construction of fire stations and purchase of fire trucks and equipment to serve the proposed project.**

Development of the proposed Specific Plan area will result in the need for additional fire protection infrastructure including new fire stations, trucks, and equipment necessary to provide fire protection

services. According to the Placer County Fire Department, a minimum of one fully-funded and equipped fire station would be required.<sup>12</sup>

The proposed project includes a 2.2-acre site designated for public use, which would be developed with a fire station. If the Placer County Fire Department determines that an alternate location outside of the project site is more appropriate for the construction of a fire station, that project would be subject to separate environmental review. Because the fire station would be constructed within the Specific Plan area, the physical impacts associated with the construction of this fire station are analyzed in the technical sections of this EIR and no additional physical environmental impact is identified. However, the need for additional fire protection infrastructure and equipment in the Specific Plan area is a *potentially significant impact*.

### Mitigation Measures

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce the impact on fire protection to ***less-than-significant level*** by ensuring that adequate fire protection infrastructure, including new fire stations, trucks, and equipment, is available in a timely manner:

- 6.10-7 a) *The fire station shall be constructed and equipped at a location approved by the Placer County Fire Department, prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the first dwelling unit. This first station may initially be located in a temporary building or location; however, a permanent station shall be available for occupancy within 18 months of issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the first dwelling unit.*
- b) *The fire station shall be sized to serve the Specific Plan area at buildout, and shall be fully funded and equipped (i.e., desks, computers, telephones, radio systems, beds, refrigerators and all other needs).*
- c) *Formation of a County Services Area (CSA) or a Community Facilities District (CFD), including a landowner-approved special tax of an adequate amount or other financing mechanism acceptable to the County, shall be required prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map to ensure that a funding mechanism for fire protection infrastructure and equipment is in place to provide adequate fire safety services in the Specific Plan area during all stages of development. The required fire station shall be completed and fully staffed and equipped prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy. The fire station shall be located on a site readily accessible to service areas and the final fire station location shall be subject to approval by the Placer County Fire Department.*

**6.10.8 Development of the proposed project could create additional fire hazards in large open space/natural areas and utility corridors by limiting pre-suppression and suppression accessibility. High fuel loading could result in areas of restricted or limited access. Development of residential areas in close proximity to utility infrastructure and open space areas increases the potential for fire related hazards.**

The introduction of development and people to the Specific Plan area could expose residents to a risk of fire hazard in open space/natural areas and utility corridors by limiting pre-suppression and suppression accessibility and in adjacent agricultural areas when crops are dry. As more people

12 Tony Clarbut, Unit Chief, and Gregory K. Guyan, Battalion Chief, Placer County Fire Department, letter to Fred Yeager, Director, Placer County Planning Department, August 20, 2004.

and activities are present in the area, the potential for wildland fires increases. As more development occurs, the potential to restrict access to open space areas for fire suppression and fuels management could also increase. This is considered a *potentially significant impact*.

### Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would reduce the impact on wildland fires to a ***less-than-significant level***:

- 6.10-8 a) *Development and subdivision design shall include adequate setbacks, as determined by the Placer County Fire Department, between open space/corridor areas and structures. Fire pre-suppression and suppression access easements to utility corridors and open space areas shall be required as part of the subdivision map process. Building envelopes or another method shall ensure separation of structures, and shall ensure access, as deemed appropriate by the Placer County Fire Department prior to approval of any tentative subdivision map.*
- b) *A County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD), or other entity for sustainable park maintenance shall be formed for the Specific Plan area prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. Funds for a fuels reduction program for open spaces and corridors shall be included in the financing arrangement by a vote of the landowners prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. The maintenance entity shall establish and identify ongoing funding for a continuous maintenance program for vegetation (both wildland and landscaped) in any and all open space, vacant areas, and landscape trail, easement and corridor areas within the Specific Plan area prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.*
- c) *The developers shall fund a fire-safe plan for the subdivisions adjacent to wildland (natural, landscape, and corridor) areas. The fire-safe plan shall include a fuels management plan, and recommend building separations and distances from wildland areas, evacuation and access routes, fire safety zones and maintenance schedule prior to approval of tentative subdivision maps.*

### **6.10-9 Construction of fire stations and related facilities within the Specific Plan area could lead to physical impacts on the environment.**

The proposed project includes a 2.2-acre site designated for a fire station. Analysis of impacts related to construction within the Specific Plan area is included in each of the topical areas contained in this Draft EIR. No additional impacts related to construction of fire stations would occur. This impact is, therefore, ***less than significant***.

### Mitigation Measures

*None required.*

### **Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

The Placer County Fire Department, in addition to a number of local fire agencies, the CDF, and the United States Forest Service, provides fire protection services in Placer County. Future development in unincorporated areas of Placer County would increase demand for fire protection

services to serve development. Specifically, development in the following areas would increase the need for fire protection services in the vicinity of the proposed project: development in the Curry Creek Community Plan, Placer Ranch Specific Plan, and Placer Vineyards Specific Plan in unincorporated Placer County.

**6.10-10 Cumulative impacts on fire services could occur due to development of the proposed project.**

Development in the South Placer region would increase the population and demand for fire protection services. In order to maintain adequate staffing levels and response times, additional fire fighters, equipment, and facilities would be required. Consistent with the adopted General Plan policies, each development project would be required to contribute its fair share of funds toward the provision of these services.

The expansion of existing or construction of new fire stations would be required to maintain adopted service levels in the cumulative scenario. The Fire Department would decide where to locate new stations to best serve the Community. Because fire station locations are unknown at this time, the physical environmental effects of constructing future fire stations would be potentially significant.

The proposed project would reduce the cumulative impact by providing a fire station that would serve the project site and vicinity, alleviating cumulative demand for fire protection services. The physical environmental effects resulting from construction of the Plan Area fire station are evaluated in this EIR. Therefore, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact is not considerable, and the cumulative impact would be ***less than significant***.

Mitigation Measures

*None required.*

## ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Plan Area is located within the boundaries of three school districts: Center Unified School District (CUSD), Elverta Joint Elementary School District (EJESD), and Grant Joint Union High School District (GJUHSD). The eastern portion of the Community is located within the CUSD boundaries, and the west portion of the Community is located within the EJESD and the GJUHSD boundaries. The boundary between these two areas is located near the center of the Community portion of the Plan Area. The University area is located entirely within the EJESD and the GJUHSD boundaries. The project includes a proposal to transfer 13 acres in parcel 28, currently within the CUSD boundaries, to the EJESD and the GJUHSD and 13 acres, which is comprised of a portion of Parcel 13 and adjacent Open Space Parcel, from the CUSD to the EJESD and the GJUHSD. The current and proposed boundaries are shown in Figure 2-13 in Chapter 2, Project Description.

### Center Unified School District

The CUSD includes one high school, one junior high school, one middle school, four elementary schools, two charter schools, and one continuation high school in Antelope. Total enrollment for the district for the 2005-2006 school year was 6,112.<sup>13</sup> The enrollment at each school is shown in Table 6.10-3. The CUSD is currently operating at or above capacity at all its schools.<sup>14</sup> The CUSD opened a new middle school in Antelope, Wilson C. Riles; where 6<sup>th</sup> graders began attending in August 2005. 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders from Center Junior High School transferred to Wilson C. Riles Junior High School in January 2006. Center Junior High School will be used for the expansion of Center High School and Global Youth Charter High School.<sup>15</sup> CUSD is working to include several schools in the proposed Placer Vineyards Specific Plan to service school demand in the area. The proposed Placer Vineyards development would construct six elementary schools, two middle schools, and one high school in the Placer Vineyards area.

### Elverta Joint Elementary School District

Elverta Joint Elementary School District operates two schools with a total enrollment of 315 students; Elverta Joint Elementary School (192 students) and Alpha Technology Middle School (123 students).<sup>16</sup> Alpha Technology Middle School has six classrooms and has not reached operating capacity.<sup>17</sup> The proposed Placer Vineyards development would construct one elementary school in the EJESD.

### Grant Joint Union High School District

Grant Joint Union High School District (GJUHSD) has six middle schools, four high schools, and a number of alternative and charter schools, with a total enrollment of 13,965 students. GJUHSD is planning to construct a new high school and junior high school near East Levee Road and National

---

13 California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit, <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest>, Accessed January 17, 2007.

14 Mike Winters, Personal Communication, Consulting Facilities Planner, November 2, 2004.

15 Center School District website, [www.centerusd.k12.ca.us](http://www.centerusd.k12.ca.us), Accessed October 26, 2005.

16 California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit, Elverta Joint Elementary School District, <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest>, Accessed January 17, 2007.

17 Sharon Anderson, Secretary, Alpha Technology Middle School, personal communication, October 26, 2005.

TABLE 6.10-3

## CENTER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

School	Enrollment
<b>Center Unified School District</b>	
High School	
Center	1,630
McClellan (continuation)	140
Junior High	
Center	1,004
Middle School	
Wilson C. Riles	405
Elementary	
Dudley	739
North Country	569
Oak Hill	825
Spinelli	437
Charter	
Antelope (K-12)	324
Global Youth	39
<b>District Total</b>	<b>6,112</b>
<b>Elverta Elementary School District</b>	
Elementary	
Elverta	192
Middle School	
Alpha Technology	123
<b>District Total</b>	<b>315</b>
<b>Grant Joint Union High School District</b>	
Junior High	
Don Julio	772
Foothill Farms	833
Martin Luther King Jr.	941
Norwood	655
Rio Linda	580
Rio Tierra	691
High School	
Foothill	1,545
Grant Union High	2,187
Highlands	1,267
Rio Linda	2,000
Alternative/Charter/Special Education	
Community Collaborative Charter	231
Elwood J. Keema High	641
Futures High	327
Grant Community Outreach Academy	715
Miles P. Richmond	59
Nova Community Day	64
Pacific High	235
Vista Nueva Career and Technology High	222
<b>District Total</b>	<b>13,965</b>
Source: California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit, Center Unified School District, www.data1.cde.ca.gov, accessed January 17, 2007.	

Drive. Rio Linda Junior High School (580 students) and Rio Linda High School (2,000 students) are closest to the project site.<sup>18</sup> Each of these schools has some capacity remaining; Rio Linda Junior High School can accommodate 782 students and Rio Linda High School can accommodate 2,093 students.<sup>19</sup>

## **REGULATORY SETTING**

### **Federal Regulations**

There are no federal regulations applicable to the provision of school services to the project site.

### **State Regulations**

#### **Proposition 1A/Senate Bill 50**

Proposition 1A/Senate Bill (SB) 50 (Chapter 407, Statutes of 1998) implemented significant fee reforms by amending the laws governing developer fees and school mitigation:

- It establishes the base (statutory) amount (indexed for inflation) of allowable developer fees at \$1.93 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.31 per square foot for commercial construction.
- It prohibits school districts, cities, and counties from imposing school impact mitigation fees or other requirements in excess of or in addition to those provided in the statute.
- It also suspends for a period of at least eight years (2006) a series of court decisions allowing cities and counties to deny or condition development approvals on grounds of inadequate school facilities when acting on certain types of entitlements.

Government Code 65996(b) prohibits local agencies from using the inadequacy of school facilities as a basis for denying or conditioning approvals of any “legislative or adjudicative act...involving... the planning, use, or development of real property”. Additionally, a local agency cannot require participation in a Mello-Roos for school facilities; however, the statutory fee is reduced by the amount of any voluntary participation in a Mello-Roos.

Satisfaction of the Proposition 1A/SB 50 statutory requirements by a developer is deemed to be “full and complete mitigation.” The law identifies certain circumstances under which the statutory fee can be exceeded, including preparation and adoption of a “needs analysis,” eligibility for State funding, and satisfaction of two of four requirements identified in the law including year-round enrollment, general obligation bond measure on the ballot over the last four years that received 50 percent plus one of the votes cast, 20 percent of the classes in portable classrooms, or specified outstanding debt.

Assuming a district qualifies for exceeding the statutory fee, the law establishes ultimate fee caps of 50 percent of costs where the State makes a 50 percent match, or 100 percent of costs where the

---

18 California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit, Grant Joint Union High School District, <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/Dataquest>, Accessed January 17, 2007.

19 Victoria Velasco, Administrative Analyst, Facilities Operations, Grant Joint Union High School District, personal communication, Tuesday, March 14, 2006.

State match is unavailable. District certification of payment of the applicable fee is required before the City or County can issue the building permit.

In 2007, commercial and residential development fees within the CUSD were \$0.42 and \$2.63 per square foot, respectively.<sup>20</sup> Effective March 20, 2006, commercial and residential development fees in the GJUHS and EJUSD were \$0.42 and \$2.63 per square foot, respectively, up from the previous cost of \$0.36 for commercial and \$2.42 for residential.<sup>21</sup> The fees are subject to change and would be applied at the then-current rate at the time development occurs.

## Education Code Sections

School district reorganizations are governed by Education Code Sections 35500 *et seq.* and 35700 *et seq.* School district boundary reorganizations may be initiated by petition by a landowner, a group of citizens, or by the majority of a school district governing body. A landowner may initiate the reorganization for an uninhabited area (fewer than 12 registered voters in the area). Landowners can not petition for reorganization with the intent of generating higher real estate values (Education Code Section 35753(8)).<sup>22</sup> The more common form of school district boundary reorganization is by a majority vote of the governing body of one or more of the school districts which have jurisdiction in the area under reorganization.

The project applicant is proposing a boundary change between CUSD, EJESD, and GJUHS. The project applicant would approach all three school district boards for a proposed reorganization. A resolution of petition supporting the proposed reorganization must be adopted by all three school district boards, thereby initiating the proceedings to be filed with the County Superintendent of Schools in both Sacramento and Placer counties. The approved resolutions would subsequently be presented to the Placer and Sacramento County Committees on School District Reorganization for consideration. Each county committee would have 60 days to hold a public hearing. If the petition is approved by both county committees, the reorganization would either be recorded and the district boundary would be changed, set for election, or appealed to the State Board of Education.<sup>23</sup>

## Department of Education Standards

The California Department of Education publishes the *Guide to School Site Analysis and Development* to establish a valid technique for determining acreage for new school development. Rather than assigning a strict student/acreage ratio, this guide provides flexible formulas that permit each district to tailor its ratios as necessary to accommodate its individual conditions. The Department of Education also recommends that a site utilization study be prepared for the site, based on these formulas.

20 Mike Winters, Consulting Facilities Planner, Center Unified School District, personal communication, January 5, 2007.

21 Victoria Velasco, Administrative Analyst, Facilities Operations, Grant Joint Union High School District, personal communication, Tuesday, March 14, 2006.

22 Michael Winters, Cauldwell, Flores and Winters, Inc., personal communication, March 2002. As cited in Placer County, *Placer Vineyards Specific Plan DEIR*, Volume IV, September 2004, page 4-II-44.

23 Michael Winters, Cauldwell, Flores and Winters, Inc, personal communication, March 2002. As cited in Placer County, *Placer Vineyards Specific Plan DEIR*, Volume IV, September 2004, page 4-II-44.

## **Local Regulations**

### **Placer County General Plan**

The following goals and policies from the Placer County General Plan are applicable to the provision of school services:

**Goal 4.J To provide for the educational needs of Placer County residents.**

Policies

- 4.J.5. The County should plan and approve residential uses in those areas that are most accessible to school sites in order to enhance neighborhoods, minimize transportation requirements and costs, and minimize safety problems.
- 4.J.6. The County should include schools among those public facilities and services that are considered an essential part of the infrastructure that should be in place as development occurs.
- 4.J.7. The County shall consider school district plans in establishing acceptable levels of service for schools, determining school location and land and facility needs, and determining appropriate financing methods. The County should designate existing and future school sites in community plans and specific plans to accommodate school district needs.
- 4.J.10. The provision of adequate school facilities is a community priority. The County and school districts will work closely to secure adequate funding for new school facilities and, where legally feasible, the County shall provide a mechanism which, along with State and local sources, requires development projects to satisfy an individual school district's financing program based upon impactation.
- 4.J.11. The County and residential developers should coordinate with the school districts to ensure that needed school facilities are available for use in a timely manner. The County, to the extent possible, shall require that new school facilities are constructed and operating prior to the occupation of the residences which the schools are intended to serve.
- 4.J.13. Before a residential development, which includes a proposed general plan amendment, rezoning or other legislative review can be approved by the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, it shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the hearing body that adequate school facilities shall be provided when the need is generated by the proposed development.<sup>24</sup>

## **IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

### **Methods of Analysis**

In most cases, to estimate the number of students generated by a project that includes residential development, the number of proposed residential units is multiplied by a student generation rate provided by the affected school district. Although this method would apply to a typical residential subdivision, it would substantially overstate the demand in a university community because university students, most of whom do not have children, would occupy a large percentage of the residential units. On average, undergraduate students generate substantially fewer children than does the general population.

---

24 This General Plan policy, enacted in 1994, is no longer enforceable in light of SB 50, enacted in 1998. SB 50 included amendments to Government Code section 65996, which prohibits cities and counties from denying development applications due to lack of school facilities or inadequate school facilities.

The Regional University campus would ultimately have 6,000 university students. The University would provide 750 student housing units for 1,500 students (25 percent). The remaining 75 percent of students attending the University would live in the adjoining Community or would commute from outside the Plan Area.

To provide a conservative estimate, all housing units in the Community were included to determine the total K through 12 student generation. Because it is likely that a number of these units would be occupied by university students, the actual number of K through 12 students generated in the Plan Area would be lower than presented in this EIR. The University student housing and retirement housing was not included in the estimate of student generation.

The current student generation rates for the CUSD, EJESD, and GJUHS D are provided in Table 6.10-4. Although both EJESD and GJUHS D serve students in grades 7 and 8, the students generated in the Plan Area would attend EJESD schools. Therefore, EJESD generation rates for 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders were applied to the proposed project, rather than GJUHS D rates. Based on each district's current student generation rates, the proposed project would generate approximately 1,793 students. Any students generated within the University and western portion of the Community would attend schools in EJESD and GJUHS D, while students generated in the eastern portion of the Plan Area would attend CUSD schools. Students may request intra district transfers to attend schools in another district.

Grade	Single-family residential (LDR/MDR)	Multi-family residential (HDR)
<b>Center Unified School District</b>		
K-6	0.354	0.046
7-8	0.158	0.034
9-12	0.272	0.042
<b>Elverta Joint Elementary School District</b>		
K-6	0.2108	0.1454
7-8	0.1082	0.0368
<b>Grant Joint Union High School District</b>		
9-12	0.1308	0.1275
Sources:		
CUSD: Mike Winters, Consulting Facilities Planner, Center Unified School District, personal communication, January 5, 2007.		
EJESD: Elverta Joint Elementary School District, <i>Residential Development School Fee Justification Study</i> , prepared by David Taussig & Associates, Inc., July 10, 2006, pages 9-10.		
GJUHS D: Grant Joint Union High School District, <i>School Facilities Needs Analysis</i> , prepared by Dolinka Group, Inc., September 15, 2006, page 7.		

Table 6.10-5 shows the number of students that would be generated by the proposed project, divided by the district they would attend.

### **Standards of Significance**

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, Placer County has determined that a significant environmental impact could occur if the proposed Specific Plan would:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the construction or modification of school facilities;

TABLE 6.10-5

## STUDENT GENERATION BY DISTRICT

Development Area/Residential Land Use	Units	K – 6 Students	7 – 8 Students	9 – 12 Students
<b>Center Unified School District</b>				
1 – LDR	141	50	22	38
3 – LDR	86	30	14	23
4 – LDR	147	52	23	40
5 – MDR	141	50	22	38
7 – MDR	191	68	30	52
8 – LDR	131	46	21	36
10 – MDR	318	113	50	86
13 – HDR	295	14	10	12
<b>CUSD Total</b>	<b>1,450</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>327</b>
<b>Grant/Elverta School Districts</b>				
15 – HDR	150	22	6	19
17 – HDR	152	22	6	19
18 – MDR	169	36	18	22
19 – MDR	170	36	18	22
20 – HDR	167	24	6	21
21 – HDR	167	24	6	21
22 – CMU <sup>1</sup>	50	7	2	6
23 – CMU	25	4	1	3
24 – MDR	254	54	27	33
26 – MDR	265	56	29	35
28 – LDR	213	45	23	28
UZ - Faculty Housing	330	70	36	43
<b>GJUSD/EJESD Total</b>	<b>2,112</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>274</b>
Single-Family (LDR/MDR/UZ Faculty Housing)	2,556	704	334	497
Multi-Family (HDR/CMU)			36	103
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,562</b>	<b>821</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>600</b>
Notes:				
1. The CMU residential units were treated as high density residential for student generation purposes.				
Sources: PBS&J, 2007.				
Generation rates for CUSD provided by Mike Winters, Consulting Facilities Planner, Center Unified School District, personal communication, January 5, 2007.				
Generation rates for EJESD provided by Elverta Joint Elementary School District, Residential Development School Fee Justification Study, prepared by David Taussig & Associates, Inc., July 10, 2006, pages 9-10.				
Generation rates for GJUHSD provided by GJUHSD, School Facilities Needs Analysis, prepared by Dolinka Group, Inc., September 15, 2006.				

- Result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives; or
- Be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the *Placer County General Plan*.

### **Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

#### **6.10-11 Buildout of the Specific Plan area could substantially increase the public school student population, exceeding current school capacities.**

Existing educational facilities are unable to accommodate the projected growth from the Specific Plan area. It is proposed that the residential portion of the Plan Area would be served by the CUSD, GJUHSD, and EJESD. The proposed project includes a 10-acre public elementary school site located in the Public Hub within the Community; the elementary school site is currently within the CUSD boundaries. A kindergarten through 8<sup>th</sup> grade school is planned in the North Residential

Village, within the EJESD boundaries. In the northeastern corner of the University site, land has been reserved for a 40-acre private high school, which is proposed to serve approximately 1,200 students.

The number of students that would be generated in the Specific Plan area is determined by the number of residential units in the Specific Plan area multiplied by student generation rates of the local school districts, as presented in Table 6.10-6. At buildout, the Specific Plan area would generate approximately 1,793 new students in the region, with approximately 942 attending schools in the CUSD, 274 in the GJUHS, and 577 in the EJESD. Existing educational facilities are unable to accommodate the projected growth from the Specific Plan area.

<b>TABLE 6.10-6</b>									
<b>TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT IMPACT</b>									
<b>Year</b>	<b>Type of Unit</b>	<b>Dwelling Units (DU)</b>	<b>K-6 Factor per DU</b>	<b>K-6 Impact</b>	<b>7-8 Factor per DU</b>	<b>7-8 Impact</b>	<b>HS Factor per DU</b>	<b>HS Impact</b>	<b>Total School Enrollment</b>
<b>Center Unified School District</b>									
	Low-Density	505	0.354	179	0.158	80	0.272	137	
	Medium-Density	650	0.354	230	0.158	103	0.272	177	
	High-Density	295	0.046	14	0.034	10	0.042	12	
<b>Buildout</b>	<b>CUSD Total</b>	<b>1,450</b>		<b>422</b>		<b>193</b>		<b>327</b>	<b>942</b>
<b>Elverta Joint Elementary School District/Grant Joint Union High School District</b>									
	Low-Density	213	0.2108	45	0.1082	23	0.1308	28	
	Medium-Density	858	0.2108	181	0.1082	93	0.1308	112	
	High-Density	636	0.1454	92	0.0368	23	0.1275	81	
	Commercial Mixed-Use	75	0.1454	11	0.0368	3	0.1275	10	
	University Faculty Housing	330	0.2108	70	0.1082	36	0.1308	43	
<b>Buildout</b>	<b>EJESD/ GJUHS Total</b>	<b>2,112</b>		<b>399</b>		<b>178</b>		<b>274</b>	<b>851</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>3,562</b>		<b>821</b>		<b>371</b>		<b>601</b>	<b>1,792</b>
Note: Student generation rates for CUSD provided by Mike Winters, January 2007. Student generation rates for EJESD. EJESD, <i>Residential Development School Fee Justification Study</i> , prepared by David Taussig & Associates, Inc., July 10, 2006, pages 9-10. Student generation for GJUHS provided by GJUHS, <i>School Facilities Needs Analysis</i> , prepared by Donlinka Group, Inc., September 15, 2006.									

Student enrollment projections for the Specific Plan are based on student generation rates provided by the CUSD, EJESD, and GJUHS in 2007. According to these figures, a total of 821 elementary students, 371 middle school students and 601 high school students would reside in the Specific Plan area upon full buildout, thereby totaling 1,793 students (see Table 6.10-6). In the eastern portion of the Community, the proposed project would generate 422 elementary students, 193 middle school students, and 327 high school students in the CUSD, for a total of 942 students. In the western portion of the Community and University, the proposed project would generate a total of 851 students, including 274 high school students who would attend school in the GJUHS, and 399 elementary and 178 middle school students who would attend EJESD schools.

Since 1996, student generation within the CUSD service area has gone down. A variety of factors have influenced the lowering of enrollment generation factors between 1996 and 2001. In this area, the closure of McClellan Air Force Base may have influenced this downward trend. Other factors may include better data, changes in demographics such as age, socio-economic levels, subsequent development and type of development. Enrollment projection factors included in District Master Plans will continue to change with characteristics of the population throughout the development of the Specific Plan area.

The following analysis is based upon the current generation rates, which would result in a more conservative estimate, given that the proposed project includes a University community, which would likely generate fewer students since undergraduate students tend to have fewer children. Based on current generation rates, the RUSP would generate approximately 1,793 students who would attend schools as described below. By the time the Plan Area is fully built out, it is likely that other specific plan developments will have commenced and schools closer to the Plan Area will have been completed. Students generated in the western portion of the Plan Area, including the University, would attend schools in the EJESD and GJUHS, while students generated in the eastern portion of the Plan Area would attend CUSD schools.

The proposed project would generate a total of approximately 821 elementary students, including 422 students in the CUSD portion of the Plan Area. The RUSP would generate the need for one elementary school to serve students in the CUSD area, which would be constructed adjacent to the community park planned for the RUSP (see Figure 2-2). Elementary school students residing in the eastern portion of the Plan Area would attend the elementary school, which would accommodate approximately 800 students. This school would be sufficient to serve the 422 elementary school students that would be generated within the CUSD. Another school would be required to serve students generated in the EJESD portion of the Plan Area. Both elementary school students and middle school students generated in the western portion of the Plan, including the University, would attend the EJESD K through 8 school planned for the Northern Village. This would include 399 elementary school students and 178 middle school students, for a total of 577. Until these schools in the Plan Area are built, students generated in the CUSD would attend one of the elementary schools in CUSD, and students generated in the EJESD would attend either Elverta Elementary School or Alpha Technology Middle School.

The proposed project would generate approximately 193 grade 7 and 8 students and 327 high school students in the CUSD portion of the Plan Area. CUSD middle school students would initially attend Riles Middle School, which may necessitate the addition of temporary classrooms. Ultimately, these students would attend a middle school closer to the Plan Area, which would be built in either the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan or a future development project. High school students would initially attend Center High School, which may also necessitate the addition of temporary classrooms. It is anticipated that these students would ultimately attend schools closer to the proposed project, such as those in the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, area once they are developed. The proposed project would generate approximately 274 high school students in the GJUHS. These students generated in the GJUHS would initially attend Rio Linda High School, which may also require the addition of temporary classrooms.

Since Proposition 1A was passed by the voters and SB 50 was passed by the Legislature, school fees generated by new development are currently deemed sufficient mitigation of any impacts based on generation of students on school facilities. Because of the passage of Proposition 1A and SB 50, County General Plan Policy 4.J.13, described above, may be unenforceable. The impact is considered **less than significant**, provided school impact fees are collected pursuant to State law.

### Mitigation Measures

*None required.*

#### **6.10-12 A change in school district boundaries could adversely affect one or more of the three school districts.**

Procedures are provided in the Education Code to protect the interests of all affected districts, when changes are proposed. The proposed change, and similar modifications for similar purposes, would be viewed as minor in nature and would permit the boundary to follow a logical dividing line as the area builds out. This is considered a ***less-than-significant impact***.

### Mitigation Measures

*None required.*

#### **6.10-13 Construction of schools within the Specific Plan area could lead to physical impacts on the environment.**

Analysis of impacts related to the construction of schools within the Specific Plan area, including but possibly not limited to loss of agricultural land, loss of wildlife habitat, disruption of cultural resources, degradation of water quality, generation of noise, are included in each of the topical areas contained in this EIR. No additional impacts related to the construction of schools have been identified. If other schools are required elsewhere outside of the Plan Area, the appropriate district would be required to complete environmental review. Therefore, the physical impact would be ***less than significant***.

### Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

### **Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Center Unified School District, Elverta Joint Elementary School District, and Grant Joint Union High School District serve students in the south Placer region. Future development in unincorporated areas of Placer County would increase the number of students attending existing schools and demand for new facilities. Specifically, development in the following areas would increase the need for services in the vicinity of the project site: Placer Vineyards, Placer Ranch, and Curry Creek, and development in the City of Roseville. It is anticipated that by 2025, these projects, in addition to the proposed project, would result in approximately 25,400 new K-12 students.

#### **6.10-14 The proposed project could contribute to cumulative increases in demand for schools.**

The proposed project, in combination with other planned development in the region, would result in more students for each of the school districts serving the area. The existing schools would not be adequate to serve all the students from proposed new development and existing facilities would likely be expanded and new schools constructed to accommodate the new students. As discussed above, the Placer Vineyards development is proposing to construct nine new schools that would serve the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, as well as other development in the area. Ultimately, the

CUSD, EJESD and GJUHSD would determine its facility needs through a master planning process, which includes coordination with the jurisdictions (e.g., Placer County) responsible for approving new development. Through this planning process, the school districts can plan for future demands on their facilities. As each development is approved, the project would be required to pay development fees consistent with SB 50 to the appropriate school district to be used by the district(s) to either expand existing facilities or construct new facilities to accommodate planned growth. The school sites included in the Regional University Specific Plan are addressed in this EIR. The environmental impacts associated with any new schools planned for the Placer Vineyards development or the proposed Placer Ranch or Curry Creek development would be analyzed in EIRs that would be considered by the Placer County Board of Supervisors. If other schools are required elsewhere, the appropriate school district would be required to complete environmental review. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be considered ***less than significant***.

### Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

# PARKS AND RECREATION

## ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

### Placer County Recreation Facilities

There are many recreational opportunities near the Plan Area, both in Placer County and in the Sacramento metropolitan region. Parks in Placer County are operated and maintained by the Facility Services Department, Parks and Grounds Division. The division maintains a variety of facilities including community parks, trails, open space areas, fishing areas, campgrounds, various play fields, picnic areas, and tot lots spread from the Tahoe region to the western edges of the County.<sup>25</sup> Table 6.10-7 lists the parks operated by the County, their amenities and locations.

Park Name	Amenities	Location
Applegate Park	Baseball diamond, decomposed granite trail	290 Applegate School Road
Bear River Campground	Colfax hiking trails, fishing and gold panning, campsites	2500 Campground Road, Colfax
Douglas Ranch Park	Baseball diamond, picnic area, tot lot	5350 Sterling Street, Granite Bay
Spring Meadows Park	Picnic area, lawn play area	Calloway Circle and Erin Drive, Auburn
Foresthill Memorial Park	BBQ/picnic areas, gazebo, dance floor, ball fields, tennis courts, tot lot	24601 Harrison Road, Foresthill
Griffith Quarry Park	Passive park, picnic area, trails	7405 Rock Springs Road, Penryn
Loomis Basin Community Park	BBQ/picnic area, equestrian arena, tot lot, basketball court, ball fields, trails	6969 King Road, Loomis
Miners Ravine Nature Reserve	Passive park, interpretive nature trail	7530 Auburn Folsom Road, Granite Bay
North Park	Tot lot, picnic areas, basketball court	12345 Parkway Place, Auburn
Sheridan Park	Tot lot, basketball court, baseball diamond	6005 Camp Far West Road, Sheridan
Sabre City Park	Grassy area, basketball court	100 Vandenburg Circle, Roseville
Squaw Valley Bike Trail	Paved, separated bike trail connecting to Lake Tahoe trail	Squaw Valley Road, Squaw Valley
Squaw Valley Park	Soccer field, tot lot, picnic areas, bike and hiking trails	Squaw Valley Road, Squaw Valley
Sterling Pointe Equestrian Center	Staging area for multiple-use trail, connecting to Folsom Lake	9688 Sterling Pointe Court, Loomis
Sterling Pointe Park	Ball field, picnic areas	4570 Lake Forrest Drive, Loomis
Todd Valley Pond Park	Trail, pond, picnic areas	Foresthill Road/Happy Pines Drive, Foresthill
Traylor Ranch Bird Sanctuary and Nature Reserve	90-acre passive park, trails, picnic areas	1910 English Colony Road, Penryn
Treelake Park	Picnic areas, tot lot, baseball field, soccer field, sports court	5255 Parkford Circle, Roseville
Treelake Terrace Park	Turf area, trails, benches	9720 Swan Lake Road, Granite Bay

Source: Placer County, Facility Services, Parks and Grounds Division, [www.placer.ca.gov](http://www.placer.ca.gov), Accessed November 2, 2004.

25 Placer County, *Parks and Grounds Division*, [www.placer.ca.gov/facility/parkgrnd.htm](http://www.placer.ca.gov/facility/parkgrnd.htm), Accessed November 2, 2004.

## **Other Parks and Recreation Facilities**

The Gibson Ranch County Park, south of the project site in Sacramento County (on Elverta Road near Watt Avenue), is a 345-acre park with a variety of activities including an equestrian center, fishing lake, camping and picnic sites, and preserved natural areas.<sup>26</sup>

The Cherry Island Regional Park, south of the project site in Sacramento County (also on Elverta Road), includes a golf course and soccer fields. The park is also designated as a habitat restoration site in the Sacramento County General Plan and contains riparian forest, native grasslands and vernal pools.

The Dry Creek Parkway, just south and east of the project site, connects the Gibson Ranch Regional Park and the Cherry Island Regional Park. The Dry Creek Regional Parkway will form a link in a regional trail system to complete a system of public parks, trails and facilities, including Folsom Lake State Park and the American River Parkway. Upon completion of this trail system, residents of Sacramento County and Placer County will be able to hike, bicycle, and ride horseback along a 70-mile greenway loop.<sup>27</sup>

The project site is also located near a variety of parks and recreational opportunities in the City of Roseville. The City operates 50 developed parks (842 developed park acres), 16 park/school joint use facilities, over 3,236 acres of open space, and over 12 miles of bike trails through open space areas.<sup>28</sup> Several water sources with extensive recreation opportunities, including Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, the American River, and the Sacramento River are also in the vicinity of the project site.

## **REGULATORY SETTING**

### **Federal Regulations**

There are no federal regulations pertaining to the provision of recreational services to the project site.

### **State Regulations**

#### **Quimby Act**

California Government Code Section 66477, Subdivision Map Act, referred to as the Quimby Act, permits local jurisdictions to require the dedication of land and/or the payment of in-lieu fees solely for park and recreation purposes. The required dedication and/or fee are based upon the residential density, parkland cost, and other factors. Land dedicated and fees collected pursuant to the Quimby Act may only be used for developing new or rehabilitating existing park or recreational facilities.

26 County of Sacramento, *Gibson Ranch County Park*, [www.sacparks.net](http://www.sacparks.net), Accessed November 1, 2004.

27 Foothill Associates, *Dry Creek Parkway Master Plan Project*, [www.foothill.com/drycreek/](http://www.foothill.com/drycreek/), Accessed November 2, 2004.

28 Placer County Planning Department, *Placer Vineyards Revised Draft EIR*, March 2006, Volume II, page 4-11-127.

## Local Regulations

### Placer County General Plan

The following goals and policies from the Placer County General Plan are applicable to the provision of parks and recreational services:

**Goal 5.A To develop and maintain a system of conveniently-located, properly-designed parks and recreational facilities to serve the needs of the present and future residents, employees, and visitors.**

#### Policies

- 5.A.1 The County shall strive to achieve and maintain a standard of 5 acres of improved parkland and 5 acres of passive recreation area or open space per 1,000 population.
- 5.A.2. The County shall strive to achieve the following park facility standards:
- one tot lot per 1,000 residents
  - one playground per 3,000 residents
  - one tennis court per 6,000 residents
  - one basketball court per 6,000 residents
  - one hardball diamond per 3,000 residents
  - one softball/little league diamond per 3,000 residents
  - one mile of recreational trail per 1,000 residents
  - one youth soccer field per 2,000 residents
  - one adult field per 2,000 residents
  - one golf course per 50,000 residents
- 5.A.3. The County shall require new development to provide a minimum of 5 acres of improved parkland and 5 acres of passive recreation area or open space for every 1,000 new residents of the area covered by the development. The park classification system shown in Table 5-1 [see Table 6.10-8 of the EIR] should be used as a guide to the type of the facilities to be developed in achieving these standards.
- 5.A.4. The County shall consider the use of the following open space areas as passive parks to be applied to the requirement for 5 acres of passive park for every 1,000 residents.
- a) Floodways
  - b) Protected riparian corridors and stream environment zones
  - c) Protected wildlife corridors
  - d) Greenways with the potential for trail improvement
  - e) Open water (e.g., ponds, lakes, and reservoirs)
  - f) Protected woodland areas
  - g) Protected sensitive habitat areas provided that interpretive displays are provided (e.g., wetlands and habitat for rare, threatened or endangered species)

Buffer areas are not considered as passive park areas if such areas are delineated by setbacks within private property. Where such areas are delineated by public easements or are held as common areas with homeowner/property owner access or public access, they will be considered as passive park areas provided that there are opportunities for passive recreational use.

TABLE 6.10-8

## PARK CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Park Type	Use Description	Desirable Site Characteristics
Mini-Park (2 acres or less)	Specialized facilities that serve a concentrated or limited population or specific group, such as children or senior citizens.	Within neighborhoods and close to high density housing or housing for the elderly.
Neighborhood Park (2 to 15 acres)	Area for intense recreational activities, such as field games, court games, playground apparatus, skating, picnicking.	Easily-accessible to neighborhood population (geographically centered with safe walking and bike access)
Community Park (15 or more acres)	Area of diverse environmental quality. May include areas suited for intense recreational activities. May be any combination of the above, depending on site suitability and community need.	May include natural features, such as water bodies. Easily-accessible to neighborhood served.
Linear Park	Area developed for one or more modes of travel, such as hiking, biking, horseback riding, or cross-country skiing.	Built or natural corridors, such as utility rights-of-way, that link other elements of the recreation system or community facilities, such as school, libraries, commercial areas, and other park areas.
Special Use	Areas for specialized or single- purpose recreational activities such as golf courses, nature centers, marinas, arenas, outdoor theatres, downhill ski areas, or areas that preserve, maintain, and interpret buildings, sites and objects of archaeological significance. Also boulevards and parkways.	
Conservancy Areas	Protection and management of the natural/cultural environment with recreation use as a secondary objective.	Variable, depending on the resource being protected.

Source: Placer County General Plan, August 1994.

5.A.5. The County shall require the dedication of land and/or payment of fees, in accordance with State law (Quimby Act) to ensure funding for the acquisition and development of public recreation facilities. The fees are to be set and adjusted as necessary to provide for a level of funding that meets the actual cost to provide for all the public parkland and park development needs generated by new development.

5.A.7. The County shall consider the creation of assessment districts, county service areas, community facilities districts, or other types of districts to generate funds for the acquisition and development, maintenance and administration of parkland and/or historical properties as development occurs in the County.

**Goal 5.C To develop a system of interconnected hiking, riding, and bicycling trails and paths suitable for active recreation and transportation and circulation.**

Policy

5.C.4. The County shall require the proponents of new development to dedicate rights-of-way and/or the actual construction of segments of the Countywide trail system pursuant to trails plans contained in the County's various community plans.

Placer County recognizes that service level standards in the General Plan have not fully considered the implications of the intensity and land uses proposed with this and other projects within the South Placer area or consistency of service levels with those of surrounding jurisdictions. Therefore, urban service level studies have been completed to more clearly define staffing, equipment, services, and other resourcing needs. These standards have been presented to the County policy makers and are reflected in the EIR as follows:

- 1 tot lot per 2,000 residents;

- 1 playground per 3,000 residents;
- 1 tennis court per 6,000 residents;
- 1 basketball court per 6,000 residents;
- 1 hardball diamond per 3,000 residents;
- 1 softball/little league diamond per 3,000 residents;
- 1 mile of recreation trail per 1,000 residents;
- 1 youth soccer field per 2,000 residents;
- 1 adult soccer field per 2,000 residents;
- 1 golf course per 50,000 residents;
- 5 acres passive parkland per 1,000 residents;
- 5 acres active parkland per 1,000 residents; and
- 1 swimming pool per 40,000 residents.

## IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

### Methods of Analysis

The *Placer County Recreation and Park Development Project Final Report* (Citygate Associates, LLC, 2005; "Citygate Report") describes proposed County guidelines and standards for active and passive parkland as well as for various types of recreational facilities. The Citygate Report has not been adopted by the Placer County Board of Supervisors, and, thus, is strictly advisory in nature. The Citygate Report guidelines are shown in Table 6.10-9. For the purposes of this analysis, the University residents were not included in the demand for parkland; residents of the University would be served by private open space and recreational facilities on campus. Therefore the projected population for the Community portion of the Plan Area of 7,577 was used for this analysis.

**TABLE 6.10-9**

**RECREATION LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS**

<b>Recreational Facility</b>	<b>Level of Service Standard</b>
Tot Lot	1 per 2,000 people
Playground	1 per 3,000 people
Tennis Court	1 per 6,000 people
Basketball Court	1 per 6,000 people
Hardball Diamond	1 per 3,000 people
Softball/Little League Diamond	1 per 3,000 people
1 Mile Recreation Trail	1 per 1,000 people
Youth Soccer Field	1 per 2,000 people
Adult Soccer Field	1 per 2,000 people
Golf Course	1 per 50,000 people
5 Acres Active Park	1 per 1,000 people
5 Acres Passive Park	1 per 1,000 people
Swimming Pool	1 per 40,000 people

Source: Placer County Recreation and Park Development Project Final Report, Citygate Associates, LLC, 2005.

## Standards of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, Placer County has determined that a significant environmental impact could occur if the proposed Specific Plan would:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered park facilities;
- Result in the need for new or physically altered park facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or park standards;
- Increase use of existing neighborhood and regional park or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility could occur or be accelerated;
- Include the construction of new recreational facilities or require the expansion of existing recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment; or
- Be inconsistent with the *Placer County General Plan* policies and standards.

## Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

### **6.10-15 Development of the Specific Plan area could result in an inadequate amount of developed passive and active parkland and related facilities.**

Based on a buildout population of 7,577 in the Community, there will be a need for a minimum of 38 acres of improved parkland and 38 acres of passive parkland in the Specific Plan area to meet the parkland dedication and improvement requirements set forth in Table 6.10-10.

Geographic Area	Population	Tot Lot	Playground	Tennis Court	Basketball Court	Hardball Diamond	Softball/Little League Diamond	1 Mile Recreation Trail	Youth Soccer Field	Adult Soccer Field	Golf Course	5 acres Active Park	5 acres Passive Park	Swimming Pool
<b>Factors</b>		1/2,000 people	1/3,000 people	1/6,000 people	1/6,000 people	1/3,000 people	1/3,000 people	1/1,000 people	1/2,000 people	1/2,000 people	1/50,000 people	1/1,000 people	1/1,000 people	1/40,000 people
Community Portion of Plan Area – Buildout	7,577	3.8	2.5	1.3	1.3	2.5	2.5	7.6	3.8	3.8	0.2	7.6	7.6	0.2
Notes: Level of service standards provided by Placer County Executive Office.														

The Community portion of the proposed project would include 63.8 acres of open space and 39.6 acres of park land. The active parkland would be distributed among a variety of park types, as suggested by General Plan Policy 5.A.3 (see Table 6.10-6). The Plan Area, as proposed, would include a 22.1-acre Community Park, an 8.5-acre neighborhood park, a 2.8-acre University Village Pocket Park, and three 2-acre pocket parks.

The County parkland level of service standards would require that the Community include recreational facilities as follows (see Table 6.10-9): eight tot lots, three playgrounds, one tennis court, one volleyball court, one basketball court, three hardball diamonds, three softball/Little League diamonds, four youth soccer fields, and four adult soccer fields. Other facilities could be constructed, including a skateboard park, tennis courts, a half-court basketball court, restrooms, maintenance areas, and a recreation building/center. The project's contribution toward the development of the actual facilities constructed at each park site may vary as set forth in the Development Agreement.

The 63.8 acres of open space within the Community would include open space corridors and easements that would provide for trails, stormwater conveyance, water quality treatment and flood detention, opportunities for wetland migration, and buffers between different types of land uses. The open space areas would be improved with trails and landscaping, qualifying as "greenways" under General Plan Policy 5.A.4.

The proposed project also calls for private open space areas within the University. According to the proposed project, the open space areas within the University would be privately owned and maintained, but access would be offered to visitors. The University Arboretum, if constructed, would include trees, shrubs, and plants cultivated for educational purposes. In addition, approximately 183.5 acres of the University would remain open space. A vernal pool complex in the southwest corner of the University would comprise 17 acres of the open space area. The remaining open space would be used for a combination of stormwater detention, lakes, and riparian habitat restoration.

Placer County would decide which residents and open space can be applied to satisfy its General Plan requirements.

The Community portion of the proposed project (population 7,577) would require approximately 38 acres of park land and 38 acres of open space. The Community would exceed the open space requirement with the 63.8 acres provided; the planned 39.6 acres of park land would exceed the requirements. However, the proposed project does not include the specific facilities that would be included in the proposed park areas. As stated above, park facilities include such improvements as tot lots, playgrounds, tennis courts, volleyball courts, basketball courts, hardball diamonds, softball/Little League diamonds, youth soccer fields, adult soccer fields, restrooms, maintenance areas, and a recreation building/center. Because the project does not include provisions for specific facilities, this is a *potentially significant impact*.

#### Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts of inadequate parkland dedication to a ***less-than-significant level***:

- 6.10-15 *Project developers in the Specific Plan area shall comply with the requirements of the General Plan by dedication and improvement of a minimum of 38 acres of active parkland and 38 acres of passive parkland. Project developers shall be responsible for dedicating and fully developing parks and or portions thereof, concurrent with demand in accordance with County levels of service. The County may require oversizing of neighborhood and larger type recreation parks, trails and facilities on a subdivision basis when it is deemed necessary and practical to serve the needs of future residents. In such cases, the County will enter into reimbursement agreements whereby future developments will pay initial developers for oversizing.*

*Concurrent with the construction of the community parks, project developers shall construct a park maintenance building and yard and provide maintenance equipment. The design and building materials, location and quantity of equipment shall be subject to the approval of the Department of Facility Services.*

*All plans and specifications shall be approved by the Department of Facility Services and/or the managing agency prior to the recordation of each final small lot subdivision map. A procedure or agreement to govern the acquisition of parklands and completed park improvements acceptable to the County and/or managing agency, and in compliance with applicable General Plan standards and policies, shall be in place prior to recordation of the first final small lot subdivision map.*

*The specific park plans shall be submitted to the County for approval prior to the final decision as to the number and location of facilities.*

**6.10-16 Additional population in the Specific Plan area may result in increased reliance upon park facilities and services in neighboring jurisdictions.**

At full buildout, the Specific Plan area will have 4,387 residences and an estimated population of 10,037. The Community portion of the plan area would have 3,157 residences and an estimated population of 7,577. Based on the population of the Community, the County requires a minimum 38 acres of improved parkland and 38 acres of passive parkland. It is assumed that residents of the University would primarily use the private open space areas and recreational facilities on campus.

Although it cannot be guaranteed that project residents will not use facilities in Roseville and Sacramento County, the proposed Specific Plan includes 39.6 acres of active parkland and 68.3 acres of open space dedicated for active and passive recreation, which meets or exceeds the County's standard. Additionally, the University portion of the proposed project includes 183.5 acres of open space and additional private recreational facilities that would be open to visitors. Between recreational facilities within both the Community and University, Community residents and University residents would be adequately served by the open space, park land, and recreational facilities in their respective portions of the Plan Area. This would make it more likely that Plan Area residents would not overuse existing park facilities in surrounding areas and cause physical deterioration. In addition, sharing of facilities is viewed as desirable in some respects, and is the reason trail networks in Sacramento County, Placer County, and Roseville are to be connected. This is a **less-than-significant impact**.

**Mitigation Measure**

*None required.*

**6.10-17 Parks within the Specific Plan area have the potential to be poorly maintained if an adequate funding source is not identified.**

Existing park fees pay for park infrastructure only. Maintenance dollars would need to be provided to pay for maintenance costs. The Specific Plan proponents are proposing that a County Service Area or other special district be formed to fund and maintain passive and active parks in the area.

As noted under Regulatory Setting, Article XIII D of the California Constitution was approved by the voters in 1997 (Proposition 218). Article XIII D generally requires that assessment fees and charges

be submitted to property owners for approval or rejection after the provision of written notice and the holding of a hearing. Lack of adequate funding for park maintenance is a *potentially significant impact*.

### Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measure would reduce the impact of inadequate funding for park maintenance to a ***less-than-significant level***.

6.10-17 *Project developers shall cause a new County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD), or other Parks Special District to be formed for sustainable park maintenance and recreation programs for the Specific Plan area prior to recordation of the first final small-lot subdivision map. A procedure or agreement to govern park maintenance and local recreation programs shall also be finalized prior to recordation of the first final Large-lot subdivision map within the Specific Plan area. This entity would thus have the ability to participate in design, inspection and acceptance of facilities, and determination of appropriate funding levels necessary to maintain these facilities and operate recreational programs. A park maintenance special tax or special assessment with a provision for increases indexed to the CPI shall be approved by the landowners (voters) of the Specific Plan area, to be developed prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map in the Specific Plan area. An indexing formula for maintenance and operation of recreational facilities and programs shall be in place prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.*

### **6.10-18 Development of the Specific Plan area will create a demand for community recreation facilities.**

Based on a projected Specific Plan buildout population of approximately 7,577 in the Community, there will be a demand for community recreation facilities, including one tennis court, one basketball court, three baseball diamonds, three softball diamonds, four adult soccer fields, and four youth soccer fields. These facilities would be constructed as needed to satisfy demand, and would be located in each project phase in order to serve all residents of the Plan Area. Lack of community recreation facilities to serve the Specific Plan area population could have an impact on similar facilities in Roseville and Sacramento County, and would be a *significant impact*.

### Mitigation Measure

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce impacts related to community recreation facilities to a ***less-than-significant level***.

6.10-18 *As a condition of Specific Plan approval, the applicant shall submit a phased schedule for providing community recreation facilities for approval by the County Parks Division. This phasing plan shall comply with County levels of service for parks and recreational facilities. Funding for construction, operation and maintenance of these improvements shall be provided in accordance with Mitigation Measures 6.10-7 and 6.10-8.*

### **Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Placer County operates and maintains parks throughout the County. Future development in unincorporated areas of Placer County would increase the number of residents using existing parks

and recreational facilities. Specifically, development in the following areas would increase the need for parks, recreational facilities, and open space in the vicinity of the project site: Placer Vineyards, Placer Ranch, Curry Creek, the City of Roseville, and the City of Lincoln.

**6.10-19 Development of the Specific Plan area could result in cumulative impacts on passive and active parkland and related facilities.**

Future development throughout the County, and specifically in the South Placer region, would increase the demand placed on existing parks and recreational facilities, and would require the construction of new parks and recreational facilities and the dedication of additional open space. All future development would be required to dedicate open space and parkland consistent with General Plan policies. New development would also be required to provide recreational facilities. These developments would either provide land and construct parks and facilities directly, or would provide in-lieu fees to contribute to future construction by Placer County. Because future development would include park and recreational facilities consistent with County standards, and the developers would be required to provide for the funding to construct and maintain those facilities, no cumulative impacts related to parks and recreation would occur. This is a ***less-than-significant cumulative impact***.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Library services in Placer County are provided by the Placer County Library District, excluding the cities of Roseville and Lincoln, which own and operate their own library systems. The district operates a main branch in Auburn, a law library, nine branch libraries, and a bookmobile that serves primarily rural areas.<sup>29</sup>

The Rocklin library, at 5460 Fifth Street, is the nearest Placer County branch to the project site. The City of Roseville operates libraries at 225 Taylor Street approximately, 3.5 miles east of Walerga Road, and at 1530 Maidu Drive. The City of Roseville has recently broken ground on a new library facility at Mahany Park, located approximately three miles from the Plan Area near Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard. This library is scheduled to be completed in early 2007. The Rocklin Public Library is in critical need of improvement, more so than any other Placer County Library District facility.<sup>30</sup> The 7,866 square foot Rocklin library is serving 38,000 residents, resulting in 0.21 square feet per capita and 1.2 items per capita, both significantly below County standards. The District's *Facilities Master Plan* recommends constructing a new 21,200 square foot facility to serve both the current population and growth expected to occur by 2010. The new facility is contingent on funding for construction and land acquisition.<sup>31</sup> In addition, the proposed Placer Vineyards Specific Plan includes a 4-acre property within the Town Center for a full County branch library, approximately two miles south of the project site.

### REGULATORY SETTING

#### Federal Regulations

There are no federal regulations applicable to the provision of library services.

#### State Regulations

There are no State regulations applicable to the provision of library services.

#### Local Regulations

#### **Placer County General Plan**

The following goals and policies from the Placer County General Plan are applicable to the provision of library services:<sup>32</sup>

---

29 Placer County, *Placer County Library*, [www.placer.ca.gov/libraries](http://www.placer.ca.gov/libraries), Accessed November 2, 2004.

30 Auburn-Placer County Library, *Library Service Plan 2002-2010*, Approved September 10, 2002, page 10.

31 Auburn-Placer County Library, *Facilities Master Plan 2002-2010*, Approved September 10, 2002, page 6.

32 Placer County is considering adopting revised standards regarding library services for the project site and surrounding proposed development. The proposed standards have not been adopted to date.

**Goal 4.A To ensure the timely development of public facilities and the maintenance of specified service levels for these facilities.**

Policy

- 4.A.5. The County shall ensure that library facilities are provided to current and future residents in the unincorporated area. The County shall also require new development to fund its fair share of library facilities.

Placer County recognizes that service level standards in the General Plan have not fully considered the implications of the intensity and land uses proposed with this and other projects within the South Placer area or service levels consistency with surrounding jurisdictions. Therefore, urban service level studies have been completed to more clearly define staffing, equipment, services, and other resourcing needs. These standards have been presented to the County policy makers and are reflected in the EIR in the form of ranges of standards.

- 0.40 square feet of facility space per resident;
- 2.2 volumes per resident;
- 1 computer station per 1,000 residents;
- 3 reader seats per 1,000 residents; and
- 2 meeting room seats per 1,000 residents.

### **Library Service Plan**

The current *Library Service Plan* establishes service guidelines to determine appropriate levels of service for Placer County communities:<sup>33</sup>

- Open hours/Staffing: The minimum levels recommended vary from 20 to 52 weekly hours of service and 1.0 staff for a service population under 4,000 to 52 weekly hours of service and 10.0 staff for a service population over 40,000. No library will be open less than 20 hours per week.
- Library Facilities: Facilities will provide 0.4 square feet per capita. The minimum library size will be 3,000 square feet.<sup>34</sup> A minimum population of 4,000 in the service area will be required before a library will be built.
- Library Materials: All libraries will have 2.2 items per capita. All libraries will have at least 12,000 items in their collection.

## **IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

### **Methods of Analysis**

This analysis used information provided by the Placer County Library District. The standards adopted in the Library Services Plan (0.4 square feet per capita) were multiplied by the projected future population of the Plan Area (10,037) to determine the library demand generated by the proposed project.

---

33 Auburn-Placer County Library, *Library Service Plan 2002-2010*, Approved September 10, 2002, pages 1-2.  
34 Elaine Reed, Director of Library Services, Written Communication, dated August 17, 2004.

## Standards of Significance

Based, in part, on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, Placer County has determined that a significant environmental impact could occur if the proposed Specific Plan would:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered library facilities;
- Result in the construction of new or altered library facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives; or
- Be inconsistent with the Placer County General Plan or the Auburn-Placer County Library Long-Range Plan.

## Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

### **6.10-20 Development of the Specific Plan area could result in inadequate library facilities.**

According to the existing *Auburn-Placer County Library Long-Range Plan*, a population of 10,037 will generate a demand for an additional 4,015 square feet of library space at full buildout. Although the University would include its own library facilities, many students from local colleges and universities in the region often use public library facilities in the area. Table 6.10-11 shows library demand based on population at full buildout.

<b>LIBRARY DEMAND BASED ON POPULATION</b>							
Year	Dwelling Units (DU)	Population	Facility Space Demand Factor 0.40 sq ft per capita	Collection Demand Factor 2.2 volumes per capita	Computer Station Demand Factor 1 computer per 1,000 pop.	Reader Seats Demand Factor 3 seats per 1,000 pop.	Meeting Room Seats Demand Factor 2 seats per 1,000 pop.
Buildout	4,387	10,037	4,015	22,082	10	30	20

Note: Level of service standards provided by the Auburn-Placer County Library Long-Range Plan and the Placer County Executive Office.

A full library facility is proposed in the Placer Vineyards development. If this library is approved and constructed, it would be the closest operating branch to the project site. Under existing conditions, however, the Rocklin Library would serve the future residents of the project site. The Rocklin Library does not meet the adopted standards in the Library Service Plan.

According to the Director of Library Services, a “full library” is warranted to serve the proposed project.<sup>35</sup> The RUSP does not propose to develop a full library, but a small branch library could be located within the Commercial Planned Development site, or may be co-located with other public community facilities.<sup>36</sup>

The Placer County Library District would ultimately decide where and if a library is needed to serve the proposed project. The project developer would be required to pay fair-share fees for library

35 Elaine P. Reed, Director of Library Services, Placer County Library, letter to Melissa Duncan, EIP Associates, August 17, 2004.

36 *Regional University Specific Plan*, July 2005, page 9-13.

services consistent with General Plan Policy 4.A.5. The physical impacts of the new library proposed within the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area and are disclosed in that EIR. If a library is not constructed within Placer Vineyards and one is required to be constructed off-site, the environmental impacts would be analyzed in a separate document at the time the facilities are proposed.

The City of Roseville operates the nearest library to the Specific Plan area, which could be affected until the proposed permanent facility is developed on the site. The City has requested that construction of the first library begin no later than 2010 and the second by 2015, if the County plans to build two smaller library facilities rather than one larger one. If the County plans only one library facility, construction of that facility should begin no later than 2010. Residents of the area will not have access to a full range of library services until a permanent facility is located in the Specific Plan area and is operational. This is considered a *significant impact*.

### Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measures would reduce the impacts on the City of Roseville's library system and the Auburn-Placer County Library District to a ***less-than-significant level***.

- 6.10-20 a) *Formation of a County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD) or other financing mechanism acceptable to the County shall be required prior to recordation of the first final small lot subdivision map to ensure that immediate funding for adequate library infrastructure consistent with County standards is in place. The Specific Plan developers shall enter into a Development Agreement to ensure a fair share contribution to adequate library facilities, and that such facilities are available prior to demonstrated need.*
- b) *Completion of one or more branch libraries to provide a minimum of 0.4 square feet per capita and stocking with books and other materials necessary for a functioning library with a minimum of 2.2 volumes per capita and otherwise meeting the standards of the Auburn-Placer County Library Long-Range Plan, including any subsequent amendments, shall occur concurrent with demand.*
- c) *Project developers shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to ensure adequate funding of the Specific Plan's fair share for the ongoing operation and maintenance of library facilities. Such funding mechanism shall be established prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map to ensure that immediate funding for adequate library operations and maintenance is in place.*

### Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The Placer County Library District serves the entire County, with the exception of Roseville and Lincoln. Future development in Placer County will increase the number of residents using the public library system. Specifically, development in the following areas would increase the need for services in the vicinity of the proposed project: Placer Vineyards, Placer Ranch, and Curry Creek developments.

**6.10-21 The Specific Plan could contribute to cumulative demand for library services.**

Development throughout the County, including the South Placer region, would increase demand for library services on existing libraries, some of which are already inadequate to serve the current population. Existing libraries would need to be expanded and/or new libraries would need to be constructed. All future development would be required to contribute fair-share fees for library services, consistent with General Plan Policy 4.A.5.

The Placer County Library provides library services throughout the County, but, because of the need to provide adequate access to all residents throughout the County, the library maintains local branches to provide service. In the case of the proposed project, the library branch that would likely provide primary service to the residents of the project site would also serve other planned growth in the project area. Therefore, the cumulative demand for library services would be served by the library branch funded, in part, by the proposed project. Therefore, this would be a ***less-than-significant cumulative impact***.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*