2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 Introduction

This Executive Summary is provided in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines §15123. The CEQA Guidelines state that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will contain a brief summary of the proposed project, identify each significant effect with mitigation that would reduce or avoid that effect, identify areas of known controversy and issues raised by agencies and the public, and identify issues to be resolved.

This summary includes a brief project overview, identifies alternatives considered, identifies issues of concern, and provides a summary table of environmental impacts and mitigation measures that reduce those impacts.

2.2 Project Overview

The Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision is a policy and project recommendation document that provides guidance and direction for the future design, implementation, and management of the Dry Creek Greenway. The Greenway is envisioned as a regional resource for promoting recreation and alternative transportation, providing wildlife habitat and floodwater conveyance, and maintaining or improving water quality.

The Dry Creek Greenway Region is located in western Placer County between the Placer-Sacramento County line on the south, the City of Auburn on the north and Folsom Lake on the east. The Dry Creek watershed within Placer County forms the Greenway limits. Included within the watershed are parts of Placer County, portions of the cities of Roseville and Rocklin, and the all of the Town of Loomis. Dry Creek and its tributaries, including Cirby Creek, Linda Creek, Swan Stream, Strap Ravine, Miners Ravine, Secret Ravine, Antelope Creek, and Clover Valley Creek are the more specific geographic locations for the proposed Greenway components.

As discussed in Chapter One, the Greenway Vision is intended for consideration and adoption by the County of Placer, and would serve as an advisory and informational document for the cities of Roseville and Rocklin, and the Town of Loomis. The cities of Roseville and Rocklin, and the Town of Loomis are not expected to adopt the Greenway Vision and therefore would not be subject to the mitigation measures outlined in this EIR. Specific projects (as recommended by the Greenway or through other plans) within these jurisdictions will require independent CEQA review by these jurisdictions.

The Vision includes a description of resources and components within Roseville, Rocklin, and Loomis. However, these resources and components have been included within the DEIR for informational and guidance purposes only. The proposed project for consideration and adoption pertains only to those resources and components located within the unincorporated areas of Placer County. Although this Draft EIR depicts Greenway Vision components within all four jurisdictions, the components within the unincorporated areas of Placer County are the only areas under environmental review.

The locations of these improvements are conceptual and approximate, and therefore the analysis in this Program EIR is at a program level rather than a project-site specific level.

Components of the Greenway Vision include:

- Vision and Potential Implementation Strategies
- Proposed Recreation Improvements, including:
    a. Identification of corridors for recreation, habitat, and habitat with potential recreation
    b. Paved and unpaved trails for pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian uses
    c. Corridor and trail access locations (nodes)
- Management Strategies
- Education and Stewardship
- Cost Estimates, Funding Strategies, and Phasing

The vision of the Dry Creek Greenway is for a multifunction connected open space system linking the Dry Creek Parkway in Sacramento County with Folsom Lake State Recreation Area and the uplands of the Dry Creek watershed.

The purpose of the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision is to encourage the conservation of the lands within the Greenway as a permanent connected open space system, to aid in drafting specific plans and development agreements that will be sensitive to the Greenway as development occurs adjacent to the creek, to provide guidance to homeowners interested in environmental management of their properties, to identify and prioritize corridors for possible future public acquisition, to identify consistent standards for Greenway elements, and to present a management framework for multi-jurisdictional implementation and long-term maintenance of the Greenway.

The following objectives are identified in the Greenway vision statements:

- Preserve and enhance riparian and aquatic habitats.
- Conserve and protect significant historic, cultural and scenic resources.
- Connect the Dry Creek Parkway to the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area.
- Provide for the management of Greenway resources.
- Provide active and passive recreation opportunities.
- Preserve floodwater conveyance capacity and reduce property damage due to flooding.
- Work with existing plans and policies.
- Secure funding to sustain and complete the Greenway.
- Function as a local and regional asset.
- Facilitate land use planning and management within the Greenway.

2.3 Alternatives

Alternatives to the project include an evaluation of a no project alternative and a Reduced Trails alternative. The complete discussion of alternatives and their associated impacts is contained in Section 15.1 Alternatives.

2.4 Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR discuss areas of controversy and issues raised by agencies and the public. An Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Dry Creek Greenway EIR was circulated for public review on April 1, 2005. This EIR addresses issues identified in the project's Initial Study and raised by agency and public comments to the NOP. Issues of controversy and concern that are addressed in specific EIR chapters include:

- Land Use, including conflicts with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community;
- Aesthetics, including the project's impact to the existing visual character of proposed project sites;
- Air Quality, including emissions from the project's construction;
- Noise, including the project's construction related noise;
- Biological Resources, including potential impacts to special status species, habitat, and riparian areas;
- Cultural Resources, including existence of sub-surface archeological resources;
- Hydrology and Water Quality, including potential impacts to Dry Creek and its tributaries during project construction.

2.5 Environmental Impact and Mitigation Measures

This Draft EIR uses the following terminology to denote the environmental effects of the proposed project:

Less Than Significant Impact: An impact which does not result in a substantial and adverse change in the physical environment. This impact does not require the implementation of mitigation measures.

Potentially Significant Impact: An impact that may have a "substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15382). The existence of a potentially significant impact requires mitigation to be proposed that would reduce the magnitude of the potential impact.

Significant Impact: Substantial and adverse environmental change is likely to occur. A significant impact requires mitigation to reduce the magnitude of the impact.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact: Substantial and adverse environmental change is likely to occur. While mitigation may reduce the magnitude of the impact, there is no feasible mitigation that would mitigate the impact to less than significant.

This Draft EIR examines the impacts and potentially significant environmental effects that may result from the implementation of the proposed project. Table 2-1 summarizes the proposed project's environmental impacts, the level of significance of identified impacts, any associated mitigation measures, and the resulting level of significance after mitigation. After mitigation, all environmental impacts have been reduced to a less than significant level. Chapters 4 through 14 and Section 15.7 (Cumulative Impacts) provide a detailed analysis of these impacts.

Table 2-1 — Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Topic/Impact Number	Impact Description	Significance	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
Land Use				
Impact 4-1	Conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 4-2	Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 4-3	Convert prime agricultural land to nonagricultural use, or impair the agricultural productivity of prime agricultural land; or convert unique agricultural land of statewide or local importance to nonagricultural use, or impair the productivity of unique agricultural land of statewide or local importance.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 4-4	Require a rezoning or general plan amendment in a community which has recently updated its community plan.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Biological Resources				
Impact 5-1	Adverse effect on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species.	Potentially Significant	5-1a, b, c, and d	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 5-2	Substantial adverse effect on oak trees, riparian habitat, or sensitive natural communities.	Potentially Significant	5-2a, b, c, and 5-1d	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 5-3	Substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.	Significant	5-2b, 5-1c, 5-3a, 5-1d, and 5-3b	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 5-4	Proposed project may interfere with the movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.	Potentially Significant	5-1c	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 5-5	Proposed project may conflict with local tree preservation policy or ordinance.	Potentially Significant	5-2a	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 5-6	The proposed project would conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	Less than Significant	None Required	--

Topic/Impact Number	Impact Description	Significance	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
Cultural Resources				
Impact 6-1	Impacts to known prehistoric or historic resources	Potentially Significant	6-1	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 6-2	Impacts to unknown prehistoric or historic resources	Potentially Significant	6-2	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 6-3	Impacts to paleontological resources	Potentially Significant	6-3	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Visual Resources				
Impact 7-1	The project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and the surroundings.	Potentially Significant	7-1	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 7-2	The project would create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Transportation and Circulation				
Impact 8-1	Creation of a substantial increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 8-2	Exceed the LOS standard established by the County.	Potentially Significant	8-2	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 8-3	Substantially increase hazards due to design features.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 8-4	Result in inadequate emergency access.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 8-5	Result in inadequate parking capacity.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 8-6	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.	Less than Significant	None Required	--

Topic/Impact Number	Impact Description	Significance	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
Air Quality				
Impact 9-1	Construction related emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM10 may exceed significance thresholds on a temporary basis during construction.	Potentially Significant	9-1a and b	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 9-2	Construction of the project would result in objectionable odors.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 9-3	Operation of Greenway projects after construction would create emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM10 that may exceed significance thresholds.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 9-4	Consistency with air quality plans.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Noise				
Impact 10-1	Temporary construction-related noise.	Potentially Significant	10-1a, b, c, and d	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 10-2	Bikeway operation noise.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Soils, Geology, and Seismicity				
Impact 11-1	Topographic alteration resulting from earth grading.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 11-2	Potential for increased erosion during and after construction.	Potentially Significant	11-2	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 11-3	Seismic impacts.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 11-4	Mineral resources rendered inaccessible.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Hydrology and Water Quality				
Impact 12-1	Grading and construction impacts to water quality.	Potentially Significant	12-1a and b	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 12-2	Post-construction storm water runoff impacts on water quality.	Potentially Significant	12-2	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant

Topic/Impact Number	Impact Description	Significance	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
Impact 12-3	Increased runoff leading to localized or downstream flooding.	Potentially Significant	12-3	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 12-4	Impacts to groundwater resources.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 12-5	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.	Potentially Significant	12-5	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Public Services and Utilities				
Impact 13-1	Increased demand for Fire and Sheriff's protection services.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 13-2	Impact on solid waste collection.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 13-3	Increased demand for electric supply and distribution.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 13-4	Impacts to parks and recreational facilities.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
Impact 14-1	Exposure of people or the environment to hazards or hazardous materials related to the presence of existing or unknown hazards related to past land uses in or near proposed project sites.	Potentially Significant	14-1	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 14-2	Exposure of people or the environment to hazards or hazardous materials related to the storage and accidental release of hazardous substances during construction.	Potentially Significant	14-2 a and b	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 14-3	Exposure of people or structures to wildland fires.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 14-4	Exposure of Greenway users to vector borne diseases.	Potentially Significant	14-4 a and b	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 Introduction

The Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision is a policy and project recommendation document that provides guidance and direction for the future design, implementation, and management of the Dry Creek Greenway. The Greenway is envisioned as a regional resource for promoting recreation and alternative transportation, providing wildlife habitat and floodwater conveyance, and maintaining or improving water quality.

The vision of the Dry Creek Greenway is for a multifunction connected open space system linking the Dry Creek Parkway in Sacramento County with Folsom Lake State Recreation Area and the uplands of the Dry Creek watershed. Creation of an off-street trail system along the southern streams within the Greenway would form the final link in a sixty to seventy mile recreational trail loop uniting the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area, the American River Parkway, the Ueda Parkway, the Dry Creek Parkway, and the Dry Creek Greenway. Additionally, establishment of the Greenway would help preserve and enhance the existing water quality, aquatic habitat, riparian habitat, and flood capacity of the creeks. Preservation and enhancement of riparian corridors would also help maintain wildlife migration routes from the Sacramento valley to the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

As discussed in Chapter One, the Greenway Vision is intended for consideration and adoption by the County of Placer, and would serve as an advisory and informational document for the cities of Roseville and Rocklin, and the Town of Loomis. The cities of Roseville and Rocklin, and the Town of Loomis are not intending to adopt the Greenway Vision and therefore would not be subject to the mitigation measures outlined in this EIR. Specific projects (as recommended by the Greenway or through other plans) within these jurisdictions will require independent CEQA review by these jurisdictions.

The project description that follows includes resources and components within Roseville, Rocklin, and Loomis. However, these resources and components have been included for informational and guidance purposes only. The proposed project pertains only to those resources and components located within the unincorporated areas of Placer County. Although this Draft EIR depicts Greenway Vision components within all four jurisdictions, the Dry Creek watershed within the unincorporated areas of Placer County are the only areas under environmental review.

The Greenway Vision consists of vision statements that identify the shared open space values of the jurisdictions that exist in the Dry Creek watershed within Placer County. In addition to the Vision Statements, the Greenway document includes potential implementation strategies that serve as a reference for the local jurisdictions to utilize for policy language and project suggestions. The Greenway Vision also includes proposed recreation improvements, including the designation of Greenway corridors along Dry Creek and its tributaries, off-street trail types and general locations, and connection/staging points (nodes). The locations of these improvements are conceptual and approximate, and therefore the analysis in this Program EIR is at a program level rather than a project-site specific level.