2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Executive Summary chapter of the EIR provides an overview of the Rancho Del Oro Estates (See Chapter 3, Project Description, for further detail) and summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis provided in Chapters 4 through 14. This chapter also reviews the alternatives to the proposed project that are described in Chapter 15, Alternatives Analysis, and identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Table 2-1, found at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental effects of the proposed project, which are identified in each technical chapter of this Draft EIR. Table 2-1 contains the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, the significance of the impacts, the proposed mitigation measures for the impacts, and the significance of the impacts after implementation of the mitigation measures.

2.1 Summary Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives

The proposed project, which is surrounded on three sides by existing or approved residential development, seeks to preserve natural resources to the extent feasible while helping to complete land use planning for the stretch of Olive Ranch Road in the western portion of the Granite Bay Community Plan (GBCP). The proposed project includes the development of 89 residential single-family lots and nine common area lots, Lots A through I, on a total of 119.4 acres. All lots would be a minimum of 42,000 square feet, or roughly one acre, in size.

The Placer County General Plan (PCGP) and the GBCP currently designate the project site as Rural Low Density Residential (0.9 to 2.3 acres per unit) DL-0.83. The existing Placer County zoning designation for the proposed project site is Residential Single-Family, Combining Agricultural, Combining Minimum Building Site of 100,000 square feet, Combining Planned Development 0.83 dwelling units per acre (RS-AG-B-100 PD 0.83). The applicant is requesting a rezone that would remove the Agriculture, Building Site, and Planned Residential Development combining districts, and would add the Density Limitation combining district to the existing RS zone district, in order to create 89 single-family lots.

No Project – No Build Alternative

CEQA requires the evaluation of the comparative impacts of the "No Project" alternative (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e]). Analysis of the No Project Alternative "[…] shall discuss […] existing conditions […] as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services." (*Id.*, subd. [e][2]) "If the project is other than a land use or regulatory plan, for example a development project on identifiable property, the 'no project' alternative is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Here the discussion would compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in the property's existing

state versus environmental effects that would occur if the project were approved." (*Id.*, subd. [e][3][B])

The No Project – No Build Alternative is defined in this chapter as the continuation of the existing condition of the project site, which is currently vacant and undeveloped. The No Project – No Build Alternative would allow the project site to continue in the site's existing state, which is undeveloped oak woodland and annual grasslands. The No Project – No Build Alternative would not meet any of the proposed project objectives.

Base Zoning Alternative

The Base Zoning Alternative would include development of the project site under the existing RS-AG-B-100 PD 0.83 zoning designation. The Base Zoning Alternative would include 40 residential single-family lots, two open space lots, and a common area parcel, approximately two acres, containing a sewer pump station and bio swale stormwater treatment basin. The two open space parcels would provide 6.27 acres of year round drainage and wetland setback location in the southeastern portion of the property, and 9.9 acres of floodplain and open space south of Miners Ravine. In addition, the Base Zoning Alternative would require the same off-site sewer infrastructure and water quality treatment as the proposed project.

Planned Development Alternative

The Planned Development Alternative would result in the development of the project as a Planned Residential Development (PD) consistent with Article 17.54.080 of the Placer County Code. The Planned Development Alternative would allow for the development of up to 63 residential lots, ranging in size from 17,000 square feet (0.4 acres), to 39,000 square feet (0.9 acres), with an average size of 23,800 square feet (0.5 acres). The internal circulation system would include a single gated access road off of Olive Ranch Road across from Ramsgate Drive. The Planned Development Alternative would include a 53.9-acre open space parcel in the western portion of the site (including preservation of 38 blue oak woodland trees), a 7.4-acre open space parcel along the southern portion of Miners Ravine, and a two-acre common area parcel with a sewer pump facility and bio swale stormwater treatment basin. In addition, a 3.3 acre on-site private park/wetland preserve would be included in the eastern portion of the site.

2.2 Environmental Impacts and Proposed and Recommended Mitigation

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a significant effect on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, mineral, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. Implementation of the proposed project could result in significant impacts on the resource areas listed below.

This Draft EIR requires mitigation measures to be implemented as part of the proposed project to reduce potential adverse impacts to a less-than-significant level. Such mitigation measures are noted in this Draft EIR and are found in the following chapters: Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Visual Resources; Transportation and Circulation; Air Quality; Noise; Soils, Geology

and Seismicity; Hydrology and Water Quality; Public Services and Utilities; and Hazardous Materials and Hazards chapters, as well as in the Initial Study for the project. If an impact is determined to be significant or potentially significant, applicable mitigation measures are identified, as appropriate. The mitigation measures are also summarized in Table 2-1, at the end of this chapter. The mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR will form the basis of the Mitigation Monitoring Plan. An impact that remains significant after implementation of mitigation measures is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

Land Use

The Land Use chapter assesses the compatibility of the proposed project with surrounding land uses, as well as adopted plans and policies, both existing and proposed. The evaluation is based upon a thorough review of the PCGP, the GBCP, the County Zoning Ordinance, and other appropriate documents to address compliance issues.

The proposed project would be consistent with the land uses allowed for the site under the GBCP, and because the proposed project includes compliance with the GBCP policies, a less-than-significant impact is expected to occur. However, the applicant is requesting an entitlement to modify the existing zoning designation for the site in order to allow for development of 89 single-family lots. Furthermore, the project would require a rezone to accommodate the uses proposed for the project; should the County approve the proposed rezone, the proposed project would be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance. Given the land use controls and development standards presently in use within Placer County, and the consistency of the project with the policies found in the GBCP, cumulative land use impacts would be less than significant.

Biological Resources

The Biological Resources chapter of the Draft EIR evaluates the biological resources known to occur or potentially occur within the Rancho Del Oro Estates project site. The chapter describes potential impacts to the resources, and identifies measures to eliminate or substantially reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. The Biological Resources chapter is based on an assessment prepared by Foothills Associates of existing plant communities, wetlands, wildlife habitats, and potential for special-status species and communities that are located in the project area.

The Biological Resources chapter concluded that impacts related to special-status fish species, western spadefoot, horned lizard, and conflicts with local policies and ordinances were less-than-significant. The following impacts are identified as potentially significant: special-status plants; freshwater invertebrates; valley elderberry longhorn beetle; western burrowing owl; raptors and migratory birds; oak woodland communities and significant trees; and impacts to jurisdictional wetlands or other waters of the U.S. However, implementation of mitigation measures included in the Draft EIR, as well as applicable goals and policies in the PCGP and the GBCP, would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Cumulative loss of biological resources in Placer County and the effects of ongoing urbanization in the region were found to be significant and unavoidable, therefore, mitigation measures are not feasible.

Cultural Resources

The Cultural Resources chapter describes cultural resources known to be located within the Rancho Del Oro Estates project area. Prehistoric resources are those sites and artifacts associated with indigenous, non-Euroamerican populations, generally prior to contact with people of European descent. Historical resources include structures, features, artifacts, and sites that date from Euroamerican settlement of the region. The Cultural Resources chapter is based on studies prepared by Ric Windmiller, R.P.A. and the Genesis Society. The chapter evaluates if the proposed project could remove, damage, or destroy existing cultural resources.

The Cultural Resources chapter concluded that the disturbance or destruction of archaeological or historical resources within the project area would be potentially significant, but with the implementation of mitigation measures, the impacts would be less-than-significant. Cumulative impacts related to disturbance or destruction of previously unknown archaeological resources in combination with other development in Placer County would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Visual Resources

This Visual Resources chapter of the Draft EIR describes existing visual and aesthetic resources for the project area and the region, and evaluates potential aesthetic impacts of the project. In addition, the Visual Resources chapter describes any scenic vistas, scenic resources (such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway), that exist within the project area. Creation of new sources of light and glare, and the effects upon the surrounding vicinity are also evaluated in the Visual Resources chapter.

The Visual Resources analysis concludes that impacts to scenic vistas and scenic resources, as well as the existing visual character or quality of the site and surroundings would be less-than-significant. Impacts associated with new sources of light and glare would be potentially significant; however, with implementation of the required mitigation measures in the Draft EIR, the impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Cumulative impacts associated with long-term impacts to the visual character of the region would be less-than-significant.

Transportation and Circulation

The Transportation and Circulation chapter discusses existing and cumulative transportation and circulation conditions associated with the Rancho Del Oro Estates project, assessed by Omni-Means, Ltd. The Transportation and Circulation chapter analysis includes consideration of automobile traffic impacts on roadway capacity, transit impacts, bicycle impacts, and pedestrian impacts.

The Traffic and Circulation chapter concluded that impacts related to study intersections and roadways from the Existing Plus Project scenario, to Existing Plus Project Plus Bayside Church Expansion Plus the Grove at Granite Bay Project Conditions, cut-through traffic**,** modified site access, transit facilities, emergency vehicle access, vehicular safety from design features or incompatible uses, and impacts resulting from inadequate parking capacity would be less than

significant. In addition, the chapter concluded that air traffic patterns would not have an impact on the proposed project. Impacts associated with traffic flow from construction traffic associated with development of the project site, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be potentially significant. However, with the implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less-than-significant. Cumulative impacts to the study area intersections and roadway segments resulting from project implementation would be potentially significant. However, with the implementation of mitigation measures provided in the Draft EIR, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Air Quality

The Air Quality chapter of the Draft EIR describes the impacts of the proposed project on local and regional air quality. The chapter describes existing air quality, construction-related air quality impacts resulting from grading and equipment emissions, direct and indirect emissions associated with the proposed project, the impacts of these emissions on both the local and regional scale, and mitigation measures warranted to reduce or eliminate any identified significant impacts.

During the construction phase, the proposed project's impacts related to fugitive particulate matter emissions and impacts related to a temporary increase in NO_X emissions would be potentially significant. However, with implementation of the required mitigation measures, the impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Operation of the proposed project would not be expected to create any potentially significant air quality impacts.

GHG emission estimates from an individual project have a relatively high uncertainty. In addition, the potential affects of current and future regulations on CO_2 emissions attributable to the project and cumulative CO_2 emissions from other sources in the State cannot be quantified. Furthermore, the way in which CO_2 emissions associated with the project might or might not influence actual physical effects of global climate change cannot be determined. For these reasons, whether the project would generate a substantial increase in GHG emissions relative to existing conditions, and whether emissions from the project would make a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the cumulative impact of global climate change is uncertain and inherently speculative.

Therefore, in light of Placer County's policies throughout the PCGP that promote sustainability and reduction of GHG emissions, which would reduce County-wide GHG emissions, the proposed project's inclusion of GHG reduction strategies, and the speculative nature of determining "new" GHG emissions from the project on a global scale, the proposed project is considered to have a less-than-significant impact on the cumulative global climate change.

Noise

The Noise chapter is based on an environmental noise assessment performed by j.c. brennan & associates, Inc. The Noise chapter describes the existing noise environment in the project vicinity, and identifies potential impacts and mitigation measures related to the construction and operation of the Rancho Del Oro Estates project. The method by which the potential impacts are

analyzed is discussed, followed by the identification of potential impacts and the recommended mitigation measures designed to reduce significant impacts to levels that are less than significant.

The Noise chapter concluded that impacts from future noise-sensitive uses (proposed residential lots) that would add to the existing transportation noise levels, exceeding County standards, would be less-than-significant. In addition, project-related increases in traffic noise levels would be less-than-significant. The Noise chapter concluded that construction noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors would be potentially significant; however, with the implementation of the mitigation measure provided in the Draft EIR, would result in a less-than-significant impact. Cumulative impacts associated with increase in project vicinity noise levels would result in less-than-significant impacts.

Soils, Geology and Seismicity

The Soils, Geology, and Seismicity chapter describes the geologic and soil characteristics of the project site and evaluated the extent to which implementation of the proposed project could be affected by seismic hazards such as ground shaking, liquefaction, and expansive soil characteristics. The analysis also addresses potential effects of the proposed project on erosion. The Soils, Geology, and Seismicity chapter was assessed by Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc.

The Soils, Geology, and Seismicity chapter concluded that impacts related to seismic activity would be less than significant. The following impacts are identified as potentially significant: loss of structural support due to liquefaction; structural damage from potentially expansive soils; and construction-related increases in soil erosion. However, implementation of mitigation measures included in the Draft EIR, as well as applicable goals and policies in the PCGP and the GBCP would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Cumulative impacts associated with long-term geologic and seismic impacts from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Granite Bay area would result in less-than-significant impacts.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Hydrology and Water Quality chapter of the proposed project Draft EIR describes existing drainage and water resources for the project site, and evaluates potential impacts of the project with respect to flooding, surface water resources, and groundwater resources. The Hydrology and Water Quality chapter was based on a preliminary drainage report prepared by A.R. Associates.

The Hydrology and Water Quality chapter identified the following impacts as potentially significant: project impacts to the existing drainage pattern and surface runoff; construction-related impacts to surface water quality; operational water quality degradation associated with urban runoff from the project site; exposure of people and structures to flood hazards on the project site; and potential impacts to important local surface water resources. However, implementation of mitigation measures included in the Draft EIR, as well as applicable goals and policies in the PCGP and the GBCP, would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Cumulative impacts associated with long-term increases in peak stormwater runoff flow and

flooding related to the proposed project and in combination with existing and future developments in Placer County would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Public Services and Utilities

The Public Services and Utilities chapter of the Draft EIR describes the public service systems and facilities within the project area and the associated potential impacts resulting from Rancho Del Oro Estates project. Public services considered in the analysis include water, wastewater, reclaimed water, gas and electricity/telephone/cable, schools, fire protection and emergency medical services, law enforcement, and other governmental services.

The Public Services and Utilities chapter concluded that impacts related to adequate gas and electricity/cable/telephone services for the proposed project, adequate governmental services available for new residents, and adequate library services available for new residents would be less-than-significant. The following impacts are identified as potentially significant: adequate water supply and delivery for new residents, adequate wastewater facilities for new residents, impacts related to current schools, fire protection and emergency medical services available to new residents, and adequate ratio of law enforcement personnel to residents. However, implementation of mitigation measures included in the Draft EIR, as well as applicable goals and policies in the PCGP and the GBCP, would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Cumulative impacts to public services and utilities impacts were found to be potentially significant due to impacts related to wastewater conveyance under buildout conditions; however, implementation of the mitigation measures included in this Draft EIR would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Hazardous Materials and Hazards

The Hazardous Materials and Hazards chapter of the Draft EIR describes existing and potentially occurring hazards and hazardous materials within the project area. The chapter discusses potential impacts posed by these hazards to the environment, as well as to workers, visitors, and residents within and adjacent to the project area. More specifically, the chapter describes potential effects on human health that could result from adjacent wildland and soil contamination stemming from past uses of the site, or from exposure to hazardous materials. The Hazardous Materials and Hazards chapter was based on a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and a Phase II Soil Investigation, both prepared by Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc.

The Hazardous Materials and Hazards chapter concludes that impacts related to the following issues would be less than significant: impacts related to exposure to naturally occurring asbestos; and impact related wildland fires. In addition, impacts related to soil contamination are identified as potentially significant, however, with the implementation of mitigation measures provided in the Draft EIR, would result in a less-than-significant impact. Cumulative impacts associated with long-term hazards-related impacts from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Granite Bay area would result in less-than-significant impacts.

The issues addressed in the Draft EIR are those identified in the Initial Study as potentially significant and requiring additional analysis. The remaining environmental issues were addressed in the Initial Study, which is included as Appendix C.

2.3 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

The following section presents a summary of the evaluation and alternatives considered for the proposed project, which include:

- No Project – No Build Alternative;
- Base Zoning Alternative; and
- Planned Development Alternative.

Summary of Alternatives Evaluation

Under the No Project – No Build Alternative, the project site would remain vacant, undeveloped land. However, because the project site is anticipated for development with urban uses based on the existing land use designations, denial of the project would likely result in the proposal of another project.

The Base Zoning Alternative would include development of the project site under the existing RS-AG-B-100 PD 0.83 zoning designation. The Base Zoning Alternative would include 40 residential single-family lots with 2.3-acre minimum lot sizes, two open space lots, and a common area parcel containing a sewer pump station and bio swale storm water treatment basin. The Base Zoning Alternative would result in a reduction in total external traffic trips. Fewer traffic trips would result in a less intense impact to surrounding intersections and roadway segments. In comparison to the proposed project, the Base Zoning Alternative would still result in impacts to pedestrian and bicycle circulation, as well as traffic impacts related to construction of the project. Development of the Base Zoning Alternative would be similar to the proposed project in that this alternative would result in irreversible urbanization of the site and alter the existing visual character.

The Planned Development Alternative would result in the development of the project as a Planned Residential Development (PD) consistent with Article 17.54.080 of the Placer County Code. The Planned Development Alternative would allow for the development of up to 62 residential lots, ranging in size from 17,000 square feet (0.4 acres) to 39,000 square feet (0.9 acres), with an average size of 23,800 square feet (See Figure 15-2). The internal circulation system would include two single gated access points off Olive Ranch Road. The Planned Development Alternative would include a 53.9-acre open space parcel in the western portion of the site, including preservation of 38 blue oak woodland trees on the project site; a 7.4-acre open space parcel along the southern portion of Miners Ravine; and a 2.0-acre common area parcel with a sewer pump facility and bioswale stormwater treatment basin. In addition, a 3.3-acre on-site private park/wetland preserve would be included in the eastern portion of the site. The Planned Development Alternative would develop approximately 50 percent of the site, and buildout of the Planned Development Alternative would include the development of 62 single-

family residential units, which would be less than the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would not fully satisfy any of the project objectives.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

The Planned Development Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative to the Proposed Project because the Planned Development Alternative would result in the addition of fewer vehicle trips to the project area, and air quality and noise impacts would be reduced due to the reduction of vehicle trips. The Planned Development Alternative would include an 8.9-acre open space area that crosses the site and preserves an existing stream corridor, an 8.3-acre wetland, and 53.9 acres of open space to the west. In addition, the Planned Development Alternative would include the preservation of 38 blue oak woodland trees on the project site. Therefore, the land use impacts resulting from the Planned Development Alternative would be fewer, as compared to the Proposed Project.

2.4 Areas of Controversy

Areas of controversy that are identified as a concern in comments received at the public scoping meeting held on October 15, 2008 on the proposed project include the following:

- Density of the proposed project as compared to density under the current zoning for the site;
- Compatibility with surrounding land uses, especially those designated for agricultural uses;
- Impacts to rare, endangered, candidate, sensitive, and special-status species within the project site;
- Impacts to existing jurisdictional waters and wetlands;
- Impacts to steelhead and salmon migration;
- Potential disturbance or destruction of cultural and/or historical resources on the project site;
- Aesthetic impacts of the project to the existing surrounding neighborhoods, including the proposed construction of a soundwall;
- Increased traffic in the vicinity of the project site, including within existing residential neighborhoods, as a result of the proposed project;
- Increased stormwater runoff and potential flooding as a result of grading associated with the proposed project; and
- Availability of sufficient water supply for the proposed project.

2.5 Issues to be Resolved

The issues and concerns identified above are resolved / addressed in the following chapters:

- Land Use;
- Biological Resources;
- Cultural Resources;

- Visual Resources;
- Traffic and Circulation;
- Hydrology and Water Quality; and
- Public Services and Utilities.

The following table (Table 2-1) summarizes the impacts identified in the environmental section of this Draft EIR. In Table 2-1, the proposed project impacts are identified for each technical chapter (Chapters 4 through 14) in the Draft EIR and the Initial Study. In addition, Table 2-1 includes the level of significance of each impact, any mitigation measures required for each impact, and the resulting level of significance after implementation of mitigation measures for each impact.

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
4. Land Use					
4-1	Compliance with the GBCP.	LS	*None required.*		N/A
4-2	Compliance with the Placer County Zoning Ordinance.	LS	*None required.*		N/A
4-3	Compatibility with existing adjacent land uses and resources.	LS	*None required.*		N/A
5. Biological Resources					
5-1	Impacts to special-status plants.	PS	*5-1*	*Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, focused surveys shall be performed in order to determine the presence or absence of the following special-status plant species: Ahart's dwarf rush, Bogg's Lake hedge-hyssop, dwarf downingia, legenere, pincushion navarretia, and/or Sanford's arrowhead. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the identification periods for all of the special-status plant species listed above. If any of the special-status plant species are found, a mitigation plan conceived from consultation with the appropriate agencies shall be prepared. The plan shall detail the various mitigation approaches to ensure no net loss of*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		special-status plants. Mitigation could include, but would not be limited to, avoidance of the plant species, salvage of plant materials where possible, acquisition of credits at an approved mitigation bank, or acquisition and preservation of property that supports the plant species.	
5-2 Impacts to special-status fish species.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
5-3 Impacts to freshwater invertebrates.	PS	*5-3(a)* *If impacts to invertebrate habitat cannot be avoided, prior to issuance of a grading permit, protocol-level surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine the presence or absence of freshwater invertebrate species, for the review and approval of the Planning Department. If the species are absent and USFWS accepts the survey findings, further mitigation is not necessary. If the species are present (or if the project applicant chooses to assume presence without conducting the surveys), the applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 5-3(b).* *5-3(b)* *Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall coordinate with USFWS to determine appropriate vernal pool habitat*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
				mitigation for project impacts. Typically, the USFWS requires compensatory mitigation for impacts to these species at a 3:1 ratio (2:1 preservation and 1:1 creation). Mitigation could include, but would not be limited to, on-site or off-site preservation and creation of seasonal wetlands or purchase of seasonal wetland credits at a qualified mitigation bank.	
5-4	Impacts to valley elderberry longhorn beetle.	PS	*5-4*	*Prior to the initiation of any construction activities that could impact elderberry shrubs, ground disturbance activities shall be restricted by constructing a 100-foot buffer around any existing elderberry shrubs on-site. The 100-foot buffer shall include installation of protective fencing around existing elderberry shrubs. Should avoidance of one or more of the shrubs be infeasible, the applicant(s) shall consult with the USFWS to determine if authorization is needed to remove the elderberry shrubs.*	LS
5-5	Impacts to western burrowing owl.	PS	*5-5(a)*	*Prior to issuance of a grading permit, pre-construction burrowing owl surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to initiation of construction activities on the project site and within 250 feet of the project*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		site boundary. Presence or signs of burrowing owls and all potentially occupied burrows shall be recorded and monitored according to CDFG and California Burrowing Owl Consortium guidelines. If burrowing owls are not detected by sign or direct observation, further mitigation is not necessary. If burrowing owls are detected, the project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 5-5(b).	
		5-5(b) *Prior to initiation of any construction activities, a 250-foot buffer zone shall be established around each burrow with an active nest until the young have fledged and are able to exit the burrow. In the case of occupied burrows without active nesting, active burrows after the young have fledged, or if development commences after the breeding season (February 1 to August 31), passive relocation, which involves installing a one-way door at the burrow entrance to encourage the owls to move from the occupied burrow, shall be performed. The CDFG shall be consulted for current guidelines and methods for passive relocation of any owls found on the site.*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
5-6	Impacts to raptors and migratory birds.	PS	*5-6(a)*	*Prior to issuance of a grading permit, if construction is expected to occur during the raptor nesting season (February 1 to August 31), a pre-construction raptor survey shall be performed to determine if active raptor nests are present on-site. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist not more than 30 days prior to the onset of construction activities. If active raptor nests are not found on or within 500 feet of the project site, further mitigation is not necessary. In addition, if construction activities are proposed to occur during the non-breeding season (September 1 to January 31), a survey is not required and further studies are not necessary. However, if active raptor nests are found on or within 500 feet of the site, the project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 5-6(b).*	LS
			5-6(b)	*During construction, construction activities shall not occur within 500 feet of the active raptor nests until the young have fledged or until the biologist has determined that the nest is not active any longer.*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		5-6(c) *Prior to issuance of a grading permit, if any vegetation removal is expected to occur as a result of the project during the typical avian nesting season (February 1 to August 31), a pre-construction survey shall be performed to determine if active migratory bird nests are present on-site. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist not more than two weeks prior to the onset of vegetation removal. If active migratory bird nests are found on-site, disturbance or removal of the nest shall be avoided until the young have fledged and the nest is not active any longer.* *It should be noted that extensive buffers, such as those recommended for nesting raptors, are not necessary for nesting avian species protected solely by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. However, depending on the bird species, site conditions, and the proposed construction activities near an active nest, a small buffer could be prescribed, as determined by the biologist. Alternatively, vegetation removal could be scheduled to avoid all potential impacts. Vegetation removal conducted between September 1 and January 31 will prevent*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			impacts to nesting birds and unfledged young.	
5-7	Impacts to western spadefoot.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
5-8	Impacts to California horned lizard.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
5-9	Impacts to oak woodland communities and significant trees.	PS	*5-9(a) To mitigate oak woodland losses within the development footprint and to account for habitat fragmentation, the project applicant shall make an in-lieu payment to the County consisting of two separate components, one for the higher value blue oak woodland (37.34 acres), and one lower per-acre payment for the poor quality live oak woodland (40.24 acres) on the project site, along with the very small amounts of valley oak woodland (0.06 acres) and mixed oak woodland (1.27 acres). The payment shall be equivalent to the fair market value of a conservation easement on oak woodland property in Placer County, with such fair market value established at the time of approval of the tentative subdivision map for the project. The in-lieu payment shall be paid at the time set forth below. The funds will include both a conservation component and an in perpetuity management component. These funds will be used by the County to purchase conservation easements to other in-*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		kind oak woodlands in the County. *5-9(b)* *Each "significant" oak tree (24 inches dbh or greater) identified for removal shall be replaced in the following manner:* *1) Subdivision Improvements. For the 69 significant oak trees to be removed because of subdivision improvements, the project shall include planting of on-site 24-inch boxes and 15-gallon trees (cumulatively 25 percent), 5-gallon trees (25 percent), and D-pots (50percent) at the ratios outlined in Table 5-2 (See Chapter 5, Biological Resources, of this EIR).* *Mitigation tree planting shall occur in two open space areas specified on the project site. These planting areas on-site, once planted with replacement oak trees, will also serve as replacement habitat for oak woodland values lost on the project site. Mitigation tree planting shall be installed by the applicant and inspected and approved by the DRC prior to acceptance of*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		improvements by the Engineering and Surveying Department. At its discretion, the DRC may establish an alternate deadline for installation of mitigation replacement trees if weather or other circumstances prevent the completion of this requirement. *2) Lot Development. A total of 2,131 inches of significant oak trees could be potentially impacted by lot development in the project within building lot setbacks on individual lots. Although the actual inches of oak tree impact from lot development may be substantially less than this total of impacted inches, all 2,131 inches of significant oak trees will be assumed removed for mitigation purposes, at $100.00 per inch at breast height, for a total mitigation of $213,100 for impacts to significant oak trees in individual lots.* *Total in-lieu payments (less the amount set forth below) for oak tree mitigation, for both oak woodland impacts and impacts to significant oak trees not mitigated on-site (i.e., for*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		subdivision improvement impacts) shall be totaled and divided by the number of total residential lots in the project, and paid on a per lot basis at building permit issuance for each lot. Each lot will thus pay a fair share of costs of oak tree and oak woodland mitigation costs distributed over the entire project site, except for the in-lieu payment for direct impacts to oak woodland acreage affected by subdivision improvements, or 5.27 acres, which will be paid in lump sum at the time of approval of improvement plans for the project.	
5-10 Impacts to jurisdictional wetlands or other waters of the United States.	PS	*5-10(a)* *To the extent feasible, the project shall be designed and constructed to avoid and minimize adverse effects to waters of the United States or jurisdictional waters of the State of California within the project area.* *5-10(b)* *Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the project site, a Section 404 permit for fill of jurisdictional wetlands shall be acquired, and mitigation for impacts to jurisdictional waters that cannot be avoided shall conform with the USACE "no-net-loss" policy and the USACE Regulatory*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Guidance Letter No. 02-2 establishing policies and guidance on appropriate mitigation for impacts to jurisdictional waters. Mitigation for impacts to both federal and State jurisdictional waters shall be addressed using these guidelines. *If a Section 404 permit is obtained, the applicant must also obtain a water quality certification from the RWQCB under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA).* *5-10(c) Prior to the issuance of a grading permit that would affect any stream crossing, or bed, bank or associated riparian vegetation of the riverine perennial marsh, riverine riparian wetland, or Miners Ravine, a Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be entered into by the applicant, for the review and approval of the CDFG.*	
5-11 Impacts related to conflicts with local policies and ordinances.	LS	*None required.*	N/A

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6. Cultural Resources			
6-1 Implementation of the proposed project may directly impact a portion of archaeological site CA-PLA-1870 (RDO#1) by road construction, grading and trenching, and may directly impact a portion of archaeological site CA-PLA-1871 (RDO#2a) by grading and trenching.	PS	*6-1 If any portion of archaeological site CA-PLA-1870 (RDO#1) and/or CA-PLA-1871 (RDO#2a) will be directly impacted by grading and trenching, and avoidance is not feasible, then a data recovery plan shall be prepared for each affected site by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric archaeology. Each data recovery plan must consider the results and recommendations in the Evaluation of Archaeological Sites CA-PLA-1870, CA-PLA-1871 & CA-PLA-1873, Rancho Del Oro Development, Placer County, California, which was prepared for the project in March 2009. Each data recovery plan shall be adopted by the County and all proposed field work outlined in the plan, including changes in field work strategy deemed necessary by the archaeologist due to the changing nature of discoveries, must be completed prior to any ground-disturbing activity within 25 feet of each respective archaeological site. Analysis of the finds and preparation of a final data recovery technical report for each site must meet current*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		professional standards.	
6-2 Implementation of the proposed project may directly impact archaeological site RDO#2b by ground-disturbing activity.	PS	*6-2 If any portion of archaeological site RDO#2b will be directly impacted by ground disturbing activity including filling, and avoidance by direct burial of the site is not feasible, then the surface of the site's cultural deposit shall be first covered with chain link fencing placed flat on the ground surface and then covered with soil that is chemically compatible with the cultural deposit. An archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric archaeology shall monitor on-site placement of the chain link fencing and burial of the archaeological site. If direct burial of the site or other means of avoidance is not feasible, then the archaeologist must prepare a data recovery plan. The data recovery plan must be adopted by the County and all proposed field work outlined in the plan, including necessary changes in the field work strategy as work progresses, must be completed prior to any ground-disturbing activity within 25 feet of the archaeological site. Analysis of the finds and preparation of a final data recovery technical report for the site must meet current professional*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
				standards.	
6-3	Implementation of the proposed project may indirectly impact portions of those archaeological sites eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources and located within the open space.	PS	*6-3*	*The covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs) for the project shall include a prohibition against any excavation or collecting of artifacts within the open space.*	LS
6-4	Disturbance or destruction of previously unknown archaeological resources within the vicinity of the project site.	PS	*6-4*	*Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor excavation activities associated with the proposed project. The monitor shall be approved by the Placer County Planning Department. Monitoring shall consist of directly watching the major excavation process. Monitoring shall occur during the entire work day, and shall continue on a daily basis until a depth of excavation has been reached at which resources could not occur. This depth is estimated as usually about five feet below grade at the beginning of the project, but may require modification in specific cases, and shall be determined by the monitoring archaeologist based on observed soil conditions. Spot checks shall*		LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		consist of partial monitoring of the progress of excavation over the course of the project. During spot checks, all spoils material, open excavations, recently grubbed areas, and other soil disturbances shall be inspected to determine if cultural materials are present. The frequency and duration of spot checks shall be based on the relative sensitivity of the exposed soils and active work areas. The monitoring archaeologist shall determine the relative sensitivity of the parcel. If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area. *Equipment stoppages shall only involve those pieces of equipment that have actually encountered significant or potentially significant deposits, and should not be construed to mean a stoppage of all equipment on the site unless the cultural deposit covers the entire building site. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s). If the discovery consists of*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect shall be provided on the Improvement Plans for the project. Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.	
7. Visual Resources			
7-1 Impacts to scenic vistas and scenic resources.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
7-2 Impacts related to the existing visual character or quality of the site and surroundings.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
7-3 Impacts associated with new sources of light and glare.	PS	*7-3 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the developer shall submit a lighting plan for the review and approval of the Placer County Building*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Official. The lighting plan shall include shielding on all light fixtures and shall address limiting light trespass and glare through the use of shielding and directional lighting methods, including but not limited to, fixture location and height. The lighting plan shall comply with the Placer County Design Guidelines for lighting, including, but not limited to, the following: • *Maximum height for building and freestanding lighting should not exceed 14 feet.* • *If property is adjacent to a residential area or residentially zoned property, the lighting should not interfere with these areas.* • *Lighting shall be directed away from adjacent roadways and shall not interfere with traffic or create a traffic hazard.* • *Upward lighting shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible.*	
8. Transportation and Circulation			
8-1 Impacts to traffic flow from construction traffic associated	PS	*8-1 In conjunction with submittal of Improvement Plans, a striping and signing plan shall be*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
	with development of the project site.			*submitted. The striping and signing plan shall include all on- and off-site traffic control devices and shall be reviewed by the County Traffic Engineer. A construction signing plan shall also be provided with the Improvement Plans for review and approval by the County Traffic Engineer.*	
8-2	Impacts to study intersections and roadways from the Existing Plus Project scenario.	LS	*None required.*		N/A
8-3	Impacts related to Existing Plus Project Plus Bayside Church Expansion Plus the Grove at Granite Bay Project Conditions.	LS	*None required.*		N/A
8-4	Impacts resulting from project-related cut-through traffic.	LS	*None required.*		N/A
8-5	Impacts related to Modified Site Access.	LS	*None required.*		N/A
8-6	Impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	PS	*8-6*	*Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, the project applicant shall ensure that the pathway and sidewalk network meets ADA accessibility requirements, subject to review and approval of the Improvement Plans by the Engineering and Surveying Department.*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
8-7	Impacts to transit facilities.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
8-8	Impacts related to emergency vehicle access.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
8-9	Impacts to vehicular safety from design features or incompatible uses.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
8-10	Impacts resulting from inadequate parking capacity.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
8-11	Impacts to air traffic patterns.	NI	*None required.*	N/A
9. Air Quality				
9-1	Impacts related to fugitive particulate matter emissions from project-associated construction activities.	PS	*9-1(a)* *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan to the Placer County APCD. This plan must address the minimum Administrative Requirements found in section 300 and 400 of APCD Rule 228, Fugitive Dust. The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving APCD approval of the Construction Emission I Dust Control Plan.* *9-1(b)* *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The prime contractor*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (i.e. make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower of greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. The inventory shall be updated, beginning 30 days after any initial work on site has begun, and shall be submitted on a monthly basis throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. At least three business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the property owner, project manager, and on-site foreman.	
		9-1(c) *Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall provide a plan to the Placer County APCD for approval by the District demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact;* N/A = *Not Applicable;* LS = *Less-than-Significant;* S = *Significant;* SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NO_X reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, aftertreatment products, and/or other options as they become available.	
		9-1(d) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The contractor shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust exceeds Placer County APCD Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust) limitations. The prime contractor shall be responsible for having an individual who is CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE). This individual shall evaluate compliance with Rule 228 on a weekly basis. It is to be noted that fugitive dust is not to exceed 40 percent opacity and not go beyond property boundary at any time. If lime or other drying agents are utilized to dry out wet grading areas they shall be controlled as to not*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		to exceed Placer County APCD Rule 228 Fugitive Dust limitations.	
		9-1(e) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, an enforcement plan shall be established, and submitted to the APCD for review, in order to weekly evaluate project-related on- and off-road heavy-duty vehicle engine emission opacities, using standards as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2180-2194. An Environmental Coordinator, CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE), shall routinely evaluate project-related off-road and heavy duty on-road equipment emissions for compliance with this requirement. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits will be notified and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours.*	
		9-1(f) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The prime contractor shall suspend all grading operations when wind speeds (including instantaneous gusts) exceed 25*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		miles per hour and dust is impacting adjacent properties.	
		9-1(g) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed District Rule 202 Visible Emission limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits are to be immediately notified to cease operations and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. Additional information regarding Rule 202 can be found at: http://www.placer.ca.gov/Deuartments/Air/Rule.*	
		9-1(h) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: During construction, no open burning of removed vegetation shall be allowed. All removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on site or taken to an appropriate disposal site.*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		9-1(i) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The prime contractor shall be responsible for keeping adjacent public thoroughfares clean of silt, dirt, mud, and debris, and shall "wet broom" if silt, dirt, mud or debris is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares. Dry mechanical sweeping is prohibited.*	
		9-1(j) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: During construction, traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less.*	
		9-1(k) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The contractor shall apply water to control dust, as required by Rule 228, Fugitive Dust, to prevent dust impacts offsite. Operational water truck(s) shall be onsite, at all times, to control fugitive dust. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact;* N/A = *Not Applicable;* LS = *Less-than-Significant;* S = *Significant;* SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		off-site.	
		9-1(l) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel powered equipment.*	
		9-1(m) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The contractor shall use CARB ultra low diesel fuel for all diesel-powered equipment. In addition, low sulfur fuel shall be utilized for all stationary equipment.*	
		9-1(n) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary power generators.*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
			9-1(o)	*Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: All on-site stationary equipment which is classified as 50 hp or greater shall either obtain a State-issued portable equipment permit or a Placer County APCD issued portable equipment permit.*	
9-2	Impacts related to a temporary increase in NO_X emissions.	PS	*9-2*	*During construction, the project contractor shall use only low-VOC architectural coatings and asphalt in compliance with PCAPCD Rules and Regulations, for review by the County Building Official.*	LS
9-3	Development of the project would result in increases in CO emissions.	LS	*None required.*		N/A
9-4	Impacts related to long-term increases of criteria air pollutants.	LS	*None required.*		N/A
10. Noise					
10-1	Construction noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors.	PS	*10-1(a)*	*Construction activities shall comply with the Placer County Noise Ordinance.*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		10-1(b) *Fixed construction equipment, which may include, but not be limited to, compressors and generators, shall be located as far away from sensitive receptors, as feasible. In addition, impact tools shall be shielded or shrouded. Intake and exhaust ports of powered construction equipment shall also be muffled or shielded.* *10-1(c)* *A disturbance coordinator shall be appointed for the project site who would receive any public noise-related complaints about construction equipment and practices. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for determining the cause of the complaint(s) and the implementation of any feasible measures to alleviate the complaint(s). The disturbance coordinator's contact information shall be posted throughout the site and adjacent public spaces.*	
10-2 Potential exposure of new noise-sensitive uses to existing transportation noise levels exceeding County standards.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
10-3 Project-related impacts to existing sensitive receptors	LS	*None required.*	N/A

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	from increases in traffic noise levels.				
	11. Soils, Geology, and Seismicity				
11-1	Loss of structural support due to liquefaction.	PS	*11-1(a)*	*The preliminary geotechnical engineering study performed by Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc., dated June 2006, indicated the presence of loose, saturated surface soils or other soil problems which, if not corrected, would lead to structural defects. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall submit for review and approval by the Engineering and Surveying Department a soil investigation of each non-pad graded lot in the subdivision produced by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer (Section 17953-17955 California Health and Safety Code).* *In addition, prior to Final Acceptance of project improvements or consideration of early building permits, and after the completion of pad grading for Lots 8-11, 34, 36, 42, 52, 53, 55, 69, 71, 72, 75, 78, 81, 82, 86, and 89, as well as Lot G, the applicant shall submit for review and approval by the Engineering and Surveying Department a soil*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact;* N/A = *Not Applicable;* LS = *Less-than-Significant;* S = *Significant;* SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		investigation of each pad-graded lot produced by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer (Section 17953-17955 California Health and Safety Code). The soil investigations shall include recommended corrective action that is likely to prevent structural damage to each proposed dwelling. The applicant shall include in the Development Notebook or modify the Development Notebook to include the soil problems encountered on each specific lot, as well as the recommended corrective actions. A note that indicates the requirements of this condition shall be included on the Improvement Plans, CC&Rs, and the Informational Sheet filed with the Final Map(s). Once approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department, two copies of the final soil investigations for each lot shall be provided to the Engineering and Surveying Department and one copy to the Building Department for their use.	
		11-1(b) *The applicant shall submit for review and approval by the Engineering and Surveying Department a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following: • *Road, pavement, and parking area design* • *Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable)* • *Grading practices* • *Erosion/winterization* • *Special problems discovered on-site, (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.)* • *Slope stability* *Once approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the Engineering and Surveying Department and one copy to the Building Department for their use. If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems which, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the soils report will be required for subdivisions, prior to issuance of Building Permits. This certification may be completed on a Lot by Lot basis or on a Tract basis.*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		This shall be so noted in the CC&Rs and on the Informational Sheet filed with the Final Map(s). The developer shall provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report.	
		11-1(c) *The project applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications, and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Department for review and approval. The plans shall show all conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees. (NOTE: Prior to*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction costs shall be paid). The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or DRC review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.	
		11-1(d) All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. Grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall not occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the DRC. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Department concurs with said recommendation. *The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. The applicant shall assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization during project construction. Where soil stockpiling or borrow areas are to remain for more than one construction season, proper erosion control measures shall be applied as specified in the Improvement Plans/Grading Plans. Erosion control shall be provided for where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department.*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		The applicant shall submit to the Engineering and Surveying Department a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110 percent of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent. *If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the Design Review Committee/Engineering and Surveying Department for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		proceeding. Failure of the Design Review Committee/Engineering and Surveying Department to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.	
		11-1(e) *Any proposed subdivision grading beyond that necessary for construction of streets, utilities, and drainage improvements (i.e., mass grading, residential pad grading) must be approved by the Design Review Committee prior to approval of project Improvement Plans. The intent of this condition is to allow detailed Design Review Committee review of lot or contour grading impacts, and to ensure that grading activities do not exceed those indicated on the preliminary grading plan for this project. Grading plans, of a suitable scale and providing specific engineering detail, including limits of grading, identification of trees, existing and proposed contours, drainage patterns, etc., shall be prepared and submitted for Design Review Committee review. If grading, beyond that indicated on the preliminary grading plan, and/or*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		environmental documents is proposed with subdivision construction, the matter shall be referred back to the Planning Commission for consideration.	
11-2 Structural damage from potentially expansive soils.	PS	*11-2* *Implement Mitigation Measures 11-1(a), 11-1(b), and 11-1(e).*	LS
11-3 Impacts related to seismic activity.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
11-4 Construction-related increases in soil erosion.	PS	*11-4(a)* *The project's ground disturbance exceeds one acre; therefore, the project is subject to the construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. The applicant shall obtain such permit from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board and shall provide to the Engineering and Surveying Department evidence of a state-issued WDID number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.* *11-4(b)* *Water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department). *Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to, the following: Fiber Rolls (SE-5), Hydroseeding (EC-4), Stabilized Construction Entrance (LDM Plate C-4), Storm Drain Inlet Protection (SE-10), Silt Fence (SE-1), revegetation techniques, gravel bags, diversion swales, dust control measures, limiting the soil disturbance, and concrete washout areas.* *11-4(c)* *Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified on the Improvement Plans and located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.* *11-4(d)* *In order to protect site resources, grading activities of any kind shall not take place within the 100-year floodplain of Miners Ravine unless otherwise approved as a part of this project.*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
12. Hydrology and Water Quality					
12-1	Project impacts to the existing drainage pattern and surface runoff.	PS	*12-1(a)*	*The project applicant shall prepare and submit with the project Improvement Plans a drainage report, in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Use Development Manual (LDM) and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the Engineering and Surveying Department for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include the following: a written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, and proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be provided to reduce erosion and water quality degradation, and to prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		to the maximum extent practicable. *12-1(b)* *Drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting runoff on individual lots, shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and shall be in compliance with applicable stormwater quality standards, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). These facilities shall be constructed with subdivision improvements and easements provided as required by the ESD. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the Homeowners' Association.*	
12-2 Construction-related impacts to surface water quality.	PS	*12-2(a)* *Implement Mitigation Measure 12-1(a).* *12-2(b)* *Water quality BMPs shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD).*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Storm drainage from on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the ESD. BMPs shall be designed, at a minimum, in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. Post-development (permanent) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to, the following: infiltration trenches (TC-10), water quality vaults, and a water quality treatment pond. Water quality facility construction shall not be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals. *All BMPs shall be maintained as required to ensure effectiveness. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Maintenance of these*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees.	
12-3 Operational water quality degradation associated with urban runoff from the project site.	PS	*12-3(a)* *Implement Mitigation Measures 12-1(a) and 12-2(b).* *12-3(b)* *This project is located within the area covered by Placer County's municipal stormwater quality permit, pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II program. Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said permit. BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff in accordance with "Attachment 4" of Placer County's NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (State Water Resources Control Board NPDES General Permit No. CAS000004).* *12-3(c)* *All storm drain inlets and catch basins within the project area shall be permanently marked/embossed with prohibitive language such as "No Dumping! Flows to Creek" or other language as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department and/or graphical icons to*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		discourage illegal dumping. Message details, placement, and locations shall be included on the Improvement Plans. ESD-approved signs and prohibitive language and/or graphical icons, which prohibit illegal dumping, shall be posted at public access points along channels and creeks within the project area. The Homeowners' association is responsible for maintaining the legibility of stamped messages and signs.	
12-4 Exposure of people and structures to flood hazards on the project site.	PS	*12-4(a)* *Implement Mitigation Measure 12-1(a).* *12-4(b)* *Stormwater runoff for Swale A shall be reduced to pre-project conditions through the installation of on-site detention facilities. (On-site stormwater detention is only recommended for the portion of the project that drains into Swale A and not for the project's impacts on runoff within the main stem of Miners Ravine.) Detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD). No detention facility construction shall be permitted within any*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.	
		12-4(c) *The limits of the future, unmitigated, fully developed, 100-year floodplain (after grading) for Miners Ravine shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) filed with the Final Map and shall designate the same as a building setback line, unless greater setbacks are required by other project conditions.*	
		12-4(d) *Finished house pad elevations shall be shown two feet above the 100-year floodplain line for Lots 5, 6, 7-11, 13, and 14 and finished lift station and chemical building pad elevations shall be shown two feet above the 100-year floodplain line for Lot G on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) filed with the Final Map. Pad elevations shall be certified by a California registered civil engineer or licensed land surveyor and submitted to the Engineering and Surveying Department. This certification shall be completed prior to construction of the foundation or at the completion of final grading, whichever comes first. No*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
				construction is allowed until this certification has been received by the Engineering and Surveying Department and approved by the Flood Plain Manager. Benchmark elevation and location shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s), to the satisfaction of the Design Review Committee.	
12-5	Potential impacts to important local watershed or important surface resources.	PS	*12-5*	*Implement Mitigation Measures 12-3(a) through 12-3(c).*	LS
13. Public Services and Utilities					
13-1	Adequate water supply and delivery for new residents.	PS	*13-1*	*Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, the project applicant shall receive a water availability letter from SJWD confirming adequate water supply and system service capacity exists to serve the proposed project. The project applicant shall submit water system improvement plans for the review and approval of SJWD and County Planning Department. The project applicant shall fund and construct all necessary water system improvements needed for the project and comply with SJWD requirements and standards. Individual will-serve applications, payment of fees, and charges for each*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		metered connection are required prior to receiving water service to each parcel.	
13-2 Adequate wastewater facilities for new residents.	PS	*13-2(a)* *The project shall include the construction of a new sanitary sewer system to serve the proposed project. The system shall include a new lift station and sanitary sewer pipelines. All sewage conveyance infrastructure to be constructed on site and in the offsite improvement area shall be included on the project Improvement Plans, which are subject to approval by the Engineering and Surveying Department and the Facility Services Department, Environmental Engineering Division.* *13-2(b)* *The project applicant shall provide a Sewer Study and Lift Station Design Report to the Environmental Engineering and Utilities Division for review and approval concurrent with submittal of the project Improvement Plans. This Sewer Study, Lift Station Design Report, and sewer utility plan shall be in general conformance with Placer County standards. The lift station for this project shall be designed and constructed to accommodate the ultimate shed area that it will serve. The developer shall have a Registered Civil Engineer*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		develop a master plan for the shed area to determine ultimate flows and the required size of the lift station. The overflow tank shall be sized at least for the existing average dry weather flows of the specific development but the design shall include easements for additional overflow tanks based on the ultimate flows of the entire shed area. Certain costs associated with the over sizing of the lift station to serve the off-site areas may be eligible for reimbursement. *The sewer utility plan shall depict sewage infrastructure extension to the parcels to the east, Sewer Line "A," between parcels 18 and 19 to the eastern property boundary and to the parcels to the north, Sewer Line "B," to the northern property boundary of Common Lot 'G'. The sewer utility plan shall depict the demolition of the existing Lawrence Drive Lift Station and the plan for collection and transmission, Sewer Line "C," of the existing sewage flow from the facility to the new lift station located in Common Lot G. The Sewer Study shall demonstrate that gravity sewer service has been provided to the maximum number of parcels*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		feasible. The Sewer Study shall describe the average daily wastewater generation from the site and the methodology used to derive the estimates. The sewer utility plan shall show paved vehicular access to all sewer manholes. The Sewer Study and Lift Station Design Report shall be approved prior to or concurrent with approval of the Improvement Plans.	
		13-2(c) *The CC&Rs for the proposed Rancho Del Oro subdivision shall include the following provisions:* • *Upon presentation of proper identification, Environmental Engineering and Utilities Division personnel and their representatives shall be provided access to all public sewer infrastructure easements for the purposes of inspection, maintenance, and repair of the sewer facilities.* • *Homeowners shall be prohibited from planting trees or constructing structures or significant landscaping within any sewer easement. Language to this effect shall be included in any easement agreement for*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		easements located onsite or in the offsite improvement area. The requirement shall also be included in the project Development Notebook. • *The access entry code for the gate entrance to the project site shall be provided to the Environmental Engineering and Utilities Division for use by their maintenance personnel.* • *Notification shall be made to all future property owners within 500 feet of the sewer lift station via CC&Rs and Developer's Notebook, that they may experience some unwanted elements associated with the maintenance of the lift station, i.e. truck traffic, noise, alarms, odors, etc.*	
13-3 Adequate gas and electricity/cable/telephone services for the proposed project.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
13-4 Impacts to current schools.	PS	*13-4 Prior to construction, the project applicant shall participate in the Mutual Benefit Agreement and pay minimum statutory developer fees of $1.15 per square foot to provide revenue for overcrowding*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			and funding shortfalls.	
13-5	Adequate fire protection and emergency medical services available to new residents.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
13-6	Adequate ratio of law enforcement personnel to residents.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
13-7	Adequate library services available for new residents.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
14. Hazardous Materials and Hazards				
14-1	Impacts related to exposure to naturally occurring asbestos.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
14-2	Impacts related to soil contamination.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
14-3	Impact related to wildland fires.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
Cumulative Impacts				
16-1	Increases in the intensity of land uses in the region due to the proposed project and all other projects in Placer County.	LS	*None required.*	N/A

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
16-2	Cumulative loss of biological resources in Placer County and the effects of ongoing urbanization in the region.	PS	*16-2*	*Implement Mitigation Measures 5-1, 5-3(a), 5-3(b), 5-4, 5-5(a), 5-5(b), 5-6(a), 5-6(b), 5-6(c), 5-9(a), 5-9(b), 5-10(a), 5-10(b), and 5-10(c).*	SU
16-3	Disturbance or destruction of previously unknown archaeological resources in combination with other development in Placer County.	LS	*None required.*		N/A
16-4	Long-term impacts to the visual character of the region from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Granite Bay area.	LS	*None required.*		N/A
16-5	Cumulative impacts to study area intersections and roadway segments resulting from project implementation.	PS	*16-5(a)*	*The project applicant shall be responsible for contributing a fair share of the cost for the necessary improvements to the Douglas Boulevard / Cavitt-Stallman Road intersection (Intersection #6). Necessary improvements shall include the westbound (Douglas Boulevard) approach being re-striped to include an additional through lane. With this mitigation measure, the westbound*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		approach of Douglas Boulevard would include one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through-right lane. The project applicant shall be responsible for payment of the proposed project's equitable share of improvement costs, in the amount of three percent (3%) of the total costs for the abovementioned improvement to the Douglas Boulevard / Cavitt-Stallman Road intersection.	
		16-5(b) *The project shall be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Granite Bay Benefit District), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The project applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fees will be required and shall be paid to the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building permits for the project:* • *County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code;* • *South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA); and* • *Placer County / City of Roseville JPA (PC/CR).*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		The current total combined estimated fee is $7,734 per single family residence. The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If either the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.	
16-6 Cumulative impacts to regional air quality.	PS	*16-6* *In order to mitigate the project's contribution to long-term emission of pollutants, the applicant shall participate in the Placer County Air Pollution District Offsite Mitigation Program by paying the equivalent amount of money, which is equal to the projects contribution of pollutants (ROG) that exceed the cumulative threshold of 10 pounds per day. The estimated total amount of excessive ROG for this project is approximately 0.26 tons per year. Therefore, the estimated payment for the proposed project is $1,859 based on $14,300 per ton. The actual amount to be paid shall be determined, per current California Air Resource Board guidelines, at the time of recordation of the Final Map. This condition shall be satisfied prior to recordation of a Final Map.*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
16-7 Project impacts concerning the production of greenhouse gases.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
16-8 Cumulative increase in project vicinity noise levels.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
16-9 Long-term geologic and seismic impacts from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Granite Bay area.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
16-10 Long-term increases in peak stormwater runoff flow and flooding related to the proposed project and in combination with existing and future developments in Placer County.	PS	*16-10(a) The project shall be subject to the one-time payment of drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the "Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance" (Ref. Chapter 15, Article 15.32, Placer County Code). The current estimated development fee is $224 per single family residence, payable to the Engineering and Surveying Department prior to each building permit issuance. The actual fee shall be that in effect at the time payment occurs.* *16-10(b) The project shall be subject to payment of annual drainage improvement and flood control fees*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		pursuant to the "Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance" (Ref. Chapter 15, Article 15.32, Placer County Code). Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall cause the subject property to become a participant in the existing Dry Creek Watershed County Service Area for purposes of collecting these annual assessments. The current estimated annual fee is $35 per single family residence.	
16-11 Increase in demand for additional public services and utilities as a result of the proposed project and other projects proposed in the Granite Bay area.	PS	*16-11* *The applicant shall pay their fair share fee per EDU, prior to Improvement Plan approval, toward the cost of the future improvement projects (including design and construction management along with actual construction costs) as identified in the RMC Technical Memorandum Trunk Sewer Hydraulic Analysis (TM 3b) dated October 31, 2006 of the June 2007 South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation (Systems Evaluation). The Environmental Engineering Division will use this money to reduce surcharging within the trunk sewer by replacement, and/or rehabilitation of existing sewer infrastructure. The applicant is notified that the fair share fee per EDU to be approved by the*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Environmental Engineering Division will be contributed to the cost to construct the recommended improvement projects and such fee will be required prior to Improvement Plan approval.	
16-12 Long-term hazards-related impacts from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Granite Bay area.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
Initial Study			
II-2. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	PS	*MM II.1 The developer will be required to notify future owners of the County's Right to Farm Ordinance, which discloses the potential effects of residing near ongoing agricultural operations. This statement shall inform lot owners that farm operators have a "right to farm" their lands despite potential nuisance to neighboring residences, including noise, odors, and use of toxic and hazardous materials.*	LS

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
V-2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5?	PS	*MM V.1* *If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s). If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect shall be provided on the Improvement Plans for the project. Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.*	LS
VII-8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard?		*MM VII.1* *The project proponent agrees to abide by a mosquito abatement program with the Mosquito Abatement District. The project will be conditioned*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		to allow the Mosquito Abatement District to review the Improvement Plans. As a condition of this project, drip irrigation will be used for landscaping areas.	
IX-4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts?		*MM-IX.1* *To mitigate potential impacts to any agricultural uses in the project area, a condition of approval will be included notifying and residents of this development of the County's "Right to Farm" ordinance which allows existing and future agricultural operations to continue where allowed by zoning. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.*	

MM = *Mitigation Measure;* NI = *No Impact*; N/A = *Not Applicable*; LS = *Less-than-Significant*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*