

# CHAPTER 16.0

---

## OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

### 16.1 ALTERNATIVES

The purpose of the alternatives analysis section in this TEIR is to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project and to evaluate the environmental impacts of the alternatives. Alternatives have been selected that could reduce or eliminate significant adverse environmental effects of the proposed project. The alternatives considered include those that offer environmental advantages over the proposed project. The following specific alternatives are discussed below:

- Reduced-Intensity Alternative
- No Project Alternative

#### 16.1.1 REDUCED-INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced-Intensity Alternative consists of a smaller scale version of the proposed project. The general location would be the same as the proposed project; however, some of the project components would differ from those included in the proposed project. The primary difference would be the smaller hotel and parking garage and absence of the performing arts center. As required in Section 2 of the UAIC-Placer County MOU, all structures would be developed in a manner consistent with and in compliance with all applicable Placer County general and community plans, zoning ordinances and design guidelines. Pursuant to the MOU, all improvements would be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Codes as adopted and supplemented by Placer County and the Tribe. The following section includes a brief description of the components of the Reduced-Intensity Alternative, as compared to the proposed project.

##### ***Main Casino Structure***

As with the proposed project, approximately 475,000 square feet of new interior space would be added to the existing casino building. Different portions of the expanded building would vary between one and four stories high. Direct access would be provided from the casino to the proposed hotel and parking garage. The number of patrons visiting the facility would be greater than the current daily average of 10,500, but less than the 14,000 anticipated under the proposed project.

### ***Hotel***

A 12-level hotel would be constructed on top of four levels of casino/meeting space with approximately 400 hotel rooms. The total building height would be approximately 190 feet, with communications antennae increasing the height to over 200 feet. The hotel would include a helicopter platform, swimming pool/spa, exercise room, family center/arcade, and cultural exhibit area as discussed for the proposed project.

### ***Performing Arts Center***

No performing arts center would be constructed under this alternative.

### ***Parking***

A seven-level aboveground parking structure would be located on the west side of the expanded casino facility. Access to the parking garage would be through one of two entryways, one leading directly from Athens Avenue and a second routed through the main hotel/casino valet porte cochere, with walkways leading patrons to the hotel lobby and casino gaming floor.

### ***Central Plant***

The central plant would be expanded as discussed for the proposed project in **Chapter 3.4.5**.

### ***Water Supply Infrastructure Improvements***

The options for water supply to the Reduced-Intensity Alternative are the same as those described for the proposed project and discussed in **Chapter 3.4.6**. These include expansion of the existing Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) connection, a new connection to the City of Lincoln water supply, or re-activating the existing onsite wells to supplement the current PCWA supply. All three options would require that the existing potable water booster pump station be upgraded to handle the estimated increased water demands of the expanded casino complex. It is anticipated that the required fire flows for the Reduced-Intensity Alternative would be approximately 3,000 gallons per minute (gpm) with a residual system pressure of 20 pounds per square inch (psi), in addition to peak day demands.

### ***Wastewater Service***

The options for wastewater service to the Reduced-Intensity Alternative are the same as those described for the proposed project and discussed in **Chapter 3.4.7**. The three main alternatives include connection to the City of Lincoln's wastewater treatment facilities, connection to the City of Roseville's Pleasant Grove wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), or expansion of the existing onsite WWTP on the western end of the project site.

### ***Roadways and Other Offsite Facilities***

The widening of Athens Avenue and other offsite improvements discussed in **Chapter 3.4.8** for the proposed project would also be constructed for the Reduced-Intensity Alternative.

## ***ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES***

Environmental impacts associated with the Reduced-Intensity Alternative are discussed below.

### ***Land Use***

As with the proposed project, the Reduced-Intensity Alternative would be consistent with Placer County and local jurisdictional land use and zoning ordinances. The Industrial Park zoning designation of the property allows for land uses proposed under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative. As with the proposed project, the Reduced-Intensity Alternative is also compatible with existing uses in the vicinity of the project site. The Tribe would continue to make contributions to Placer Legacy for the preservation of open space, as described in the MOU. Similar to the description of the proposed project's impacts in **Chapter 4.0**, the Reduced-Intensity Alternative would also result in less than significant impacts to prime farmland or sensitive users.

The hotel under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative would exceed the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) height threshold of 200 feet. Issuance of a revised "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration" under Part 77 Airspace Obstruction Analysis would be required, as well as the subsequent implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.1. Directional and identification signage for the Reduced-Intensity Alternative would be the same as for the proposed project. Mitigation Measure 4.2 would be recommended to ensure consistency with the Placer County Sign Ordinance.

### ***Population, Employment, and Housing***

Under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative, employment created by the expansion would not reach the level described for the proposed project. The number would be slightly lower with the removal of the performing arts center and the reduction in the number of hotel rooms.

The Reduced-Intensity Alternative, similar to the proposed project, would not create an imbalance in the local job or housing market, nor create the necessity of construction of new employee housing. No mitigation is recommended.

### ***Biological Resources***

Under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative, significant and potentially significant impacts to biological resources, as described in **Chapter 6.0**, would still occur. Cliff swallows nesting on the project site would potentially be impacted by construction activities. Offsite improvements, including the widening along Athens Avenue and upgrades to utilities, would still impact sensitive habitats (including waters of the U.S. and other jurisdictional wetlands) and special status species. All mitigation measures identified in **Chapter 6.0** would be required to reduce impacts to biological resources to less than significant levels under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative.

### ***Cultural Resources***

Under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative, impacts described in **Chapter 7.0** would still have the potential to occur. Most of the project components would be located on previously developed land that has been thoroughly investigated for the presence of cultural and paleontological resources. However, because the Reduced-Intensity Alternative includes the same offsite improvements to undeveloped areas along Athens Avenue as the proposed project, the potential for inadvertent discovery of significant cultural or paleontological resources in previously undeveloped areas would not be reduced. Mitigation Measure 7.1, implementation of an inadvertent discovery plan, would be recommended for the Reduced-Intensity Alternative in order to ensure a less than significant impact.

### ***Visual Resources***

The Reduced-Intensity Alternative would result in changed views for local sensitive receptors, contribute to urbanization of western Placer County, and introduce buildings to the Sunset Industrial Area (SIA) that exceed 50 feet in height. Design, landscaping, and lighting would comply with applicable Placer County guidelines. No mitigation measures would be warranted under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative.

### ***Transportation and Circulation***

Under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative, many of the impacts to intersections, roadways, and transportation systems described in **Chapter 9.0** would still have the potential to occur, however at lesser intensities than the proposed project. Construction of the project components would have the potential to cause traffic delays and safety hazards. Operation of the Reduced-Intensity Alternative would cause a substantial increase in traffic, which would decrease the level of service at several local intersections. Traffic queues at project driveways would have the potential to exceed vehicle storage space. Conflicts between vehicles and trains at the Athens Avenue/Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) crossing could increase. Additional use of Placer County Transit (PCT) service would occur. However, because the performing arts center would not be constructed under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative, no impacts due to special events would occur. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 9.1 through 9.18 and 9-20, impacts due to increased traffic would be reduced to less than significant levels.

### ***Air Quality***

Under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative, impacts to air quality described in **Chapter 10.0** would have the potential to occur. Construction emissions resulting from release of dust and other criteria air pollutants would constitute a potentially significant impact. Operational air quality impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions, would be proportionally less than those described for the proposed project as identified in **Chapter 10.0**. The inclusion of the environmental commitments described in **Chapter 10.0**, in addition to Mitigation Measures 10.1 and 10.2, would ensure a less than significant impact to air quality from construction and operation of the Reduced-Intensity Alternative.

### **Noise**

Under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative, noise impacts described in **Chapter 11.0** would have the potential to occur. Construction of the Reduced-Intensity Alternative would create substantial increases in noise on a temporary and intermittent basis. The Reduced-Intensity Alternative would also lead to a substantial increase in the current traffic volumes, which would raise the ambient noise levels. However, because there are no sensitive receptors in the immediate project vicinity, the increased noise levels would not cause a significant impact. No mitigation measures are recommended.

### **Soils, Geology, and Seismicity**

The Reduced-Intensity Alternative would cause impacts similar to those described in **Chapter 12.0**. A site-specific geotechnical study was conducted to determine soil characteristics and suitability of the project site. The same potential for construction-related erosion and unsuitable soil conditions would be present under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative as would occur with the proposed project. The implementation of Mitigation Measures 12.1 through 12.5 would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

The Reduced-Intensity Alternative would result in similar issues related to water quality and hydrology as those described for the proposed project. These include the potential for impacts to water quality from construction-related pollutants, and changes in drainage patterns resulting from a slight increase in impervious surfaces associated with offsite improvements. Mitigation Measures 13.1 and 13.2 would be applicable to the Reduced-Intensity Alternative, and would reduce any potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

### **Public Services and Utilities**

The Reduced-Intensity Alternative would create additional demands for public service and utilities similar to those discussed for the proposed project, however the impacts would be reduced proportionally with the reduction in employees and patrons. As with the proposed project, impacts to solid waste services, energy suppliers, parks and recreation facilities, schools, and libraries would be less than significant. The Reduced-Intensity Alternative would create additional demands for water supply, wastewater treatment, fire protection/emergency medical services, and law enforcement services, which would be significant. The same options for water and wastewater services would be available under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative as for the proposed project. Due to the height of the hotel and parking garage, similar but reduced fire protection staffing, vehicles, and equipment would be required. While additional law enforcement demands would be fulfilled by the existing MOU between the Tribe and Placer County, the Tribe would continue its reimbursable contract with California Highway Patrol. The Reduced-Intensity Alternative could also result in potentially significant impacts to local AM radio broadcasting, however due to the reduced height of the hotel, the impact would be less. Mitigation Measures 14.1 through 14.5

would be recommended to ensure impacts to public services and utilities would be less than significant under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative.

### ***Hazardous Materials and Hazards***

Under the Reduced-Intensity Alternative, potential impacts described in **Chapter 15.0** would be similar as for the proposed project. Temporary hazard-related impacts resulting from construction of a smaller hotel, parking garage, and off-site improvements would occur, and Mitigation Measures 15.1 through 15.6 would be implemented to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. Operation of the Reduced-Intensity Alternative would also result in use and storage of hazardous materials, increased fire hazards, and a risk of hazardous material release from transportation or industrial accidents; these represent potentially significant impacts. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 15.7 through 15.11 would reduce these operational impacts to less than significant levels.

## **16.1.2 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE**

Under the No Project Alternative, the casino would continue to operate as it has since opening in 2003. The casino building would not be expanded, nor would the hotel, parking garage, or performing arts center be constructed. Furthermore, the central plant would not be expanded or upgraded, nor would changes in water or wastewater facilities or service occur. For the purposes of the environmental analysis, it is assumed that the property would remain in use as it has since completion of Thunder Valley Casino in 2003.

### ***LAND USE***

Due to the environmental commitments and previous mitigation measures undertaken by the Tribe, the existing casino complex is consistent with plans for the SIA. Existing uses would continue to operate on the project site. The No Project Alternative would maintain the fiscal contributions listed in the MOU by the Tribe to Placer County for protection of open spaces via Placer Legacy. No impacts to land use would occur.

### ***POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING***

The No Project Alternative would not provide additional employment opportunities for residents of Placer County and surrounding areas. Local population and housing would not be significantly impacted under the No Project Alternative.

### ***BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES***

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no adverse impacts to sensitive biological resources, such as vernal pools, seasonal wetland habitat, freshwater marsh habitat, riparian habitat and the associated special status species.

### ***CULTURAL RESOURCES***

Under the No Project Alternative, no additional land would be disturbed. This alternative would not result in any significant impact to cultural or paleontological resources.

### ***VISUAL RESOURCES***

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no change to the current aesthetic setting. Views from State Route 65 and nearby sensitive visual receptors would continue to include the existing casino complex. No buildings exceeding 50 feet in height would be constructed. Nighttime illumination of the casino would remain unchanged. This alternative would not result in significant impacts to visual resources.

### ***TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION***

Under the No Project Alternative, three of the study intersections would continue to operate below acceptable levels of service during the weekday PM peak hour. The replacement of the signalized intersection of Sunset Boulevard/State Route 65 with a grade-separated ramp interchange is already scheduled and funded; following construction, this intersection would operate at an acceptable level of service. Under the No Project Alternative, fair-share funding for needed improvements at the intersections of Baseline Road/Foothills Boulevard and Baseline Road/Fiddymont Road/Walerga Road would not be provided by the Tribe. No changes would be made to the access driveways on the existing casino parcel; therefore, no impacts related to queue length at any of the driveways would occur. Existing Placer County Transit and casino shuttle service would continue as currently scheduled. No impacts to transit service, bicycle or pedestrian facilities would occur. The potential for vehicle/train conflicts at the at-grade UPRR crossing would not increase. Since the performing arts center would not be constructed under the No Project Alternative there would be no traffic impacts from special events. Because no offsite traffic improvements would be constructed, there would be no potential for offsite environmental impacts.

### ***AIR QUALITY***

Under the No Project Alternative, no construction-related impacts to air quality would occur. The amount of electricity used and number of vehicle trips to and from the casino would remain essentially unchanged. No significant air quality impacts would occur from operation of the existing property. Under the No Project Alternative, no photovoltaic panels would be installed on the casino property.

### ***NOISE***

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no construction-related increases in the ambient noise levels within the vicinity of the casino. No noise-related impacts would occur from continued operation of the existing property.

### ***SOILS, GEOLOGY, AND SEISMICITY***

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no impacts related to soils, geology, or seismicity. Under this Alternative, no impacts as a result of erosion would occur, because no construction activities would occur which might disturb local soils. Similarly, no potential exists under this alternative for impacts related to unstable, expansive, corrosive, or otherwise unsuitable soils.

### ***HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY***

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no impacts to water quality from construction-related activities, or drainage impacts from increased impervious surfaces. There would be no increased demand for water, or impact to underlying aquifers. The onsite WWTP would continue to discharge treated effluent to Orchard Creek under the existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

### ***PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES***

Under the No Project Alternative, no additional public facilities or services would be required. There would be no need to expand water service to the site, or extend sewer service from a nearby district and/or expand the existing wastewater treatment facilities. The needs for fire protection, law enforcement and other services would remain unchanged. No impacts to the nearby AM radio broadcaster would occur under the No Project Alternative.

### ***HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND HAZARDS***

Under the No Project Alternative, the potential to discover unknown soil and groundwater contamination from construction-related earth-moving activities would not occur. Construction-related hazards, including increased fire risks, would not occur. Hazardous materials used and stored onsite for operation and maintenance of the WWTP, casino, and grounds would continue to be stored and used appropriately. The potential for inadvertent release of hazardous materials from industrial or transportation accidents would remain unchanged, and the casino's current hazardous materials business plan and emergency plan would remain in effect.

## **16.1.3 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS**

The environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would cause the least damage to the biological and physical environment. The No Project Alternative would result in the least environmental impact; however, it would not achieve the project objectives discussed in **Chapter 3.3**. Additionally, under the No Project Alternative, no fair-share funding would be provided for a grade separation at the UPRR crossing or needed improvements at the intersections of Baseline Road/Foothills Boulevard and Baseline Road/Fiddymont Road/Walerga Road. The Reduced-Intensity Alternative would result in similar impacts to the proposed project; however, they would be proportionately lessened due to the

reduced scale of development. While the Reduced-Intensity Alternative would result in less environmental impact than the proposed project, it would not fully meet the project objectives. Specifically, it would not provide additional employment opportunities or fulfill the demand for recreational events and entertainment in Placer County, potentially resulting in the loss of tourism and entertainment spending in Placer County, and would not generate the cash flow required to justify the investment in the expansion.

## **16.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED**

Implementation of the proposed project would contribute to the following four cumulative impacts, identified in the SIA Plan EIR as significant and unavoidable (ESA, 1997): 1) increased cumulative noise from traffic sources, 2) increased cumulative air pollutant emissions from mobile sources, 3) increased cumulative air pollutant emissions from construction activities and equipment, and 4) increased volume and duration of downstream flows in the Auburn Ravine watershed due to increased stormwater runoff. These cumulative impacts are discussed further in **Chapter 16.5**. With implementation of all mitigation measures recommended in this TEIR, additional significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts related to increased traffic would occur. These impacts are discussed further in **Chapter 16.5**.

## **16.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES**

Irreversible environmental changes may include, for example, a large commitment of nonrenewable resources, or irreversible damage resulting from environmental accidents associated with a project. The proposed project would not cause any significant, irreversible environmental changes.

## **16.4 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

A growth-inducing impact is defined as an impact that fosters economic or population growth either directly or indirectly. Included in this definition are public works projects that would remove obstacles to population growth. Direct growth inducement would result if a project, for example, involved the construction of new housing. Indirect growth inducement would result if a project established substantial new permanent employment opportunities (e.g., new commercial, industrial, or governmental enterprises) or if it involved a construction effort with substantial short-term employment opportunities that would indirectly stimulate the need for additional housing and services.

Growth inducement may constitute an adverse impact if the indirect growth is not consistent with or accommodated by the land use plans and growth management plans and policies for the area affected. Local land use plans provide for land use development patterns and growth policies that allow for orderly urban development supported by adequate urban public services, such as water supply, roadway infrastructure, sewer services, and solid waste services. A project that would induce “disorderly” growth

(i.e., conflict with the local land use plans) could indirectly cause additional adverse environmental impacts and other public services impacts.

The proposed project would include new employment opportunities. Employment opportunities are envisioned in the SIA Plan; therefore, some growth is anticipated. Given the current number of casino workers living in Placer County (33%) and the availability of labor in the regional work force, it is expected that there would be minimal migration of workers into Placer County. Additionally, training opportunities are available to attract local residents with no previous casino employment experience, rather than creating a need for a specialized work force that may not exist locally. While the jobs/housing ratio is expected to increase marginally in the short term, the increase would not be significant, due to the current surplus of available housing.

The proposed project includes road widening along portions of Athens Avenue and Thunder Valley Court and associated utility improvements for energy and telecommunications. The road improvements are located along an existing corridor and do not provide access to land-locked parcels. Energy and telecommunications infrastructure would be relocated, but substantial increases in capacity, other than those increases directly associated with the proposed project, are not planned. No growth inducement would result from these improvements.

Three options are available for supplying potable water to the proposed project. Use of onsite wells would not be growth-inducing, as these facilities would only serve the proposed project. Expansion of the PCWA connection option and Phase I of the City of Lincoln connection option would not involve offsite infrastructure and thus would not induce growth. The City of Lincoln plans to expand its existing water facilities as discussed in **Chapter 3.4.6**; however, these facilities are not required to serve the project.

Wastewater infrastructure would be constructed or expanded to meet the needs of the proposed project. Expansion of the onsite WWTP would not induce growth, as these facilities would only serve the proposed project. Connection to the City of Lincoln WWTRF via a gravity sewer line (Options 1 and 2, **Chapter 3.4.7**) would require the construction of the South Lincoln Regional Sewer System, which would serve existing and planned development along the Athens Avenue corridor. The system would not induce growth, as it would provide permanent wastewater conveyance for planned growth evaluated in previous environmental documents including specific plans, the City of Lincoln General Plan, Placer County General Plan, and the Draft EIR for the South Lincoln Sewer Project (EIP Associates, 2005). Connection to the City of Lincoln WWTP via a pump station/force main configuration (Option 3, **Chapter 3.4.7**) would require installation of approximately 3 miles of pipeline and construction of a pump station. This option could be configured to serve only the casino, or expanded to serve other nearby existing properties and planned development south of Athens Avenue. This alternative would not induce growth, as previous documents have addressed potential impacts of the planned growth. Connection to the City of Roseville's treatment facilities would require expansion of the Pleasant Grove WWTP, a new

influent lift station and approximately 3.7 miles of pipeline. The new facilities would be sized to convey wastewater from the proposed project and other planned developments. The expansion has previously been evaluated but may need to be modified to specifically address the proposed project. As the facilities would be expanded to serve only planned development and the proposed project, such an expansion would not be growth inducing.

## 16.5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

“Cumulative impacts” refers to the effects of two or more projects that, when combined, are considerable or compound other environmental effects. The cumulative conditions analysis reflects the estimated development and traffic associated with the level of growth anticipated by the year 2025. The cumulative setting is primarily based on development anticipated under the Placer County General Plan and SIA Plan; however, plans for the areas of north Roseville, northwest Rocklin, and south Lincoln were also considered. In addition to build-out of area general plans, transportation projects and several development projects requiring amendments and/or rezoning in the project vicinity are discussed. The majority of the project descriptions summarized below are based on information that was available at the time the Notice of Preparation for this TEIR was released and implementation of these projects is dependent on required approvals by applicable agencies.

### 16.5.1 TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

**Highway 65 (Lincoln) Bypass:** The Federal Highway Administration and the California Department of Transportation propose to construct a four-lane freeway around the west side of the City of Lincoln, in Placer County, from south of Industrial Avenue to north of Riosa Road, near the town of Sheridan. The length of the bypass would be approximately 11.7 miles. This project would be constructed in two phases (Caltrans, 2007).

**Sunset Boulevard/State Route 65 Interchange:** This project involves the replacement of the existing at-grade signalized Sunset Boulevard/State Route 65 interchange with a grade-separated partial cloverleaf interchange to improve traffic flow. The estimated \$31 million dollar project is jointly funded by Placer County, the City of Rocklin, and the Highway 65 Joint Powers Authority. Construction is scheduled to begin in 2008, with completion anticipated in 2009 (Placer County, 2007d).

**Sacramento/Placer I- 80 Operational and Capacity Improvement Plan:** This 5.8-mile project would increase freeway capacity, improve safety, and improve traffic flow along Interstate 80 from approximately one-half mile west of the Sacramento/Placer County line to approximately one mile east of the State Route 65 connector in Placer County. Improvements include widening the I-80 mainline with auxiliary lanes and bus/carpool (HOV) lanes, installation of ramp meters, and upgrading traffic monitoring systems. The first phase is underway

and is scheduled for completion in 2008. Construction of the subsequent phases is anticipated to be complete by 2011 with the exception of the last phase which is not currently funded (Caltrans, 2007).

**Placer Parkway**

The proposed Placer Parkway project, which would provide an access-controlled connection between SR 65 in south Placer County and State Route 70/99 in south Sutter County, is not anticipated to be complete until after 2025. According to the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA), no state or federal funding exists for this \$600 - 650 million project; therefore, no schedule has been developed for its implementation. Environmental studies related to corridor preservation are underway, and the Final Tier 1 EIR/EIS is expected to be complete in 2008 (MRO, 2008).

**Placer County 2027 Regional  
Transportation Plan**

The 2027 Regional Transportation Plan documents planned transportation projects in Placer County through 2027. In addition to those transportation projects listed above the following improvements are planned in the vicinity of the project site:

- Widening of Twelve Bridges Drive to four lanes from Industrial Avenue to State Route 65, and widening to six lanes from State Route 65 to Lincoln Parkway, including interchange improvements (2015);
- Construction of an interchange at State Route 65 and Whitney Boulevard (2022);
- Widening of Industrial Avenue to four lanes from Athens Avenue to State Route 65 (2010);
- Phased construction of a four-lane extension of Fiddymment Road to connect to Nelson Road in Lincoln (2010);
- Phased construction of a four-lane road extension of Sunset Boulevard from Cincinnati Avenue to Fiddymment Road (2022 – The first phase, from Cincinnati Avenue to Foothills Boulevard North, was completed in 2007);
- Phased construction of the new Foothills Boulevard North from Sunset Boulevard to Athens Avenue (2022 – Phase one is complete; Phase two will widen the road from two to four lanes); and
- Widening of Foothills Boulevard North to four lanes from the Roseville city limits to Sunset Boulevard (2016; Placer County Transportation Planning Agency, 2005).

## 16.5.2 DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

### *PLACER COUNTY*

- Placer Ranch Specific Plan:** This project includes approximately 2,213 acres within the SIA, approximately one mile west of the State Route 65/Sunset Boulevard Interchange. Since 2003, the developer had been processing the specific plan through the County. In October of 2007, the developer requested that the City of Roseville process the specific plan and ultimately annex the plan area. In November of 2007, the City Council recommended that staff begin processing the Specific Plan. The draft land use plan includes a 297-acre California State University Sacramento branch campus that would accommodate up to 25,000 full-time equivalent students, 5,000 residential units, 1,740 student and faculty units associated with the university, up to 9 million square feet of commercial/office and light industrial uses, parks, open space, 2 elementary schools and one middle school (City of Roseville, 2008).
- Placer Vineyards Specific Plan:** This Specific Plan proposes a master planned community with residential, commercial, employment, open space, recreational and public/quasi-public land uses in the southwest corner of Placer County. Approximately 14,132 residential units are proposed at buildout, which is planned to occur in 20 to 30 years. The development would have a population of approximately 33,000 people, 274 acres of commercial uses, 641 acres of quasi-public land uses and 919 acres of park and open space land (Placer County, 2007a).
- Regional University Specific Plan:** This project would include the development of 1,157.5 acres in unincorporated western Placer County consisting of a university and adjoining community component. The four-year university would include administrative, athletic, and performing arts facilities as well as housing for staff, faculty, students, and a retirement village. The community component would include 3,232 residential units, commercial, employment, open space, parks, and public uses, including a K-6 school and K-8 school (Placer County, 2007a).
- Creekview Specific Plan:** This project proposes the annexation and development of 511 acres in unincorporated Placer County, within the City of Roseville's sphere of influence. The development would include 2,361 residential units in addition to open space, parks, public/quasi-public uses, commercial/office, and light industrial development. An adjacent 237-acre site, outside of the sphere of influence, will be evaluated at a program level for either a four-year university or a regional job center (City of Roseville, 2008).
- Sierra Vista Specific Plan:** This project proposes the annexation and development of approximately 2,100 acres in unincorporated Placer County. A majority of the area is located within the City of Roseville's Sphere of Influence. The specific plan area would

contain approximately 9,995 residential units, approximately 226 acres of commercial/office development, approximately 150 acres of parks, 200 acres of open space, and 75 acres of public/quasi-public uses including schools (City of Roseville, 2008).

**Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan:** This project proposes a development on approximately 525.8 acres in southwestern Placer County. The development would include 933 residential units, and agricultural, open space, commercial, and public/quasi-public uses. Additional residential development would occur when other landowners seek entitlements for their properties (Placer County, 2007a).

**Curry Creek:** Proposed development of mixed commercial and residential land uses located in unincorporated Placer County. This project is located on 5,200 acres. The development is in the early stages of planning and the number of residential units has yet to be determined (URS Corporation, 2007b).

**California Motocross Park:** A 158-acre project located along Athens Avenue, adjacent to the Materials Recovery Facility and Landfill and one mile west of the proposed casino expansion. The California Motocross Park would consist of open-air racetracks, covered racetrack, enclosed spectator viewing booths overlooking a 250,000 square foot amphitheater-style racetrack, picnic grounds, playgrounds, parking, restrooms and showers. A proposed 130,000-square foot building complex would hold family restaurants, retail stores, video and game arcades, and a conference center. A Draft EIR is currently being prepared (California Motocross Park, 2007).

**Formica Reuse** The Formica Reuse will include the redevelopment of a 211-acre site formerly occupied by the Formica Corporation plant. Proposed reuses include light industrial, office, and retail space. The site is expected to be completely redeveloped by 2025 (Placer County Redevelopment Agency, 2007a).

**Placer Corporate Center** This multi-phase project includes 900,000 square feet of office and light-industrial uses on a 102-acre parcel. At the intersection of Sunset Boulevard and South Loop Road there would be construction of a limited access traffic signal (Placer County, 2007a).

**Empire West/Athens Park Office Complex:** A project proposed on 30.75 acres between Industrial Avenue and SR 65, consisting of an office center that will be composed of one 3-story, one 2-story, and eleven 1-story office buildings. This proposal also includes a large parking area and five more lots for future offices (Placer County Redevelopment Agency, 2007a).

- Nichols Industrial Park:** A proposed industrial development on 35.8 acres located in the SIA to the northwest of Cincinnati Avenue and Nichols Drive. This project would create 26 build-to-suit parcels. Currently the applicant is seeking a subdivision map and Conditional Use Permit with Placer County. Included would be three lots dedicated for open space preservation (Placer County, 2007a).
- West Sunset Business Park Expansion** The project is located southwest of Sunset Boulevard and Cincinnati Avenue in the SIA and includes expansion of West Sunset Business Park, with a requested Tentative Subdivision Map and Conditional Use Permit for 19.63 acres. The project proposes construction of a 79,000 square foot office/warehouse shell (Placer County, 2007a).
- Cincinnati Avenue Light Industry Complex** Five acres of proposed development at the north end of Cincinnati Avenue including two 39,500-square foot office/warehouses. This project requests approval of a Minor Use Permit with Placer County (Placer County, 2007a).
- American Engineering and Asphalt** This project would construct a heavy processing facility at the eastern portion of the 4.5-acre storage area, with construction of a 4,000 square foot metal building north of the existing shop. The project would also increase the height of the storage piles from 15 feet to 20 feet. A Conditional Use Permit is being requested (Placer County, 2007a).
- Tilton Office/Warehouse** This project proposes construction of a 17,760 square foot office/warehouse building via a Minor Use Permit (Placer County 2007a).
- Sundance Industrial Park** A proposed 33+/- acre commercial development along the north side of Athens Avenue between Industrial Avenue and Foothills Boulevard North. The project proposes three open space lots within 19 subdivided commercial units (Placer County, 2007a).

***CITY OF LINCOLN***

- Lincoln Crossing Marketplace** Approved project consisting of 23 buildings on over 35 acres in the City of Lincoln at the corner of Joiner Parkway and Ferrari Ranch Road. The commercial development will contain numerous businesses, including Target, Staples, PetsMart, Ross, and TJMaxx. A hotel complex will be developed onsite, as well as several restaurants. This project is under construction (City of Lincoln, 2007).
- Lincoln 270** Proposed annexation to City of Lincoln of 278 acres of unincorporated Placer County land along Twelve Bridges Drive between SR 65 and Industrial Avenue. Project has certification of an EIR (City of Lincoln, 2007).
- Lincoln Crossing** Phases II and III of the 2,901-unit development are currently under construction to the northwest of the Proposed Project. Phase II includes 391 single units and

174 condominium units, while Phase III currently has over 1300 homes scheduled for construction (City of Lincoln, 2007).

### ***CITY OF ROSEVILLE***

- West Roseville Specific Plan** Located to the southwest of the proposed project on recently annexed land, this development borders the SIA on approximately 3,162 acres. The development includes residential, service, employment, open space and public uses, including schools and community facilities. Approximately 8,430 residential units. The Plan Area would house approximately 20,810 people and provide jobs for 3,726 employees (City of Roseville, 2007).
- Roseville Conference Center** This approved project contains a convention center and multiple hotels and is located to the south of the proposed casino expansion along SR 65, north of the Roseville Galleria. The 36,967-square foot conference center would be connected to a ten-story Embassy Suites hotel with 281 rooms, a second multi-story hotel with 219 rooms (minimum), two restaurants, and a parking structure (City of Roseville, 2006).

### ***CITY OF ROCKLIN***

- Rocklin Resort Condominiums** This project proposes a 96-unit condominium project on approximately 6.4 acres of the existing 49.8-acre Sunset Whitney golf course, southeast of the proposed casino expansion along Sunset Boulevard in Rocklin. (Rocklin, 2007b).
- Orchard Creek Business Park** This project includes 21 commercial and professional lots situated on approximately 115 acres at the corners of Rocklin and Lincoln, east of SR 65 and north of Whitney Boulevard. The Placer Center for Health is currently under construction within the Orchard Creek Business Park (Rocklin, 2007b).

## **16.5.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

The proposed project would be in an area designated by the County for industrial development (the SIA). The County previously prepared an EIR for the SIA covering the environmental impacts of planned future development (ESA, 1997). That EIR concluded that certain impacts would be significant; therefore, any projects proposed to be built in the SIA may contribute in some way to the total cumulative impacts that have previously been found to exist. As such, the proposed casino expansion may contribute incrementally to those cumulative impacts. The cumulatively significant impacts identified by the SIA Plan EIR are described below, along with a summary of the conclusions in this TEIR about the contribution of the proposed project to the identified cumulative impacts:

- the loss of agricultural land (as discussed below, the project does not contribute to the incremental loss of agricultural land);
- increased noise from traffic sources (as discussed below, the project contributes to the cumulative impact);
- impact to air quality (as discussed below, the project contributes to the cumulative impact); and
- increased stormwater flows (as discussed below, the project contributes to the cumulative impact).

These results regarding cumulative impacts were formulated under the County's prior analysis of the SIA under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Additional cumulative impacts related to increases in traffic were identified in the TEIR, even though increased traffic was not identified in the SIA Plan EIR as an area of concern for cumulative impacts. Following is a summary of cumulative impacts related to the proposed project, by environmental issue:

### ***LAND USE***

As the SIA develops and the listed projects are constructed, cumulative effects to land use and planning may result from the development of conflicting land uses, unplanned growth, and resulting public service impacts. It is assumed that cumulative projects would be developed consistently with the General Plan or would involve an amendment to the General Plan or issuance of a Conditional Use Permit that would ultimately result in consistency. Since planned construction and operation would take place on previously developed land, the proposed project would not add to the cumulative loss of agricultural land as discussed in the SIA Plan EIR.

### ***POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING***

Implementation of the proposed project, along with cumulative development in the surrounding area, will introduce new economic activity in Placer County, which will be beneficial to the area. The goods and services industry will see an increase in patronage due to the proposed project as well as current and future improvements to the SR 65 corridor, providing increased accessibility to the SIA and surrounding jurisdictions. The region is currently experiencing a jobs/housing imbalance, with the recent housing boom creating a large amount of residential units without a balanced level of employment. The proposed project would create new employment opportunities that would help resolve this imbalance. The project's cumulative contribution to population, employment and housing impacts would be less than significant.

### ***BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES***

Implementation of the proposed project and associated offsite improvements, in conjunction with additional local projects, would result in cumulatively considerable adverse effects to biological resources if habitats (including wetlands) for special status species were destroyed. However, potential cumulative effects from local projects would be minimized through compliance with applicable federal, state and

local regulations. Specifically, approved projects would follow the provisions set forth by the Placer County General Plan (Section 6, Natural Resources), Federal Endangered Species Act/California Endangered Species Act, and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, which require site-specific studies to determine mitigation necessary to preserve and enhance biological resources. With the implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in **Chapter 6.0**, the proposed project and associated offsite improvements would result in minimal cumulatively considerable adverse effects to biological resources.

### ***CULTURAL RESOURCES***

The proposed project would not significantly affect or contribute to the loss of important historical, archaeological, or paleontological sites in Placer County. No prehistoric or historic sites within the project site or offsite improvement area were identified based on relevant criteria for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Resources. Although the potential exists for an unanticipated discovery of such a resource during ground-disturbing activity on previously undeveloped land, the mitigation measure contained in **Chapter 7.0** would reduce cumulative impacts related to cultural resources. No significant cumulative impacts to cultural resources would occur as a result of the proposed project.

### ***VISUAL RESOURCES***

The proposed project would result in changed views for local sensitive receptors, contribute to urbanization of western Placer County, and introduce buildings to the SIA that exceed 50 feet in height. However, the project is in a designated zone for industrial development and is consistent with the land use plans for Placer County and the SIA. All building, landscaping, and lighting design would comply with the aforementioned land use plans, and would be consistent with the aesthetics of the existing facility. Thus, no significant cumulative impacts related to visual resources would occur as a result of the project.

### ***TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION***

The year 2025 traffic volume estimates were based on travel demand forecasts developed using the Placer County model, which was updated for use in the Placer Ranch traffic impact analysis. Cumulative conditions analysis for the proposed project addresses weekday PM peak hour. No Saturday PM peak hour analysis was conducted, as year 2025 forecasts do not predict traffic volumes during this hour (KHA, 2007). Regulatory setting, methodology, and significance criteria are presented in **Chapter 9.0**.

**Figures 16-1A and 16-1B** show the cumulative weekday PM peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersections without the addition of project-related traffic (Cumulative No Project). Additionally, these two figures show the assumed lane configurations for the study intersections in the year 2025. Two intersections are included on these figures that were not included in the Existing Plus Project conditions analysis presented in **Chapter 9.0**. These intersections include the proposed Whitney Ranch Parkway

**Figure 16-1A:** Weekday PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes –Cumulative No Project Conditions (1)

**Figure 16-1B:** Weekday PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes –Cumulative No Project Conditions (2)

extension with the southbound and northbound ramps on SR 65. Intersections of Sunset Boulevard/SR 65 and Sunset Boulevard/Placer Corporate Drive/South Loop Road are assumed to operate under the planned improvements described in **Chapter 9.0**. Trip distribution assumptions of the cumulative analysis include re-direction of some of the northward-oriented traffic to the planned Lincoln Bypass; otherwise, distribution patterns are expected to remain essentially unchanged from existing conditions. Cumulative impacts related to transportation and circulation are discussed below.

<b>IMPACT 16.1:</b>	The proposed project would cause an increase in traffic in the weekday PM Peak Hour, which has the potential to decrease the LOS at area intersections.
<b>SIGNIFICANCE:</b>	Significant
<b>MITIGATION:</b>	Mitigation Measures 16.1 through 16.14
<b>RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE:</b>	Significant and Unavoidable at Sunset Boulevard/Cincinnati Avenue intersection due to lack of feasible mitigation (impact is Less than Significant at all other intersections)

**Table 17 of Appendix F** summarizes the intersection LOS results for Cumulative No Project conditions. Under the anticipated year 2025 conditions, 29 of the 42 analyzed intersections would operate at an unacceptable LOS during the weekday PM peak hour. **Figures 16-2A and 16-2B** show the Cumulative Plus Project weekday PM peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersections. **Table 20 of Appendix F** shows intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project conditions.

The cumulative analysis does not assume the implementation of any of the mitigation measures presented in **Chapter 9.0**; however, the Cumulative Plus Project analysis includes re-distribution of some of the traffic at the casino driveway intersections to account for projected completion of the parking garage. This results in an improvement in LOS at two of the study intersections (Athens Avenue/Driveways 1 and 3). With the addition of project-related traffic, the following 27 study intersections are predicted to operate at an unacceptable LOS during the weekday PM peak hour:

- Athens Avenue/Fiddymont Road
- Athens Avenue/Foothills Boulevard North
- Athens Avenue/Industrial Avenue
- Industrial Avenue/Ace Hardware
- Industrial Avenue/Placer Corporate Drive
- Industrial Avenue/South Loop Road
- Industrial Avenue/Alantown Road
- Industrial Avenue/Packard Drive
- Industrial Avenue/Washington Boulevard
- Pleasant Grove Boulevard/Washington Boulevard
- Sunset Boulevard/Cincinnati Avenue

**Figure 16-2 A:** Weekday PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes –Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

**Figure 16-2B:** Weekday PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes –Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

- Sunset Boulevard/Placer Corporate Drive/South Loop Road
- Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road/University Avenue
- Sunset Boulevard/West Stanford Ranch Road/Lone Tree Boulevard
- Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard
- Sunset Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard
- Sunset Boulevard/Park Drive
- Sunset Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road
- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Alantown Drive
- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Packard Drive
- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Foothills Boulevard
- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Fiddymment Road
- Pleasant Grove Boulevard/Foothills Boulevard
- Pleasant Grove Boulevard/Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard
- Pleasant Grove Boulevard/Fiddymment Road
- Baseline Road/Foothills Boulevard
- Baseline Road/Fiddymment Road/Walerga Road

With implementation of Mitigation Measures 16.1 through 16.14, six of the 27 study intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS. Mitigation Measure 16.8, proposed for the Sunset Boulevard/Cincinnati Avenue intersection, has been determined to be infeasible due to right of way constraints; therefore, impacts at this location are considered significant and unavoidable. Project-related impacts could be fully mitigated at the following seven additional intersections. Although these locations would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS, the project-related impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

- Athens Avenue/Industrial Avenue
- Industrial Avenue/Packard Drive
- Industrial Avenue/Washington Boulevard
- Sunset Boulevard/Park Drive
- Sunset Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road
- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Foothills Boulevard
- Baseline Road/Fiddymment Road/Walerga Road

No specific improvements are feasible at the five study intersections listed below. These intersections would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS. Each of these intersections was analyzed using both the Placer County traffic model and the City of Roseville traffic model, as requested by the City. Although the Placer County model identified a project-related impact, the analysis conducted using the City's model showed no significant long-term impacts to Roseville's transportation system resulting from the proposed project. Because each of these intersections are located within the City of Roseville's jurisdiction, impacts were assessed using the City's model and are, therefore, considered less than

significant. Additional details regarding the City of Roseville’s traffic model, significance criteria, and analysis methods are included in **Appendix F**.

- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Alantown Road (project traffic adds 18 PM peak hour trips)
- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Packard Drive (project traffic adds 18 PM peak hour trips)
- Blue Oaks Boulevard/Fiddymment Road
- Pleasant Grove Road/Foothills Boulevard
- Pleasant Grove Road/Fiddymment Road

Addition of project-related traffic would result in no measurable change to the operations of the eight intersections listed below. Although these intersections would operate at an unacceptable LOS, this does not represent a project-related impact.

- Industrial Avenue/Alantown Road
- Pleasant Grove Boulevard/Washington Boulevard
- Sunset Boulevard/Atherton Road/University Avenue
- Sunset Boulevard/West Stanford Ranch Road/Lone Tree Boulevard
- Sunset Boulevard/West Oaks Boulevard
- Sunset Boulevard/Blue Oaks Boulevard
- Pleasant Grove Boulevard/Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard
- Baseline Road/Foothills Boulevard

<b>IMPACT 16.2:</b>	The proposed project would result in increased traffic at the three signal-controlled driveways to the casino parcel, possibly exceeding queue capacity and creating safety hazards.
<b>SIGNIFICANCE:</b>	Potentially Significant
<b>MITIGATION:</b>	Mitigation Measure 16.15
<b>RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE:</b>	Less than Significant

Traffic impacts related to excessive vehicle queuing at project driveways were analyzed under Cumulative Plus Project conditions using the same methods described in **Chapter 9.0**. After accounting for the modified trip distribution at project driveways following construction of the parking garage, it was determined that eastbound queues at Thunder Valley Court/Driveway 3 could potentially exceed vehicle storage capacity during the weekday PM peak hour. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 16.15, impacts related to driveway queues would be reduced to less than significant levels.

<b>IMPACT 16.3:</b>	The proposed project would cause an increase in traffic in the PM peak hour, which has the potential to decrease the level of service along area freeway mainline segments.
<b>SIGNIFICANCE:</b>	Significant

<b>MITIGATION:</b>	Mitigation Measure 16.16
<b>RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE</b>	Significant and Unavoidable

The results of the Cumulative No Project conditions analysis of SR 65 mainline operations in the weekday PM peak hour are summarized in **Table 18 of Appendix F**. The cumulative analysis divides SR 65 near the project area into four segments, in anticipation of the completion of the Whitney Ranch Parkway between Sunset Boulevard and Twelve Bridges Drive. Each of the SR 65 segments is projected to operate at LOS F (more than 45 passenger cars per mile per lane) in both directions during the weekday PM peak hour without the addition of the proposed casino/hotel expansion traffic.

The Cumulative Plus Project conditions analysis of SR 65 mainline operations in the weekday PM peak hour are summarized in **Table 22 of Appendix F**. Overall, no change in LOS is anticipated at any of the studied freeway segments with the addition of project-related traffic volumes. However, a significant impact is projected due to project-related exacerbation of unacceptable freeway segment operations.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 16.16 would reduce impacts, resulting in acceptable LOS operations on most of the freeway segments. However, northbound SR 65 north of Twelve Bridges Drive and northbound SR 65 between Twelve Bridges Drive and Whitney Ranch Parkway would continue to operate at LOS F. Impacts at these locations would be significant and unavoidable.

<b>IMPACT 16.4:</b>	The proposed project would cause an increase in traffic in the PM peak hour, which has the potential to decrease the level of service at local freeway ramp junctions.
<b>SIGNIFICANCE:</b>	Significant
<b>MITIGATION:</b>	Mitigation Measure 16.16
<b>RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE</b>	Less than Significant

The Cumulative No Project conditions with respect to freeway ramp junctions are shown in **Table 19 of Appendix F**. Each ramp at each of three SR 65 interchanges was analyzed under cumulative conditions: Twelve Bridges Drive, Whitney Ranch Parkway (planned), and Sunset Boulevard (planned). At the Twelve Bridges and Sunset Boulevard interchanges, both directions of loop and diagonal on-ramps were analyzed separately, resulting in evaluation of 16 ramps. Eleven of these are predicted to operate at LOS F under Cumulative No Project conditions.

Addition of project-related traffic would exacerbate operations at ten of these ramps, causing the southbound loop on-ramp of the Sunset Boulevard interchange to fall below an acceptable LOS and creating a significant impact. Operations at the northbound off-ramp and northbound diagonal on-ramp of the Twelve Bridges Drive interchange, although operating at LOS F, would be unaffected by project-related traffic. A summary of the Cumulative Plus Project ramp analysis is presented in **Table 23 of Appendix F**.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 16.16 would improve operations at the study ramp junctions. Although the northbound on-ramp of the Whitney Ranch Parkway interchange would continue to operate at LOS F following mitigation, project-specific impacts would be fully offset. The rest of the studied ramp junctions would operate at acceptable LOS following mitigation. Residual impacts are less than significant.

<b>IMPACT 16.5:</b>	The proposed project would result in increased use of alternative transportation facilities, including transit systems, bikeways and pedestrian routes.
<b>SIGNIFICANCE:</b>	Potentially Significant
<b>MITIGATION:</b>	Mitigation Measure 9.16
<b>RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE:</b>	Less than Significant

The implementation of the proposed project would increase the number of vehicles on roadways in the vicinity of the casino/hotel. Because of this increase, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit systems have the potential to be affected.

Cumulative No Project conditions for the Placer County transit system predict an 823 percent increase in transit riders, this number being accommodated by increased service on five existing fixed-route lines and 14 additional lines (PCTPA, 2005). The proposed casino expansion has the potential to increase PCT ridership on the Lincoln/Rocklin/Sierra College line and connecting routes. Most of the additional transit demand would likely be in the form of employee trips, as many casino patrons would come from outside the PCT service area.

Placer County has adopted a Bikeway Master Plan that includes no additional future bicycle pathways in the general vicinity of the proposed project (Placer County, 2002). The Placer County General Plan (2005a), Goal 3.D.1 encourages alternative forms of transportation in major employment areas, and the SIA Plan mirrors this goal. Therefore, with the expected growth in north Roseville and south Lincoln, it is possible that bicycle pathways extending through the SIA would be present in the year 2025. Pedestrian walkways would not likely be enhanced within the project vicinity due to the industrial land uses surrounding the proposed project.

The proposed project would not have a significant impact on local bicycle or pedestrian traffic, because no existing or planned bikeways or sidewalks connect the casino with local population centers. Given that bicycle and pedestrian activity in the SIA is generally low, no increased safety hazards to cyclists or pedestrians would occur. However, the increase in PCT use would be potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 9.16 would reduce transit-related impacts, including cumulative impacts, to a less than significant level.

<b>IMPACT 16.6:</b>	The proposed project would increase the potential for conflicts between vehicles and trains at the at-grade UPRR crossing along Athens Avenue.
<b>SIGNIFICANCE:</b>	Significant
<b>MITIGATION:</b>	Mitigation Measure 16.17
<b>RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE:</b>	Less than Significant

Under Cumulative No Project conditions, approximately 2,660 vehicles would cross the UPRR tracks along Athens Avenue in the weekday PM peak hour. Addition of the project-related traffic would increase the estimated crossings to 3,900-4,000 vehicles during this hour, approximately evenly split between westbound and eastbound. With this traffic volume, two major impacts have the potential to occur: queues of vehicles could form across the tracks; or queues of vehicles on Industrial Avenue waiting to cross the tracks could extend out of their turn lanes, blocking through traffic and creating a safety hazard.

A queue length analysis for key traffic movements was completed for the at-grade crossing, assuming a 7,000-foot train traveling at a speed of 30 mph (thereby requiring 200 seconds to clear the at-grade crossing). Average and peak queues were calculated for three key movements, as described in **Chapter 9.0**. The queue length analysis indicates that there is little potential for vehicles to form a queue along Athens Avenue extending the 1,200 feet from Thunder Valley Court/Driveway 3 to the UPRR crossing, particularly with the planned “demand-responsive” signal at the driveway intersection. However, there is a high probability for both northbound and southbound traffic on Industrial Avenue to queue beyond the vehicle storage capacity of their respective turn lanes while waiting for a train to clear the crossing. The potential for rear-end collisions would be increased as queues of waiting vehicles extend into lanes of through traffic along Industrial Avenue. This represents a significant impact, which can be mitigated to less than significant levels by the implementation of Mitigation Measure 16.17, which includes a fair-share contribution toward the planning, design, and construction of a grade-separation structure at the Athens Avenue/UPRR crossing.

A feasibility study with three alternative designs for the grade separation is included as **Appendix G**. Each alternative was configured in accordance with the planned widening (from two to four lanes) of the segment of Industrial Avenue north of the intersection with Athens Avenue, scheduled for completion in 2010. Alternative 1 would consist of a fully grade-separated structure for all traffic and pedestrian movements at the Athens Avenue/Industrial Avenue intersection, and a bridge structure to carry Athens Avenue across the UPRR right of way. Mechanically Stabilized Embankment (MSE) walls would be used to support the grade separation, and would also allow access to Casino Driveway 4 from an above-grade elevation. Alternative 2 would entail a partial grade separation for all turning movements at the Athens Avenue/Industrial Avenue intersection. Through traffic on Industrial Avenue and all pedestrian movements would remain at grade, while northbound left-turn and southbound right-turn lanes of Industrial Avenue would be elevated on MSE walls. All lanes of Athens Avenue would be similarly

elevated, culminating in a bridge structure across the UPRR right of way. Alternative 3 would provide flyover ramps for northbound left-turn and eastbound right-turn traffic, the two major movements at the Athens Avenue/Industrial Avenue intersection. Minor traffic movements and pedestrians would remain at grade.

The three alternative designs were evaluated using several key “filter criteria.” These criteria include: whether each alternative would meet the purpose and need for crossing improvements; engineering feasibility; constructability; right of way needs; provisions for access to adjoining parcels; environmental impacts; impacts to railroad operations; traffic improvements; safety improvements; and cost estimates. Alternative 3 was determined to be infeasible and undesirable due to engineering constraints, substantial right of way demands, and negative scores on several other key issues. Alternatives 1 and 2 are both considered feasible; however, Alternative 1 has several distinct advantages over Alternative 2, namely, successful accomplishment of all project objectives, fewer engineering constraints, improved railroad operation, lower right of way demands, and lower cost.

<b>IMPACT 16.7:</b>	The proposed project has the potential to decrease LOS at signalized intersections in the City of Roseville sphere of influence.
<b>SIGNIFICANCE:</b>	Less than Significant
<b>MITIGATION:</b>	None Warranted

In response to a comment made by the City of Roseville regarding the Notice of Preparation for the proposed project, additional analysis was performed specifically using the City’s traffic model for study intersections within the Roseville sphere of influence. This model equates to a year 2020 cumulative analysis, including proposed improvements to City of Roseville intersections and roadway segments identified in the updated Transportation System Capital Improvements Program (CIP) as necessary to maintain acceptable level of service (URS, 2007a). Twenty Roseville-area intersections were evaluated under CIP 2020 No Project and CIP 2020 Plus Project conditions. Operational standards for these intersections were established using the City’s General Plan policies regarding level of service (LOS), described in **Chapter 9.0**. Impacts at the analyzed intersections were considered significant if the proposed project would cause degradation in intersection operations such that less than 70 percent of the City’s signalized intersections would operate at LOS C or better (assuming buildout of currently entitled land within the City and year 2020 market-rate development levels outside of the City).

Intersection LOS was calculated using the City’s methodology for determining volume/capacity (V/C) ratios, which varies slightly from the methodology used for the Existing and Cumulative conditions analysis presented in **Chapter 9.0**. Additional details regarding LOS methodology can be found in **Tables 30** and **31** of **Appendix F**. An analysis of CIP 2020 No Project conditions predicted 12 study intersections would operate at LOS C or better, while the remaining eight intersections would operate at

LOS D or E. Intersection configurations and traffic volumes for CIP 2020 No Project conditions are presented in **Figure 12** and **Table 32** of **Appendix F**.

Addition of project-related traffic to the 20 Roseville-area intersections would have relatively little effect on operational LOS. No change in V/C ratio is predicted at ten of the intersections, while an increase of 0.01 is anticipated at eight additional locations. A V/C ratio increase of 0.02 is predicted at the two remaining intersections; in none of the analyzed scenarios does the slight increase in V/C ratio result in a decreased LOS. Even with the addition of project-related traffic, over 70 percent of the City of Roseville's signalized intersections would continue to operate at LOS C or better, representing a less than significant impact. This is most likely due to the fact that the casino is a regional trip generator; consequently, the majority of casino patrons will continue to use SR 65 to and from the south, rather than surface streets within the City of Roseville. CIP 2020 Plus Project conditions are presented in **Figure 13** and **Table 33** of **Appendix F**.

The following mitigation measures will be implemented to address impacts related to transportation and circulation.

**Mitigation Measure 16.1:** Athens Avenue/Fiddymont Road Intersection Improvements

Mitigation Measure 16.1 applies to Impact 16.1.

At the time of traffic improvement construction, the Tribe shall provide a fair share contribution toward the following improvements, to raise the predicted LOS F to LOS C:

- Install a traffic signal
- Northbound approach: Increase from a single left/thru/right lane to two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane
- Southbound approach: Increase from a single left/thru/right lane to one left-turn lane, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane
- Eastbound approach: Increase from a single left/thru/right lane to one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one free-flow right-turn lane
- Westbound approach: Increase from a single left/thru/right lane to one left-turn lane, three through lanes, and one free-flow right-turn lane

Fair share responsibility: 4.9 percent

**Mitigation Measure 16.2:** Athens Avenue/Foothills Boulevard North Intersection Improvements

Mitigation Measure 16.2 applies to Impact 16.1.

At the time of traffic improvement construction, the Tribe shall provide a fair share contribution toward the following improvements, to raise the predicted LOS D to LOS C:

- Install a traffic signal
- Northbound approach: Add a third lane, so the lane configuration on this approach would be one left-turn lane, one shared left/right-turn lane, and one right-turn lane
- Eastbound approach: Provide right-turn overlap signal phasing
- Widen Athens Avenue east and west of the intersection to provide receiving lanes for the additional turn lane on the northbound approach. This widening shall be to the satisfaction of the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD).

Fair share responsibility: 15.2 percent

**Mitigation Measure 16.3:** Industrial Avenue/Ace Hardware Intersection Improvements

Mitigation Measure 16.3 applies to Impact 16.1.

At the time of traffic improvement construction, the Tribe shall provide a fair share contribution toward the following improvements, to raise the predicted LOS F to LOS C:

- Northbound approach: Widen to provide two through lanes
- Southbound approach: Widen to provide two through lanes

Fair share responsibility: 39.0 percent

**Mitigation Measure 16.4:** Industrial Avenue/Placer Corporate Drive Intersection Improvements

Mitigation Measure 16.4 applies to Impact 16.1.

At the time of traffic improvement construction, the Tribe shall provide a fair share contribution toward the following improvements, to raise the predicted LOS F to LOS C:

- Northbound approach: Widen to provide a second through lane
- Southbound approach: Widen to provide a second through lane
- Westbound approach: Provide right-turn overlap signal phasing

Fair share responsibility: 38.9 percent

**Mitigation Measure 16.5:** Industrial Avenue/South Loop Road Intersection Improvements

Mitigation Measure 16.5 applies to Impact 16.1.

At the time of traffic improvement construction, the Tribe shall provide a fair share contribution toward the following improvements, to raise the predicted LOS F to LOS C:

- Northbound approach: Widen to provide a second through lane and provide right-turn overlap signal phasing
- Southbound approach: Provide a second left-turn lane

- Widen South Loop Road to accommodate the second southbound left-turn lane. This widening shall be to the satisfaction of the Placer County ESD.

Fair share responsibility: 22.0 percent

**Mitigation Measure 16.6:** Industrial Avenue/Packard Drive Intersection Improvements

Mitigation Measure 16.6 applies to Impact 16.1.

At the time of traffic improvement construction, the Tribe shall provide a fair share contribution toward the following improvement:

- Westbound approach: Provide separate left- and right-turn lanes

Fair share responsibility: 0.8 percent

Although this improvement would not provide operation at LOS C or better, it fully mitigates the project-specific impact at this location, resulting in a less than significant impact. It should be noted that the proposed project is expected to add only 13 vehicles per hour to the intersection.

**Mitigation Measure 16.7:** Industrial Avenue/Washington Boulevard Intersection Improvements

Mitigation Measure 16.7 applies to Impact 16.1.

At the time of traffic improvement construction, the Tribe shall provide a fair share contribution toward the following improvement:

- Eastbound approach: Provide right-turn overlap signal phasing

Fair share responsibility: 0.5 percent

Although this improvement would not provide operation at LOS C or better, it fully mitigates the project-specific impact at this location, resulting in a less than significant impact. It should be noted that the proposed project is expected to add only 13 vehicles per hour to the intersection.

**Mitigation Measure 16.8:** Sunset Boulevard/Cincinnati Avenue Intersection Improvements

Mitigation Measure 16.8 applies to Impact 16.1.

The Tribe shall provide a fair share contribution toward the following improvements, which would raise the predicted LOS F to LOS C:

- Northbound approach: Convert the existing shared through/right-turn lane to separate through and right-turn lanes (with the right-turn configured to allow free-flow turns)
- Southbound approach: Add a second left-turn lane and convert the existing shared through/right-turn lane to separate through and right-turn lanes and provide right-turn overlap signal phasing

- Eastbound approach: Add two through lanes (for a total approach configuration of one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and a shared through/right-turn lane)
- Westbound approach: Add two through lanes (for a total approach configuration of one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and a shared through/right-turn lane)

Fair share responsibility: 4.7 percent

However, due to the lack of available right-of-way on the northbound and southbound approaches, this mitigation measure is not feasible. As such, the project-related impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measure 16.9:** Sunset Boulevard/Placer Corporate Drive/South Loop Road Intersection Improvements

Mitigation Measure 16.9 applies to Impact 16.1.

At the time of traffic improvement construction, the Tribe shall provide a fair share contribution toward the following improvements, to raise the predicted LOS F to LOS D:

- Northbound approach: Add a second right-turn lane
- Eastbound approach: Add two through lanes (for a total of four)
- Westbound approach: Add a second left-turn lane and a through lane (for a total of three through lanes)

Fair share responsibility: 15.6 percent

**Mitigation Measure 16.10:** Sunset Boulevard/Park Drive Intersection Improvements

Mitigation Measure 16.10 applies to Impact 16.1.

At the time of traffic improvement construction, the Tribe shall provide a fair share contribution toward the following improvements:

- Northbound approach: Convert a through lane to a left-turn lane

Fair share responsibility: 1.4 percent

Although this improvement would not provide operation at LOS C or better, it fully mitigates the project-specific impact at this location, resulting in a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measure 16.11:** Sunset Boulevard/Stanford Ranch Road Intersection Improvements

Mitigation Measure 16.11 applies to Impact 16.1.

At the time of traffic improvement construction, the Tribe shall provide a fair share contribution toward the following improvements:

- Northbound approach: Construct a second left-turn lane

Fair share responsibility: 1.7 percent

Although this improvement would not provide operation at LOS C or better, it fully mitigates the project-specific impact at this location, resulting in a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measure 16.12:** Blue Oaks Boulevard/Foothills Boulevard Intersection Improvements

Mitigation Measure 16.12 applies to Impact 16.1.

At the time of traffic improvement construction, the Tribe shall provide a fair share contribution toward the following improvements:

- Southbound approach: Convert a through lane to a third left-turn lane (with a resulting intersection approach configuration of three left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane.

Fair share responsibility: 0.7 percent

Although this improvement would not provide operation at LOS C or better, it fully mitigates the project-specific impact at this location, resulting in a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measure 16.13:** Baseline Road/Fiddymont Road/Walerga Road Intersection Improvements

Mitigation Measure 16.13 applies to Impact 16.1.

At the time of traffic improvement construction, the Tribe shall provide a fair share contribution toward the following improvement:

- Northbound approach: Provide right-turn overlap signal phasing.

Fair share responsibility: 1.8 percent

Although this improvement would not provide operation at LOS C or better, it fully mitigates the project-specific impact at this location, resulting in a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measure 16.14:** Contribute to Placer County Traffic Mitigation Fee Program

Mitigation Measure 16.14 applies to Impact 16.1.

The Tribe shall contribute to the Placer County traffic mitigation fee program to fund the appropriate share of offsite improvements or area-wide improvements that are beyond the scope of the proposed project. These offsite or area-wide improvements will be determined in discussions with Placer County. To the extent that any of the costs of mitigation measures implemented in connection with the proposed

project are included in the CIP for the SIA or any other community plan approved by Placer County, those costs would represent a credit against the amount stated in the fee program for the relevant improvement.

**Mitigation Measure 16.15: Signal Coordination at Project Driveways**

Mitigation Measure 16.15 applies to Impact 16.2.

In order to reduce queuing along Athens Avenue at the three signal-controlled project driveways, the traffic signals at Driveway 1, Driveway 2, and Thunder Valley Court/Driveway 3 shall be interconnected and their operation coordinated, so as to minimize operational issues along the project frontage on Athens Avenue. This coordination shall extend to the existing signal at the Athens Avenue/Industrial Avenue intersection and the future proposed signal at the Athens Avenue/Foothills Boulevard North intersection.

To reduce or eliminate the presence of excessive queues of vehicles on Athens Avenue, the signal coordination system shall incorporate appropriately located queue detectors. These queue detectors will be designed to force a green signal at the downstream traffic signal when queues reach a designated length. The signal coordination software and hardware should include a link to County offices in Auburn, allowing for real-time monitoring/troubleshooting of operations. The specific approach to implementing the signal coordination system, including hardware requirements, locations of queue detectors, etc., shall be determined by the Tribe with review and approval by the Placer County Department of Public Works (DPW) prior to Improvement Plan approval. If required by UPRR, PUC, and Placer County, specialized software/hardware shall be used (such as LA DOT/Metrolink) that allows interface and communications between railroad equipment and traffic signal controls during railroad preemption sequence.

**Mitigation Measure 16.16: State Route 65 Widening**

Mitigation Measure 16.16 applies to Impacts 16.3 and 16.4.

The Tribe shall provide a fair-share contribution (7.7 percent) toward the cost to widen SR 65 to a six-lane freeway (three lanes in each direction) from Blue Oaks Boulevard to Industrial Avenue. With the implementation of this mitigation, operations along most of the study freeway mainline segments and ramp junctions would improve to an acceptable LOS. Although the northbound SR 65 on-ramp at the Whitney Ranch Parkway interchange would continue to operate at LOS F, all project-specific impacts would be fully mitigated. However, the northbound SR 65 mainline north of Twelve Bridges Drive and the northbound SR 65 mainline between Whitney Ranch Parkway and Twelve Bridges Drive would continue to operate at LOS F, with exacerbation of a preexisting unacceptable LOS. Residual impacts at these two locations are significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measure 16.17: UPRR Grade Separation**

Mitigation Measure 16.17 applies to Impact 16.6.

The Tribe shall provide a fair-share contribution toward the planning, design, and construction of one of the UPRR grade-separation structure alternatives presented in the grade separation feasibility study (KHA, 2007) (**Appendix G**). The project's fair share responsibility has been preliminarily calculated to be 34.5 percent of the total cost. The remaining costs would be shared by other planned local developments that would benefit from the grade separation. An Assessment District or other financing mechanism will be established for funding the construction of the improvements. Construction of this structure would require approval from the California Public Utility Commission and coordination with the UPRR.

### ***AIR QUALITY***

A cumulative emissions inventory of Placer County for the pollutants of concern projected for the year 2020 is presented in **Table 16-1**. Ozone precursor and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions are shown as a percentage of Placer County total emissions. California Air Resources Board (CARB) does not project emissions for Placer County beyond the year 2020; therefore 2025 project emissions were compared to 2020 countywide emissions. URBEMIS output files for cumulative year 2025 are included in **Appendix H**. Operation of the proposed project in the cumulative 2025 conditions would result in the generation of reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), and particulate matter 10 microns in size (PM<sub>10</sub>) as shown in **Table 16-2**. This would be considered a conservative comparison, since emissions of criteria air pollutants have been reduced over the last ten years due to more stringent mobile emission laws and a move towards lower-emission fuels. **Table 16-2** shows that emissions associated with the proposed project would represent less than 0.056% of Placer County total emissions for ROG; 0.0067% of the total Placer County emissions for NO<sub>x</sub>; and 0.11% of the total Placer County emissions for PM<sub>10</sub>. The incremental effect of the proposed project, when considered in conjunction with existing and other proposed projects, is a small portion of the estimated Placer County total emissions.

**TABLE 16-1  
2020 EMISSIONS INVENTORY FOR PLACER COUNTY**

Sources	Pollutant of Concern		
	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>
	tons per year		
Stationary	2,044	1,387	839.5
Area wide	2,810.5	401.5	9,526.5
Mobile	4,161	5,292.5	474.5
<b>Total Emissions</b>	<b>9,015.5</b>	<b>7,081</b>	<b>10,840.5</b>

Source: CARB, 2007

**TABLE 16-2  
2025 PROPOSED PROJECT EMISSIONS**

Emission Category	Pollutant of Concern		
	ROG	NOx	PM <sub>10</sub>
	tons per year		pounds per day
Area	0.74	1.26	0.02
Mobile	4.36	3.39	63.25
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>5.10</b>	<b>4.74</b>	<b>63.27</b>
CEQA Threshold	10	10	80
Exceeds Threshold	No	No	No
Placer County 2020 Emissions <sup>1</sup>	9,015.5	7,081	59,400
<i>Project's percentage of Countywide Total (%)</i>	<i>0.056</i>	<i>0.067</i>	<i>0.11</i>

Source: CARB, 2007; AES, 2007

While the proposed project represents a small portion of cumulative emissions in Placer County, the SIA Plan EIR indicates cumulatively significant and unavoidable effects from increases in construction emissions and mobile source criteria air pollutants, primarily from vehicular sources (ESA, 1997). The proposed project would contribute to this cumulative impact.

### ***Carbon Monoxide***

The addition of project-related traffic to expected cumulative conditions would exacerbate unacceptable operating conditions at 12 local intersections. Even with implementation of proposed mitigation measures to offset project-specific impacts at seven locations, these intersections would potentially meet CO emissions “hotspot” evaluation criteria. A cumulative impact would occur due to CO emissions.

### ***Climate Change***

With the implementation of Assembly Bill 32 in 2012, greenhouse gas emissions in California will be reduced. Additionally, with the implementation of mitigation measures in **Chapter 10.5**, project-related greenhouse gases emitted directly and indirectly would be significantly reduced. Therefore, a less than significant cumulative impact on air quality would occur due to greenhouse gas emissions.

### ***NOISE***

The proposed project would contribute to a cumulative noise impact from vehicle traffic in the SIA. This noise would represent a small increment of noise generated along area roadways. The surrounding area is zoned industrial and limits the development of sensitive receptors. The nearest sensitive receptor is located approximately 0.85 miles north of the project site. The SIA Plan EIR indicates cumulatively significant and unavoidable noise impacts due to increased traffic on area arterial roadways (ESA, 1997). The proposed project would contribute to this cumulative impact.

### ***SOILS, GEOLOGY, AND SEISMICITY***

The proposed project could cause a slight increase in the potential for erosion and sedimentation in the area, however standard erosion control measures would fully mitigate this impact. Soil available for earthwork is mildly corrosive; use of suitable soils and construction materials, recommended as Mitigation Measures 12.4 and 12.5, would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. No seismic hazards including earthquake hazards, liquefaction, and/or lateral spreading were identified. No significant cumulative impacts related to soils, geology, or seismic issues would occur as a result of the proposed project.

### ***HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY***

Because the proposed project would result in approximately two acres of additional impervious surfaces within the right of way along Athens Avenue and Thunder Valley Court, there would be a slight increase in the amount of stormwater runoff to the Auburn Ravine watershed as a result of the proposed project. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 13.1 and 13.2 would ensure that overall drainage patterns would be maintained, local flooding would not increase, and stormwater would be kept free from pollutants and sediment. The SIA Plan EIR identifies a cumulatively significant increase in the volume and duration of downstream flows in the Auburn Ravine watershed resulting from increased stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces from the future development of the SIA (ESA, 1997). The project would contribute to a minor portion of this increase despite implementation of feasible mitigation measures. Cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality from the project would occur.

### ***PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES***

#### ***Water***

The use of onsite wells would not contribute to cumulative impacts to public water providers. An expanded PCWA connection or connection to the City of Lincoln water system would increase demands on public water providers. Both PCWA and the City of Lincoln have indicated that potable water could be provided to the project site through their existing and planned infrastructure. Mitigation Measure 14.1 specifies that the Tribe would enter into a water service agreement with a water provider, which would address connection fees and commitment for water service. Future development would be required to contract with these providers under similar terms. Cumulative impacts to public water providers would be less than significant.

#### ***Wastewater***

Expansion of the onsite WWTP would not contribute to cumulative impacts to public wastewater service providers; however, connection to the City of Lincoln or City of Roseville's treatment facilities would increase demands on these agencies. Connection to the City of Lincoln Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility (WWTRF) would require infrastructure improvements to serve the proposed project and future development, which has been evaluated in the Draft South Lincoln Sewer Line Project EIR

(EIP Associates, 2005) and Addenda (City of Lincoln, 2006; PBS&J, 2007). Connection to the City of Roseville's treatment facility would require expansion of sewer infrastructure and the Pleasant Grove WWTP, which would be sized for the proposed project and future development. Mitigation Measure 14.2 provides that the Tribe contract with a wastewater service provider and pay the applicable fees for connection and needed improvements. With appropriate mitigation and planned wastewater infrastructure improvements, cumulative impacts to public wastewater service providers would be less than significant.

### ***Reclaimed Water***

The proposed project would not result in a demand for reclaimed water and thus would not contribute to cumulative impacts to reclaimed water providers.

### ***Solid Waste Disposal***

The proposed project would continue to send a portion of solid waste to the Materials Recovery Facility, where it would be sorted and processed for recycling. A portion of solid waste from the proposed project would be disposed at the Western Regional Landfill along with cumulative solid waste from existing and proposed development. The estimated closure date of the Western Regional Landfill is 2051; a 480-acre site on the west side of Fiddyment Road has been designated for future landfill expansion. As the amount of waste from the proposed project would not significantly decrease the life expectancy of the landfill, and given that landfill expansion is planned for future development, cumulative impacts to solid waste services would be less than significant.

### ***Energy***

As the proposed project can be served by PG&E and future development in the area would also be served by PG&E's electrical grid and natural gas pipelines, cumulative impacts to energy utilities would be less than significant.

### ***Parks and Recreation***

The proposed project would not increase the use of or demand for public parks or recreation facilities and thus would not contribute to cumulative impacts to these facilities.

### ***Schools***

The proposed project would not increase the use of or demand for schools and thus would not contribute to cumulative impacts to schools.

### ***Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services***

The Tribe would compensate Placer County for the demands created by the proposed project. With compensation provided per the MOU between the Tribe and Placer County, in conjunction with the implementation of environmental commitments specified in Chapter 14.3 and Mitigation Measure 14.3, cumulative impacts to fire protection and emergency medical services would be less than significant.

### ***Sheriff/Police***

The Tribe would compensate the Placer County Sheriff and California Highway Patrol for the demands created by the proposed project. With compensation provided per the MOU between the Tribe and Placer County, in conjunction with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 14.4, cumulative impacts to law enforcement services would be less than significant.

### ***Library Services***

The proposed project would not affect the use of or demand for libraries or contribute to cumulative impacts to library services.

### ***Telecommunications***

The proposed project has the potential to significantly impact a local AM radio broadcaster. Mitigation Measure 14.5 would reduce cumulative impacts to telecommunications services to a less than significant level.

### ***HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND HAZARDS***

The project site and offsite improvement area are not affected by prior hazardous materials contamination. Development of the proposed project would result in use and storage of hazardous materials, increased fire hazards, and a risk of hazardous material release from transportation or industrial accidents. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 15.1-15.11, cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials and hazards would be less than significant.