



**COUNTY OF PLACER**  
Community Development Resource Agency

John Marin, Agency Director

**ENVIRONMENTAL  
COORDINATION  
SERVICES**

Gina Langford, Coordinator

**MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

In accordance with Placer County ordinances regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Placer County has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and on the basis of that study hereby finds:

- The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this Negative Declaration has been prepared.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has thus been prepared.

The environmental documents, which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached and/or referenced herein and are hereby made a part of this document.

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

<b>Title:</b> Oakwood Estates	<b>Plus#</b> PMLD T20070721
<b>Description:</b> Project proposes approval of a rezone to allow a 9.95 acre parcel to be divided into two parcels consisting of 5.10 and 4.85 acres.	
<b>Location:</b> 2740 Humphrey Road, Loomis, Placer County	
<b>Project Owner/Applicant:</b> Richard and Sandie Bryant, 1700 Park Oak Drive, Roseville CA 95661	
<b>County Contact Person:</b> EJ Ivaldi	530-745-3147

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

The comment period for this document closes on **May 11, 2008**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site (<http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/EnvCoordSvcs/EnvDocs/NegDec.aspx>), Community Development Resource Agency public counter, and at the Loomis Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Parcel Review Committee. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3075 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references. Refer to Section 18.32 of the Placer County Code for important information regarding the timely filing of appeals.

Recorder's Certification

POSTED 04/10/2008  
through 06/09/2008  
JIM McCAULEY, COUNTY CLERK  
By J. Deaman  
Deputy Clerk

EXHIBIT F 55





**COUNTY OF PLACER**  
**Community Development Resource Agency**

**ENVIRONMENTAL  
COORDINATION  
SERVICES**

John Marin, Agency Director

Gina Langford, Coordinator

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3003 • www.placer.ca.gov/planning

**INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST**

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project application. The document may rely on previous environmental documents (see Section C) and site-specific studies (see Section I) prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration will be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared.

**A. BACKGROUND:**

Project Title: <b>Oakwood Estates</b>	Plus# PMLD T20070721
Entitlements: Rezone and Minor Land Division	
Site Area: 9.95 acres/433,422 square feet	APN: 032-091-020
Location: The project site is located on the west side of Humphrey Road, approximately 500 feet south of its intersection with Colwell Road, Placer County (2740 Humphrey Road).	
Project Description: The applicant is requesting approval of a rezone from RA-B-X 10 acre minimum (Residential agricultural, combining a minimum building site size of 10 acres) to RA-B-X 4.6 acre minimum (Residential agricultural, combining a minimum building site size of 4.6 acres) to allow a 9.95 acre parcel to be divided into two parcels consisting of 5.10 and 4.85 acres.	
<u>Project Site:</u> The subject property comprises approximately 9.95 acres and is located at 2740 Humphrey Road in the Loomis area. The site contains an existing residence, a barn structure, and private driveway. The property is designated Rural Estate 4.6 acre to 20 acre minimum in the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan and zoned RA-B-X 10 acre minimum (residential agricultural, combining a minimum building site size of 10 acres). There are large-lot rural residential land uses with existing single-family residences on adjacent parcels to the north, south, east and west. The property is relatively level and covered with oak woodland, annual grasslands, and irrigated pasture.	

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**

Location	Zoning	General Plan/Community Plan	Existing Conditions & Improvements
Site	RA-B-X 10 acre minimum (residential agricultural, combining a minimum building site size of 10 acres)	Rural Estate 4.6 acre to 20 acre minimum	Single-family residence and barn structure
North	Same as project site	Same as project site	Rural, large-lot residential uses/single-family residence
South	Same as project site	Same as project site	Rural, large-lot residential uses/single-family residence
East	RA-B-X 10 acre minimum (residential agricultural, combining a minimum building site size of 10 acres)/ RA-B-X 4.6 acre minimum (residential agricultural, combining a minimum building site size of 4.6 acres)	Same as project site	Rural, large-lot residential uses/single-family residence
West	Same as project site	Same as project site	Rural, large-lot residential uses/single-family residence

**C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:**

The County has determined that an Initial Study will be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the County-wide General Plan and Community Plan Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It will also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

The following documents serve as Program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference will occur:

- ➔ Placer County General Plan EIR
- ➔ Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan EIR

Section 15183 states that "projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified will not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site." Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, and it has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or will be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then additional environmental documentation need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

**D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including "No Impact" answers.

- b) "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
  - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
  - ➔ **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

**I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN)			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)			X	

**Discussion- Item I-1:**

The proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista as the project site is not visible from any identified scenic roadway or vista.

**Discussion- Item I-2:**

The proposed project will not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway as it is not located within the proximity of a state scenic highway.

**Discussion- Item I-3:**

The project site is covered predominantly with oak woodlands, annual grasslands, and irrigated pasture. The property is developed with a single-family residence, barn structure, and private driveway. The existing visual character of the property will remain largely intact as new improvements (extension of driveway, one additional residence, utilities, etc.) will be located in the least environmentally sensitive areas on-site. Grading impacts will be minimal due to the relatively level site and there will be nominal impacts to native trees and their driplines as most improvements will be developed outside of these areas. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item I-4:**

The proposed project will result in the creation of one residential lot and there is the potential for a new source of light (residential lighting). However, the amount of light generated by one additional residence will not adversely impact nighttime views in the area. No mitigation measures are required.

**II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (PLN)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (PLN)				X

4. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion- Item II-1:**

The project site is not mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance.

**Discussion- Item II-2:**

The Residential Agricultural Zone District allows for various agricultural operations including animal raising and keeping, crop production, grazing, etc. Although there are some small hobby farms in the project's vicinity, there are no known agricultural operations adjacent to this property. The County does have a Right-to-Farm Ordinance in place that notifies future buyers of property in agricultural areas that existing farming activities may be perceived as obnoxious. However, the farmer has the right to continue these agricultural activities provided that they are legal and are associated with farming operations (e.g., crop dusting, tilling, planting, operation of heavy equipment, dust and odor generating activities, etc).

**Discussion- Item II-3:**

The site and surrounding properties are zoned for Residential Agricultural uses which are consistent with the proposed project. In addition, the property is not under a Williamson Act Contract.

**Discussion- Item II-4:**

The proposed project will not involve any changes in the existing environment that may result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

**III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (APCD)			X	
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (APCD)			X	
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (APCD)			X	
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (APCD)			X	
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (APCD)				X

**Discussion- Item III-1:**

The project is consistent with the Sacramento Valley Air Quality Management Plan. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Items III-2,3:**

The proposed project is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin portion of Placer County. This area is designated as non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standard and non-attainment for the state particulate matter standard. According to the project analysis, the project will be below the District's threshold for construction and operation and will not have a significant impact on air quality. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Items III-4,5:**

Based upon the project analysis, and that the nearest home within the project site is more than 500 feet from Interstate I-80, the project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, the project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. No mitigation measures are required.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)		X		
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)		X		
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)			X	
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)		X		
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)				X
6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (PLN)			X	
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (PLN)		X		
8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- Items IV-1,2,4:**

Gibson & Skordal, LLC completed a Jurisdictional Delineation and Special Status Species Evaluation of the project site in September 2007. The study identified 3.16 acres of hardwood woodland, 4.38 acres of grassland, and 1.74 acres of irrigated pasture. The hardwood woodland is composed of Valley Oak, Live Oak, Blue Oak, Himalayan Blackberry, Mediterranean Barley, Soft Chess, and perennial Rye. The annual grasslands are dominated by Soft Chess, Ripgut Brome, and Dog Tail. There was no water feature observed within the study area. The project area was found to provide suitable habitat for five special-status wildlife species including the Townsend's big-eared bat, Tricolor blackbird, burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, and White-tailed kite. The project area was also found to provide suitable habitat for three special-status plant species including big-scale balsamroot, Brandegee's clarkia, and Red Bluff dwarf rush.

62

**Mitigation Measures- Items IV-1,2,4:**

Prior to any grading or tree removal activities, during the raptor nesting season (February 1 - September 1), a focused survey for raptor nests will be conducted by a qualified biologist. A report summarizing the survey will be provided to Placer County and the California Department of Fish & Game (CDFG) within 30 days of the completed survey. If an active raptor nest is identified, appropriate mitigation measures will be developed and implemented in consultation with CDFG. If construction is proposed to take place between February 1<sup>st</sup> and September 1<sup>st</sup>, no construction activity or tree removal will occur within 500 feet of an active nest (or greater distance, as determined by the CDFG). Construction activities may only resume after a follow up survey has been conducted and a report prepared by a qualified raptor biologist indicating that the nest (or nests) is no longer active, and that no new nests have been identified. A follow up survey will be conducted two months following the initial survey, if the initial survey occurs between February 1<sup>st</sup> and July 1<sup>st</sup>. Additional follow up surveys may be required by the DRC, based on the recommendations in the raptor study and/or as recommended by the CDFG. Temporary construction fencing and signage as will be installed at a minimum 500 foot radius around trees containing active nests. If all project construction occurs between September 1<sup>st</sup> and February 1<sup>st</sup> no raptor surveys will be required. Trees previously approved for removal by Placer County, which contain stick nests, may only be removed between September 1<sup>st</sup> and February 1<sup>st</sup>. If tree removal or grading activity commences during the breeding season of the Townsend's big-eared bat, a field survey will be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine whether active roosts are present on the project site or in areas containing suitable roosting habitat within 50 feet of any development activity. Field surveys will be conducted in late April or early May in the season before construction begins when bats are establishing maternity roosts and before pregnant females give birth. If no roosting bats are found, no further mitigation is required. If roosting bats are found, disturbance of the maternity roosts will be avoided by halting construction until either the end of the breeding season or until a qualified biologist removes and relocates the roosting bats in accordance with CDFG requirements.

**Discussion- Item IV-3:**

On January 1, 2005, Senate Bill 1334 established Public Resources Code Section 21083.4, requiring a county to determine whether a project may result in a conversion of oak woodlands that will have a significant impact on the environment. If a county determines that there may be a significant impact on oak woodlands, the county will require one or more types of mitigation measures specified in SB 1334 or "other" mitigation measures developed by the county. Although the project site contains strands of oak trees, the percentage of canopy coverage and lack of oak woodland characteristics precludes impacts to oak woodlands. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item IV-5:**

The Jurisdictional Delineation prepared by Gibson & Skordal, LLC in September 2007 concluded that there are no waters of the United States on the project site.

**Discussion- Item IV-6:**

Although the project site supports various habitat types, there are no known native resident or migratory wildlife corridors within the project area, or its vicinity. The project area's close proximity to Humphrey Road, the Town of Loomis, and other developed rural residential properties does not lend support to such corridors. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item IV-7:**

Tree surveys were conducted for the project area by Forest Slopes Management at different times during October and December in 2007. There were 65 native trees identified on-site within 50 feet around the outside boundary of the project area, including valley oaks and interior live oaks. One native tree (15" dbh Interior Live Oak) is proposed to be removed as part of this development (Tree #435). The Placer County Tree Ordinance requires mitigation for impacts to native trees. The following mitigation measures will reduce the impact from significant to less than significant:

**Mitigation Measures- Item IV-7:**

The applicant will mitigate for the removal of and impacts to trees on-site by replacing trees on-site. For each diameter inch of a tree removed, replacement will be on an inch-for-inch basis. For example, if 100 diameter inches are proposed to be removed, the replacement trees will equal 100 diameter inches (aggregate). Prior to approval of Improvement Plans the applicant will submit to the DRC for review and approval a Planting Plan that details the tree replacement, irrigation, and monitoring plan for the mitigation of impacted trees (including removal and impacts to dripline). Trees must be installed by the applicant and inspected and approved by the DRC prior to the acceptance of 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. In lieu of tree replacement on-site for tree removal listed above, a contribution of \$100 per diameter

inch at breast height for each tree removed or impacted or the current market value, as established by an Arborist, Forester or Registered Landscape Architect, of the replacement trees, including the cost of installation, will be paid to the Placer County Tree Preservation Fund. If tree replacement mitigation fees are to be paid in the place of tree replacement mitigation planting, these fees must be paid prior to acceptance of improvements.

**Discussion- Item IV-8:**

At the present time, Placer County has not adopted a Habitat Conservation Plan or a Natural Communities Conservation Plan. Therefore, there will be no impact to such plans.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)			X	
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)			X	
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)			X	
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)				X
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)				X
6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)			X	

**Discussion- Items V-1,2:**

A report by Peak and Associates, Inc. dated September, 2007 indicated that there are no known prehistoric period or historic period resources identified within the project area and that there are no known historical resources on the property for the purposes of CEQA review. The report also indicates that there is always the remote possibility that previous activities (both natural and cultural) have obscured prehistoric or historic period artifacts or habitation areas, leaving no surface evidence that will permit discovery of these cultural resources. As such, standard construction conditions will apply to this project and state "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 and a County approved archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. 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 will 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". No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item V-3:**

A report by Peak and Associates, Inc. dated September, 2007 concluded that the project area is located on granite rocks of the Penryn Pluton and has virtually no known probability of yielding fossils from excavations in this unit. There remains a slight possibility that localized unmapped Pleistocene sediments which might include fossils overlie the granite, but this appears so unlikely that it is not worth consideration. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item V-4:**

The proposed project does not have the potential to cause a physical change that will affect unique known ethnic cultural values.

64

**Discussion- Item V-5:**

The proposed project will not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area.

**Discussion- Item V-6:**

There are no known burial sites within the project boundaries. If any human remains are unearthed during construction activities, the provisions of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 will apply. Standard construction conditions as noted above in Discussion Item V1, 2 also apply to this project and will ensure that there is no significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

**VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)				X
2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)			X	
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)				X
4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)				X
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)			X	
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD)			X	
7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)			X	
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)				X
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18, 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)				X

**Discussion- Items VI-1,4,8:**

The proposed project is located on soils classified in the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Survey of Placer County as Andregg coarse sandy loam. The only identified soil constraint was the slope of the soil and was identified as being moderately suited for road construction. There were no identified soil limitations for use with dwellings, without basements. The Soil Survey does not identify any unique geologic or physical features for the Andregg coarse sandy loam type and did not identify any expansive soil limitations. Construction of a house and paved roadway and the re-grading and re-surfacing of the existing access road will not create any unstable earth conditions or change any geologic substructure.

**Discussion- Items VI-2,5,6:**

The proposed project includes the construction of a single family dwelling, a section of paved roadway on the existing access alignment, and regrading and resurfacing of the remainder of the existing access. The area of disturbance for these improvements is relatively small and the roadway improvements are located on previously disturbed areas. Also, any erosion potential will occur during the short time of the construction of the improvements. Therefore, the impacts to soil disruptions, erosion, and deposition of eroded soil in the tributary are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item VI-3:**

The proposed project improvements, construction of a house and roadway improvements, will generally be at the same grade as the existing topography.

**Discussion- Item VI-7:**

The project is located within Placer County. The California Department of Mines and Geology classifies the project site as a low severity earthquake zone. No active faults are known to exist within the County. The project site is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure and liquefaction. The project will be constructed in compliance with the California Building Code, which includes seismic standards. Therefore, these impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials? (EHS)				X
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (APCD)				X
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)			X	
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)			X	
8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)		X		
9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)			X	

**Discussion- Items VII-1,2:**

The use of hazardous substances during normal construction activities is expected to be limited in nature, and will be subject to standard handling and storage requirements. Any hazardous materials that may potentially be stored and/or used on the property as part of future business operations will also be subject to standard handling and storage requirements. Accordingly, impacts related to the handling, use, disposal, or release of hazardous substances is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item VII-3:**

Based upon the project analysis, the project is not expected to emit hazardous emissions.

**Discussion- Items VII-4,9:**

This project will not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. A records review of an aerial photograph taken in 1938 showed that the subject parcel did not have a history of orchards. Thus, it is not likely that the property contains contamination associated with pesticide and herbicidal spraying. The likelihood of this project creating or exposing people to existing sources of potential health hazards or creating a significant hazard to the public or environment is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item VII-5:**

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

**Discussion- Item VII-6:**

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**Discussion- Item VII-7:**

The project will result in one new residential parcel. A will-serve letter from the Loomis Fire Protection District and/or Cal Fire will require compliance with all applicable standards set forth in the State Fire Safety Codes. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item VII-8:**

The project will likely include a stormwater detention/drainage system. Stormwater detention basins and pipes, unless properly designed and managed, have the potential to create a significant health hazard by providing an environment conducive to breeding mosquito disease vectors. This is a potentially significant impact that will be reduced to a less than significant impact with the following mitigation measure:

**Mitigation Measures- Item VII-8**

MM VII.1 In order to minimize potential health hazards related to mosquito breeding, the project proponent will abide by the Placer Mosquito Abatement District (PMAD) construction guidelines for stormwater detention systems. The project will be conditioned to allow the Placer County Mosquito Abatement District to review the Improvement Plans.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any potable water quality standards? (EHS)				X
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)			X	
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (ESD)			X	
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)			X	
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality?(ESD)			X	

7. Otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EHS)			X	
8. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)				X
9. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)				X
10. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD)				X
11. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)				X
12. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD)			X	

**Discussion- Item VIII-1:**

The project will not violate any potable water quality standards as it is served by a public water supply.

**Discussion- Item VIII-2:**

The project proposes the use of public treated surface water supplies, so there are no direct impacts to groundwater quantity or direction due to well withdrawals. However, the introduction of residential uses and impervious surfaces can have indirect groundwater recharge capability impacts in some areas. The soil types in the project area are not conducive to recharge, except perhaps along major drainage ways. As this project does not involve disturbance of major drainage ways, impacts related to groundwater recharge are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Items VIII-3,4:**

The proposed project includes the construction of a house, several hundred feet of paved driveway with portions on the existing access alignment with some grading and resurfacing on undisturbed areas of the property. Portions of the driveway improvements are located in an existing alignment and construction for the undisturbed areas will be at or close to the existing grade. The drainage patterns from the proposed construction will change slightly with the application of pavement for the driveway alignment. Increases in runoff generally occur due to the increase of impervious. Therefore, the impact is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Items VIII-5,6:**

The area of disturbance for the project improvements is relatively small in proportion to the overall size of parcels and some of the roadway improvements are located on previously disturbed areas. Also, any erosion potential and sediment transport into the surface water will occur during the short time of the construction of the improvements. Therefore, the impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Items VIII-7,8,9:**

The project will utilize stormwater best management practices in order to reduce erosion as mandated by Placer County Engineering and Surveying. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area as defined and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The project improvements are not proposed within a local 100-year flood hazard area and no flood flows will be impeded or redirected after construction of the improvements. The project site is located near a tributary to Codfish Creek and is elevated well above areas that are subject to flooding and is not located within any levee or dam failure inundation area. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item VIII-11:**

The project will not alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater as it will be utilizing a publicly treated water source.

**Discussion- Item VIII-12:**

The project will not impact the watershed of important surface water resources, but the flows generated from this small project are minor as stormwater best management practices will be used to reduce erosion onsite. The amount of flows generated from this project are considered to be minor as it is for an existing dwelling on 9.95 acres into one 5.10 acre parcel and one 4.85 acre parcel. The existing dwelling will occupy the 5.10 acre parcel and the new lot will be for the 4.85 acre parcel. One new lot will be created by this subdivision. This impact is insignificant as compared to the density of a major subdivision. No mitigation measures are required.

**IX. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (EHS, ESD, PLN)			X	
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)				X
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				X
5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)				
6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)				X
7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)			X	
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- Item IX-1:**

The proposed project will not physically divide an established community.

**Discussion- Items IX-2,7:**

The proposed project is consistent with the existing Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan designation of Rural Estate 4.6 acre to 20 acre minimum. A rezone from RA-B-X 10 acre minimum (Residential agricultural, combining building site size of 10 acres minimum) to RA-B-X 4.6 acre minimum (Residential agricultural, combining building site size of 4.6 acres minimum) will result in two parcels consisting of 5.10 and 4.85 acres in area. This rezone will not substantially change the character of the area as surrounding properties are of similar size with parcels ranging from 1.9 to 10 acres. The property to the east (opposite Humphrey Road) of the subject property is also similarly zoned RA-B-X 4.6 acre minimum. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item IX-3:**

At the present time, Placer County has not adopted a Habitat Conservation Plan or a Natural Communities Conservation Plan. As such, there will be no impact to such plans.

**Discussion- Item IX-4:**

The addition of one new residential lot will be compatible with the rural residential uses that exist on the adjacent properties.

**Discussion- Item IX-5:**

There are no known agricultural operations occurring on-site or on surrounding properties. Although the property is zoned to allow residential agricultural uses, the proposed project will not adversely affect agricultural resources or operations in the area.

**Discussion- Item IX-6:**

The proposed project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community.

**Discussion- Item IX-8:**

The proposed project will not cause economic or social changes that will result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN)				X
2. The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

Based on the classification studies prepared by the State Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, no mineral resources that will be of value to the region are known to occur on this site, or in the immediate vicinity. As such, the proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site

**XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan, Community Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (EHS)			X	
2. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (EHS)				X
3. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (EHS)			X	
4. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (EHS)				X
5. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (EHS)				X

**Discussion- Items XI-1,3:**

Construction of the project, through build-out, will increase ambient noise levels. Adjacent residents may be negatively impacted. This impact is considered to be temporary and less than significant. A condition of approval for the project will be recommended that limits construction hours so that early evening and early mornings, as well as all day Sunday, will be free of construction noise. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item XI-2:**

The future additional residence will not create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

**Discussion- Item XI-4:**

The project is not located within an airport land use plan.

**Discussion- Item XI-5:**

The project is not located within any known private airstrips.

**XII. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (PLN)				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The project will result in the addition of one new residential parcel and will not induce substantial population growth in the area or displace substantial amounts of existing housing.

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)			X	
2. Sheriff protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)			X	
3. Schools? (EHS, ESD, PLN)			X	
4. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (EHS, ESD, PLN)			X	
5. Other governmental services? (EHS, ESD, PLN)			X	

**Discussion- All Items:**

The project will result in the addition of one new residential parcel. It will not require the construction of any new public facilities or burden any public services beyond the current capacities. Additionally, the project will not result in substantial physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities. No mitigation measures are required.

**XIV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)				X
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The addition of one new residential parcel will not require the construction of any new recreational facilities or burden any existing recreational facilities beyond their current capacities.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD)			X	
2. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD)				X
3. Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)			X	
4. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)				X
5. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)				X
6. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (ESD)				X
7. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (i.e. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (ESD)				X
8. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (ESD)				X

**Discussion- Item XV-1:**

The project proposal will result in the construction of one additional residential single family parcel. The proposed project will generate approximately one additional PM peak hour trip. The proposed project creates site-specific impacts on local transportation systems that are considered less than significant when analyzed against the existing baseline traffic conditions; however, the cumulative effect of an increase in traffic has the potential to create significant impacts to the area's transportation system. Article 15.28.010 of the Placer County Code establishes a road network Capital Improvement Program (CIP). This project is subject to this code and, therefore, required to pay traffic impact fees (currently estimated to be \$2,983 per single family dwelling) to fund the CIP for area roadway improvements. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item XV-2:**

The proposed project creates one additional residential parcel. The General/Community Plan considered the Zoning of the property at the time of Plan development. The creation of the additional parcel will not exceed a level of service standard established by the General/Community Plan.

**Discussion- Item XV-3:**

The proposed project uses existing access alignments and grades and will be required to construct roadway improvements to meet current County standards. Approximately 240 feet of proposed roadway will be shared by two parcels with the remaining portions of driveway serving individual dwellings. Therefore, the impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item XV-4:**

The servicing fire district has not provided comments on the proposed project however, this project will be required to meet or exceed fire safe residential driveway standards (PRC §4290) to the satisfaction of the servicing fire district.

**Discussion- Item XV-5:**

The applicant will provide sufficient parking for the proposed project.

**Discussion- Item XV-6:**

The proposed project uses existing access alignments and grades and will be required to construct roadway improvements to meet current County standards. These improvements will not create a hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclist

**Discussion- Item XV-7:**

There are no adopted policies supporting alternative transportation that will apply to the creation of one parcel.

**Discussion- Item XV-8:**

The construction of one additional house and related roadway improvements will not change air traffic patterns or increase the air traffic levels that results in substantial safety risks.

**XVI. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (ESD)				X
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EHS, ESD)			X	
3. Require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage systems? (EHS)			X	
4. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental				X

effects? (ESD)				
5. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (EHS)			X	
6. Require sewer service that may not be available by the area's waste water treatment provider? (EHS, ESD)				X
7. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs in compliance with all applicable laws? (EHS)			X	

**Discussion- Items XVI-1,6:**

The proposed project will utilize private septic systems to provide sewer service and will connect to Placer County Water Agency for potable water sources and will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.

**Discussion- Item XVI-2:**

The project will result in the construction of a new water delivery system to the subject property. PCWA water currently serves the existing residence for APN 032-091-020. This APN covers the existing lot to be split into two parcels. Thus, a new water line will be installed to serve the new proposed dwelling on the new lot as proposed. The construction of a new water line serving the proposed dwelling on the new lot will not create significant environmental effects as this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item XVI-3:**

Soil testing was conducted for the new parcel to determine the adequacy of installing an onsite sewage disposal system. The results of the soil testing defined the minimum useable sewage disposal area (MUSDA) for the new proposed parcel. Sewer service is not available to serve the dwellings in this area, thus, the soil testing was required to provide adequate and legal sewage disposal for the parcel. The impact for the construction of one new on-site sewage system is considered to be routine and less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item XVI-4:**

The proposed project will not generate enough increases in stormwater flow to require the construction of any new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of any existing facilities.

**Discussion- Item XVI-5:**

Sufficient water supplies are available to this project site from PCWA which provides treated surface water to supply potable water to residences in this area. PCWA provided written comments on the requirements to provide potable water service to the subject subdivision. No new or expanded entitlements are needed for this project and this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item XVI-6:**

The proposed project will not require public sewer service as this area is served by on-site sewage disposal systems as indicated in Discussion Item XVI-3.

**Discussion- Item XVI-7:**

The project is served by the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill in Roseville which has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal demand. Thus, the impact concerning the ability of the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill to meet the project's solid waste disposal needs is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially impact biological resources, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		X
3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X

**F. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES** whose approval is required:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Game	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/>

**G. DETERMINATION** – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

Although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

**H. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE** (Persons/Departments consulted):

Planning Department, E.J. Ivaldi, Chairperson  
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Ted D. Rei  
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Wastewater, Ed Wydra  
 Department of Public Works, Transportation  
 Environmental Health Services, Grant Miller  
 Air Pollution Control District, Yu-Shuo Chang  
 Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow  
 Facility Services, Parks, Vance Kimbrell  
 Placer County Fire/CDF, Bob Eicholtz/Brad Albertazzi

*Gina Langford*

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date March 27, 2008  
 Gina Langford, Environmental Coordinator

**I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:** The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

<b>County Documents</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance	
<input type="checkbox"/> _____		
<b>Trustee Agency Documents</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
<b>Site-Specific Studies</b>	<b>Planning Department</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Study
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
	<b>Engineering &amp; Surveying Department, Flood Control District</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tentative Parcel Map
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
	<b>Environmental Health Services</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study		
<input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis		

		<input type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On-Site Sewage Disposal Soil Testing
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Air Pollution Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction Emission & Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> URBEMIS Model Output
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Fire Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic & Circulation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Mosquito Abatement District	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Guidelines and Standards for Vector Prevention in Proposed Developments
<input type="checkbox"/> _____		