

been inhabited by prehistoric and historic peoples for thousands of years. The proposed project, in combination with other development in the Sacramento region could contribute to the loss of significant cultural resources, which include Native American ancestral remains. Because all significant cultural resources are unique and non-renewable members of finite classes, all adverse effects or negative impacts erode a dwindling resource base, the project's incremental contribution to these significant cumulative impacts would be potentially cumulatively considerable, and thus *potentially significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.5-14.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.5-5 *Implement Mitigation Measure 6.5-2.*

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.5-6: **The proposed project, in combination with other development in Placer County, could adversely affect unique paleontological resources. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, pp. 6.5-14 to 6.5-15.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Based upon previous fossil finds and paleontological research, Placer County has fossil-bearing sediments that date back hundreds of thousands of years. The proposed project, in combination with other development in the County could contribute to the loss of significant paleontological resources. Because all significant paleontological resources are unique and non-renewable members of finite classes, all adverse effects or negative impacts erode a dwindling resource base. The loss of any one paleontological site affects all others in a region because these resources are best understood in the context of the entirety of the ancient ecologic system of which they formed a part. The boundaries of paleontologically important sites are not limited by property boundaries. Consequently, a meaningful approach to preserving and managing paleontological resources must focus on the likely distribution of those resources, rather than on project or parcel boundaries. The ancient ecologic system is represented paleontologically by the total inventory of all sites and other fossil remains. In this case, development in Placer County potentially could disturb known or unknown paleontological resources. Proper planning and appropriate mitigation can help to capture and preserve knowledge of such resources and can provide opportunities for increasing our understanding of the past environmental

conditions by recording data about sites discovered and preserving fossils found. Federal, State, and local laws are in place, as discussed above, that protect these resources. However, the project's incremental contribution to these significant cumulative impacts would itself be potentially cumulatively considerable, and thus *potentially significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.5-14 to 6.5-15.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.5-6 *Implement Mitigation Measure 6.5-3.*

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

F. GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY

Standards of Significance

Under criteria based on the State CEQA Guidelines, for purposes of this EIR, an impact would be considered significant if the proposed project would:

- Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault;
 - Strong seismic groundshaking;
 - Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or
 - Landslides.
- Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.
- Be located on a geologic 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.
- Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-A of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property.

- Result in the loss of, or loss of access to, mineral resources identified in a Mineral Resource Zone by the California Geological Survey.

(DEIR, pp. 6.6-12 to 6.6-13.)

Impact 6.6-1: **The proposed project could expose people or structures to fault rupture. The project would cause *no impact*.** (DEIR, p. 6.6-13.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

The study area is more than 40 miles from the nearest zoned fault (the Cleveland Hill fault); therefore, fault-line surface rupture would not be a hazard at the project site. Thus, the proposed project would have *no impact*.

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

No impact.

Impact 6.6-2: **The proposed project could expose people or structures to strong seismic groundshaking. This impact is *less than significant*.** (DEIR, pp. 6.6-13 to 6.6-14.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

From a review of regional and local geo-seismic conditions, there is a possibility that the study area would be subject to at least one major earthquake during the useful life of the project. The most likely large-earthquake scenario in the 30-year timeframe projected by the USGS would be a MW 7.0 event on the Hayward-Rodgers Creek fault, which would produce groundshaking intensities of MMI IV to V at the project site.¹⁸ The resulting

vibration could cause damage to some buildings, roads and infrastructure (primary effects). However, as reported in the Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report, the potential for liquefaction and seismic deformation beneath the site is not probable. In addition, the potential for ground lurching, differential settlement, or lateral spreading during or following seismic events is considered low, provided proper geotechnical engineering and design recommendations are followed. (DEIR, p. 6.6-13.)

To reduce the primary and secondary risks associated with seismically induced groundshaking, it is necessary to take the location and type of subsurface materials into consideration when designing foundations and structures at the project site. In Placer County, educational, residential, and commercial buildings and all associated infrastructure are required to reduce the exposure to potentially damaging seismic vibrations through seismic-resistant design, in conformance with Chapter 16, Structural Design Requirements, Division IV, Earthquake Design, of the *California Building Code*. Adherence to the Building Code, as required by state and County law, would ensure maximum practicable protection available for users of the building and associated infrastructure. Adherence would include:

- the use of CBC Seismic Zone 3 Standards, as the minimum seismic-resistant design for all proposed facilities;
- seismic-resistant earthwork and construction design criteria, as needed, based on the site-specific recommendations of a California Certified Engineering Geologist in cooperation with the project's California-registered geotechnical and structural engineers;
- an engineering analyses that demonstrates satisfactory performance of alluvium or fill where either forms part or all of the support, especially where the possible occurrence of liquefiable soils exists; and,
- an analysis of soil expansion potential and appropriate remediation (compaction, removal/replacement, etc.) prior to using any expansive soils for foundation support.

Based on an existing regulatory framework that addresses earthquake safety issues and adherence to the requirements of the Building Code, seismically induced groundshaking would not be a substantial hazard at the project site. In view of the above, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* impact regarding exposing people or structures to seismic groundshaking. (DEIR, p. 6.6-14.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.6-3: **The proposed project could expose people or structures to landslides. There would be *no impact*.** (DEIR, p. 6.6-14.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

The study area contains low slopes and gently undulating terrain. The Preliminary Geotechnical Report prepared for the proposed project did not identify landslide hazards at the site. Therefore, landslides would not be a hazard in the study area. There would be *no impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.6-14.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

No impact.

Impact 6.6-4: **Construction activities resulting in ground disturbance have the potential to result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil as well as topographic alterations. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, pp. 6.6-14 to 6.6-15.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Natural forces, both chemical and physical, are continually at work breaking down soils. Erosion poses two hazards: (1) it removes soils, thereby undermining roads and buildings and producing unstable slopes, and (2) it deposits eroded soil in waterways through stormwater runoff. Human activities, such as site preparation for construction and alteration of topographical features, frequently accelerate natural erosion. The following analysis focuses on the potential geotechnical effects of erosion related to project development. For a discussion of potential effects on water quality due to erosion and

sedimentation caused by construction activities or urban runoff, please see Draft EIR Section 6.8, Hydrology and Water Quality. (DEIR, pp. 6.6-14 to 6.6-15.)

Future development within the Plan Area would require some grading and leveling of the site to accommodate new suburban uses. The alteration of topographic features can lead to increased erosion by creating unstable rock or soil surfaces, by changing the permeability or runoff characteristics of the soil, or by modifying or creating new pathways for drainage. (DEIR, p. 6.6-15.)

As noted in the Setting section of the Draft EIR, the project site is not considered a good source of topsoil. Upon completion of the project, structures, roadways, and landscaping or revegetated areas would eventually cover any soils exposed during construction; thus, no long term new erodible soils would be created as a result of the proposed project. (DEIR, p. 6.6-15.)

Therefore, because erosion is anticipated to occur in disturbed soil areas, these impacts are considered *potentially significant*.

Mitigation Measure:

6.6-4 a) *The 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 ESD for review and approval of each new development project. 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. (Prior to 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.*

- b) *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. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary 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 ESD 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. It is the applicant's responsibility to 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. The applicant shall also provide for erosion control, implementing similar erosion control measures, where roadside drainage is off the pavement, to the satisfaction of the ESD.

The applicant shall submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110% 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 of 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 DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.

- 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.*

- d) *Developers of projects within the Plan Area, including off-site improvements, with ground disturbance exceeding one-acre that are subject to construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program shall obtain such permit from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board, and shall provide to the ESD evidence of a State-issued WDID number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.*

(DEIR, p. 6.6-15 to 6.6-16.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.6-5: **Construction of the proposed project on expansive soils could result in potential impacts to foundations, structures, roadways, and other near surface improvements. This impact is potentially significant.** (DEIR, pp. 6.6-16 to 6.6-17.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

The Consolidated Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report noted that laboratory test results of near-surface soils indicate the native sandy and silty clays on-site exhibit moderate to high expansion (shrink-swell) potential. Such soils are capable of exerting substantial expansion pressures on structural foundations, interior floor slabs, and exterior flatwork. Soils with moderate to high expansion potential can also cause damage to hardscape, pavement, and other surface or near-surface improvements. Therefore, construction on expansive soils is considered a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, pp. 6.6-16 to 6.6-17.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.6-5 a) *The developer of any new project within the Plan Area, including off-site improvements, shall submit to the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD), for review and approval, a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:*

- 1) *Road, pavement, and parking area design;*

- 2) *Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable);*
- 3) *Grading practices;*
- 4) *Erosion/winterization;*
- 5) *Special problems discovered on-site, (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.); and*
- 6) *Slope stability.*

Once approved by the ESD, the project developer shall provide two copies of the final report to the ESD 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 and other entitlements, prior to issuance of Building Permits. This certification may be completed on a Lot by Lot basis or on a Tract basis, or other defined project basis. This shall be noted in the CC&Rs and on the Informational Sheet filed with the Final Map(s). It is the responsibility of the developer to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report.

- b) *For non-pad graded lots, prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall submit to the ESD for review and approval, a soil investigation of each lot in the subdivision produced by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer (Section 17953-17955 California Health and Safety Code). For pad graded lots, prior to Final Acceptance of project improvements or consideration of early Building Permits and after the completion of the pad grading for all lots, the applicant shall submit to the ESD for review and approval, a soil investigation of each lot produced by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer (Section 17953-17955 California Health and Safety Code).*

(DEIR, p. 6.6-17.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.6-6: New development on the project site could be exposed to unstable soil conditions. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.6-17 to 6.6-18.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

The project site is underlain by soils with physical characteristics that vary, which could affect the performance of foundations and excavations, concrete slabs, roadways, and the structural integrity of buildings and structures. Such characteristics include, but are not limited to, the sizes and relative proportions of fine- and coarse-grained soil particles (texture), the degree of cementation, plasticity index, liquid limit, and permeability. If these characteristics are not identified prior to design and construction and planned site features not engineered properly, foundations, buildings, roadways, and other project components could be subject to damage from underlying soil types. Because development of the proposed project may increase the potential for buildings, roadways, and structures to be exposed to unstable soil conditions, this would be a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, pp. 6.6-17 to 6.6-18.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.6-6 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.6-5(a) and (b).

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.6-7: The proposed project could result in the loss of, or loss of access to, mineral resources identified in a Mineral Resource Zone by the California Geological Survey. There would be *no impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.6-18.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

The study area contains no mineral extraction operations or known mineral resources. The loss of, or loss of access to, identified mineral resources would not be an anticipated effect of the proposed project. Therefore, there would be *no impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.6-18.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

No impact.

Impact 6.6-8: Cumulative development in Placer County, including the proposed project, could expose people and structures to hazards associated with seismic groundshaking. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.6-18 to 6.6-19.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

Cumulative development in Placer County, including the proposed project, would increase the number of people and structures that could be exposed to hazards associated with seismic activity. As described in Impact 6.6-2, groundshaking intensities of MMI IV to V can be anticipated, and the resulting vibration could cause damage to some buildings, roads and infrastructure. (DEIR, p. 6.6-18.)

Impacts associated with potential geologic hazards related to soil or other conditions occur at individual building sites. Buildings and facilities in the County must be sited and designed in accordance with appropriate geotechnical and seismic guidelines and recommendations consistent with the requirements of the County Building Code. Adherence to all relevant plans, codes, and regulations with respect to project design and construction would provide adequate levels of safety, and the cumulative impact would be less than significant. Such adherence would ensure that the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts regarding seismic groundshaking and ground failure, and, therefore, the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.6-18 to 6.6-19.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.6-9: Cumulative development in Placer County, including the proposed project, could result in erosion and topsoil loss. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.6-19.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

Impacts from erosion and loss of topsoil from site development and operation can be cumulative in effect within a watershed. Development throughout Placer County is subject to State and local runoff, erosion, and sedimentation prevention requirements, including the applicable provisions of the general construction permit, BMPs, the NPDES permit process, as well as implementation of fugitive dust control measures in accordance with Air Quality Management District Rule 403 (see Section 6.3, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR). These requirements would be implemented as conditions of approval of project development and subject to continuing enforcement. (DEIR, p. 6.6-19.)

Implementation of the proposed project would modify soil and topographic conditions at the site to accommodate development and to provide a stable and safe physical environment. This modification during construction could expose areas of soil to erosion by wind or water. Development of other cumulative projects in the vicinity of the study area could expose soil surfaces, and further alter soil conditions, subjecting soils to erosional processes during construction. To reduce the potential for cumulative impacts that could cause erosion, the proposed project in the study area and cumulative projects in the adjacent area are required to be developed in conformance with the provisions of applicable federal, State and County laws and ordinances. The implementation of Mitigation Measures 6.6-4(a) through (d) and 6.6-5 would ensure that the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts on the watershed caused by runoff and erosion from cumulative development activity would be *less than significant*. No further mitigation is required. (DEIR, p. 6.6-19.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.6-10: Cumulative development in Placer County, including the proposed project, could be constructed on expansive soils that could become unstable. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.6-19.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.
(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

The geographic context for analysis of impacts on development from expansive soil or soils exhibiting characteristics that could make them unstable (e.g., re-use of soils for engineered fill) or depth to groundwater is generally site-specific. Prior to construction of any development requiring a soils/geotechnical report, the County would require that soils characteristics at a specific site are identified and that design and construction incorporate the recommendations suggested in the report. With adherence to these requirements and the implementation of Mitigation Measures 6.6-4 and 6.6-5, the cumulative impact would be considered *less than significant*. No further mitigation is required. (DEIR, p. 6.6-19.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

G. HAZARDS

Standards of Significance

Under criteria based on State CEQA Guidelines, for the purposes of this EIR, impacts would be considered significant if the proposed project would:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;

- 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;
- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment due to past uses on the project site;
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan;
- 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;
- 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 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; or
- 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.

(DEIR, pp. 6.7-18 to 6.7-19.)

Impact 6.7-1: **Construction of the proposed project could involve the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials, which could be a safety hazard for people living and working within the Plan Area. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.7-19.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Hazardous materials would be used in varying amounts during construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed project. Construction and maintenance activities would use hazardous materials, such as fuels (gasoline and diesel); oils and lubricants; paints and paint thinners; glues; cleaners (which could include solvents and corrosives in addition to soaps and detergents); and pesticides and herbicides. The RWQCB requires a Spill Prevention Countermeasure and Control (SPCC) plan in the case of a project with larger quantities of petroleum products. (DEIR, p. 6.7-19.)

The types and amounts of hazardous materials used during construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed project would vary according to the nature of the activity; therefore, the specific hazardous materials and amounts that would be on site or transported cannot be determined at this time. This impact is considered *potentially significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-19.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.7-1 a) *Comply with all federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials during project construction.*
- b) *All reserve fuel supplies and hazardous materials must be stored within the confines of a designated construction area.*
- c) *Equipment refueling and maintenance must take place only within the staging area.*
- d) *Construction vehicles shall be inspected daily for leaks.*

(DEIR, p. 6.7-19.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-2: **Operations of the University campus and commercial land uses in the Plan Area could involve the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials, which could be a safety hazard for people living and working within the Plan Area. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.7-20 to 6.7-21.)**

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Nearly all of the potential land uses in the proposed project would involve some level of use or storage of hazardous materials. In each case, the potential hazards would depend on the types of materials used, where the materials would be used, how they would be

used, and who would use them. Households and certain businesses, such as office-based businesses, would use relatively small quantities of hazardous materials when compared to certain other businesses, such as those engaged in research and development or light manufacturing. Manufacturing, research and development businesses that handle larger quantities of hazardous materials would often use a wider variety of materials, which could include less common materials and acutely hazardous materials. However, businesses that handle larger quantities of hazardous materials and acutely hazardous materials would also be subject to more regulation and oversight than businesses that handle smaller quantities of more common materials. In addition, employees of businesses that handle large quantities of hazardous materials would also typically receive special training (often required by law under OSHA) to help them understand these potential hazards. (DEIR, p. 6.7-20.)

Residential and Commercial Hazardous Material Use

Hazardous materials would be handled and stored routinely by households and most businesses within the project area. Typical household hazardous materials would include oils (e.g., motor oil and hydraulic oil), fuels (e.g., gasoline and diesel), paints (both latex and oil-based), solvents (e.g., degreasers, paint thinners, and aerosol propellants), acids and bases (e.g., automobile battery fluids, swimming pool chemicals, and many cleaners), disinfectants, metals (e.g., mercury in thermometers, batteries, and photography chemicals), and pesticides and herbicides. (DEIR, p. 6.7-20.)

Commercial businesses would use materials similar to households, and some (e.g., gas stations, dry cleaners, and photoprocessors) would use hazardous materials in larger quantities specifically related to their business activities. For example, supermarkets and gas stations stock hazardous materials for sale to consumers; service stations handle fuel, motor oil, antifreeze, and other fluids; and supermarkets handle automotive fluids, cleaners, pesticides, and batteries. In addition, dry cleaners handle perchloroethylene and photoprocessors handle fixer and developer chemicals. (DEIR, p. 6.7-20.)

Although individual households and many businesses use relatively small volumes of hazardous materials, the total volume of the hazardous materials managed by all of the households and businesses in the project area could be substantial, which would increase the opportunities for accidents and improper use, storage, and disposal. However, because many hazardous materials are consumed through their use (e.g., fuel, paint, aerosols), the quantity of hazardous materials handled is generally believed to be substantially greater than the volume of hazardous waste generated. In any case, the Placer County Facility Services has a household hazardous waste collection program that safely collects, transports, and disposes of residual hazardous wastes. (DEIR, p. 6.7-20.)

Commercial products are labeled to inform users of potential risks and to instruct users in appropriate handling procedures. Although households are relatively less regulated than businesses, the risks posed by hazardous materials use at project-related residences would be similar to those in similar residential areas already developed in the City of Roseville,

adjacent residential areas and western Placer County. Home use of common household hazardous materials is typically considered to pose an acceptable level of risk. (DEIR, p. 6.7-20.)

University Campus

Laboratory-based research and development conducted at the proposed University could involve a broad spectrum of activities requiring the use of laboratory bench space, laboratory support space (e.g., tissue culture rooms, media preparation areas, cold rooms, glassware wash areas, and dark rooms), and other ancillary facilities (offices and work stations, storage areas, libraries, and meeting rooms). Typical laboratories contain workbenches, sinks, storage areas, fume hoods, biosafety cabinets, and a wide variety of instruments and equipment. Each instrument is generally associated with one or more basic techniques. Like the appliances in a typical household kitchen, the instruments range in size from as small as a blender to as large as a commercial restaurant refrigerator. The equipment housed in a laboratory depends on the technologies employed and the materials handled. Many laboratories also include space for computers that control instruments or are used to store and analyze data. Most of the work in laboratories is performed at room temperature or body temperature under normal atmospheric pressure. Other types of laboratories could use a greater range (lower and higher) of temperatures and pressures. Standard laboratory techniques include measuring weights and volumes, gently heating and cooling materials, and shaking and stirring solutions. Research and development laboratories typically use relatively small quantities of hazardous materials at any one time. (DEIR, p. 6.7-21.)

The quantities of hazardous materials that would be used, stored, and disposed of on the proposed University site cannot be quantified precisely because the specific future University uses are unknown. Even if the uses were known, institutions cannot reasonably be expected to predict in advance every possible chemical or combination of chemicals they could conceivably use. However, compliance with applicable laws and regulations pertaining to the use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials is assumed. As required by the County's subsequent conformity review process, the applicant for the university would be required to prepare a Campus Master Plan. The County could determine at that time, based on the type and configuration of uses within the Campus portion of the project area, that additional environmental review would be required for any issue associated with the Campus, including but not limited to the generation or handling of hazardous materials. (DEIR, p. 6.7-21.)

The proposed project would involve the use of varying amounts and types of hazardous materials in the day-to-day activities and operations of the residential, commercial, and University uses. This would be a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-21.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.7-2 *The proposed project shall comply with all federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials within the University, residential, and commercial land uses.*

(DEIR, p. 6.7-21.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-3: **In the future, the project site could be included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 or could pose a risk from other hazardous releases and, therefore, may pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, pp. 6.7-21 to 6.7-22.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

The project site and off-site improvement areas are not listed on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As described in the Environmental Setting, Phase 1 ESAs prepared for all locations within the study area indicated there is no obvious evidence of any hazardous materials contamination on or near the project site that would present a substantial risk to the public or the environment as a result of project development. The Phase 1 ESAs did note, however, that stained soil typically associated with old spills, leaking equipment, or improper disposal of petroleum products are present at some locations, along with various kinds of metal and wood debris. The Phase 1 ESAs recommended the debris and stained soils be removed and properly disposed of prior to site development. (DEIR, p. 6.7-22.)

As the debris and stained soil is removed, it is possible that soil contamination of a larger extent than identified in the Phase 1 ESA may be discovered. It is also possible that undiscovered contamination from past uses on the site could be encountered during construction. Unless properly identified and managed, the removal of contaminated soil could present a hazard to construction workers and may be inadvertently spread, which could result in more environmental contamination. This is considered a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-22.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.7-3 a) *The applicant shall ensure the recommendations for removing all debris and stained soils identified in the existing Phase I ESAs prepared for the project site and off-site improvement areas [Wallace-Kuhl Associates, Consolidated Environmental Site Assessment Regional University Specific Plan, November 28, 2006] and any supplements or amendments thereto, are implemented prior to site preparation.*
- b) *If, during site preparation, visual or olfactory evidence of contamination is observed when soils are disturbed during construction, the applicant shall ensure the location is investigated and remediated to meet State and County regulations and any required remediation shall be completed prior to resuming construction.*
- c) *The applicant shall ensure Grading Notes include standard County provisions for the management of previously unidentified hazardous materials contamination or debris that may be encountered during construction.*
- d) *Prior to submittal of a small lot tentative subdivision map or plans for residential or other sensitive development, properties not previously evaluated with a current Phase I Environmental Site Assessment may be required to complete a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, as determined by Environmental Health Services. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be conducted by a qualified professional. If past commercial agricultural uses are disclosed that could have resulted in persistent contamination, such as rice fields, soil sampling shall be conducted within former commercial agriculture areas. In these instances, prior to setting conditions for subdivision development, soil investigation shall be conducted according to guidelines developed by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and contained in the DTSC August 2002 "Interim Guidance for Sampling Agricultural Fields for School Sites", or equivalent protocol. Sampling and site investigation shall be conducted by a California registered environmental professional, performed with oversight from Placer County Environmental Health Services, and with applicable permits.*

As a result of soil investigation, a limited and confined area of contamination may be identified and found to be suitable for simple removal. If this is the case, remediation will be required to meet State and County regulations and be completed prior to recordation of the final small lot subdivision map or equivalent final Placer County approval for residential projects.

As a result of soil investigation, unconfined and/or widespread residual concentrations of agricultural chemicals may be identified at levels where they individually or in combination meet or exceed US EPA, CalEPA Preliminary Remediation Goals, or equivalent screening levels, thereby indicating the need for risk assessment. Any indicated risk assessment shall be completed prior to improvement plans or equivalent approval. Risk assessments shall include a DTSC Preliminary Endangerment Assessment or no further action determination, or equivalent.

Any remedial action indicated by a risk assessment shall be completed and certified prior to recordation of the small lot tentative subdivision final map or equivalent final Placer County approval. Remediation shall include a DTSC Remedial Action Workplan, or equivalent, and can include a range of activities, including restrictions on use, soil excavation and disposal off-site, or encapsulation in appropriate areas away from sensitive receptors in the Specific Plan area.

(DEIR, pp. 6.7-22 to 6.7-23.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-4: **Recycled water from the PGWWTP could be used to irrigate publicly accessible areas such as landscaped parks and roadway medians. This impact is less than significant.** (DEIR, pp. 6.7-23 to 6.7-24.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

Recycled water from the PGWWTP would be conveyed to the project and used for irrigation in parks and for irrigation of landscaping in other places accessed by the public. Individuals using or maintaining the parks and landscaped facilities in areas accessible to the public would come in contact with the water when these features are actively irrigated, from water adhering to grass and other landscaping, or through any remaining water that has not yet infiltrated into the subsurface. Ponding would be minimized by controlling the rates and frequency of application. (DEIR, p. 6.7-23.) Approximately 650 afy of this irrigation demand could be served by recycled water from the PGWWTP. The City of Roseville has indicated that the amount of recycled water that would be

generally made available to the proposed project would be based upon the average dry weather flow of wastewater from the proposed project. The 650 afy figure, therefore, assumes the peak day irrigation demand served by recycled water would be limited by the average dry weather flow of wastewater from the proposed project which was determined to be 650 afy.

The PGWWTP has been designed and operated to produce effluent that meets or exceeds standards consistent with "Disinfected Tertiary Recycled Water" as defined by Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (Division 4, Chapter 3, Section 60301.230). Water meeting these standards (referred to as "tertiary-2.2 criteria") may be used for unrestricted use, which includes (but is not limited to) body-contact for recreation (swimming), irrigation of food crops, and irrigation of parks, playgrounds, and schoolyards. The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) considers a properly filtered and disinfected water meeting the tertiary-2.2 standard to be essentially pathogen-free and adequately protective of public health. As the recycled water provider, the City is responsible for ensuring the application sites comply with the siting and use requirements established in Section 60310 of the CCR. The crossconnection requirements would ensure that the recycled water distribution infrastructure in the project site does not enter the potable water distribution system. (DEIR, p. 6.7-23.)

Because there is no evidence that use of tertiary-2.2 recycled water would result in any conditions that would unduly expose future project occupants to unmitigated risks, this is considered a *less-than-significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-24.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-5: **The project could include development where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas, which could present a safety hazard. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.7-24.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Wildland fires can be initiated by natural phenomena, such as lightning, or from extremely dry and hot conditions. However, wildland fires can also be started by human activities, such as smoking, use of flammable fuels, automobiles, and malfunctioning electrical equipment. (DEIR, p. 6.7-24.)

The proposed project would construct residences on a large portion of the existing grassland areas, thus reducing on-site natural fuel for fires. However, the areas surrounding the Specific Plan area would remain dry grasslands until those areas are developed. Because the area is located in a potential fire zone and there would be an increase in the population in this area, people and structures could be exposed to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of wildland fires. This would be a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-24.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.7-5 a) *The proposed project shall comply with all federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to wildland fires.*
- b) *Prior to construction, the County shall review project plans for conformance with the UBC and UFC to reduce risk of fires originating within the County.*
- c) *During construction activities, the applicant shall consult with the Placer County Fire Department in order to implement fire prevention measures at sites adjacent to natural areas.*
- d) *Construct a fire station as required by Mitigation Measure 6.10-7(a).*
- e) *A minimum 10-foot firebreak, which shall be maintained until such time that adjacent properties are developed, shall be required in all areas with wood fences that are adjacent to wild areas.*

(DEIR, p. 6.7-24.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-6: **The proposed project could be located near a private airstrip and could cross a safety hazard for people residing or working within the Plan Area. There would be *no impact*.**

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

A private, non-paved airstrip is located immediately south of the western (University) portion of the project site, approximately 2,700 feet east of Brewer Road. The airstrip runs north/south with the north end of the airstrip located directly adjacent to the RUSP property. The Placer County General Plan includes Public Facility Buffer Zones, which are intended to separate residential, commercial, and other land uses continuously or frequently occupied by people from areas designated Public Facility, where nuisances and safety hazards, such as the operation of aircraft, would be incompatible with other land uses. The Placer County General Plan identifies the following minimum buffer zone widths between designated land uses and airports:

- Residential — 2,000 feet
- Commercial — 1,000 feet
- Industrial — 0 feet
- Recreation — 0 –500 feet.

(DEIR, pp. 6.7-24 to 6.7-25.)

Although the private airstrip adjacent to the project site is not designated as a public facility, the operation of the airstrip entails the same or similar potential incompatibilities with proposed project land uses and is treated as a public facility for the purposes of this analysis. (DEIR, p. 6.7-25.)

To comply with the General Plan, the Regional University Specific Plan includes a 2,000 foot buffer, measured from the end of the airstrip, for any residential use or structure, occupied office, classroom, administration building, athletic facilities, such as recreation center, stadium, gymnasium, performing arts center, maintenance building or other occupied university building. No buffer is required for maintenance buildings, corporation yards, or expansive, low-population outdoor recreation facilities, such as athletic fields, open space, parks, or parking lots. The buffer would remain in place until such time as the County determines the private airstrip is no longer a legally permissible use on the property or the property owner voluntarily relinquishes any right of use that would result in any overflight of the University portion of the RUSP. With the 2,000-foot buffer, residents or occupants of the Plan Area would not subject to potential hazards from any flights from the airstrip. Because the Specific Plan specifies that no University buildings, residential buildings, recreational facilities, athletic facilities, or other occupied uses would be developed within aviation facility buffer zones without first obtaining

County certification that the aviation facilities have been permanently removed from operation, there would be *no impact* related to hazards associated with operation of the airstrip. (DEIR, p. 6.7-25.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-7: **The development of the Plan Area could physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. This impact is *less than significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.7-25.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

The proposed project would convert agricultural land to urban uses. Ingress and egress, including new roads and streets within and surrounding the project area would be constructed to Placer County Land Development standards. However, roadway improvements would not result in any changes to existing emergency access, nor would it prevent the implementation of future emergency plans. Such improvements (e.g., Watt Avenue extension) would, in fact, provide additional access, which would be considered a benefit of the proposed project. Therefore, implementation of the project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-25.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-8: **The proposed project could include stormwater basins and open channels that could provide breeding opportunities for**

mosquitoes. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-26.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

The project site contains small stream channels, canals, and irrigation/tailwater ditches, which could provide some habitat for mosquito populations. The proposed stormwater drainage system would consist of a combination of open space drainageways, retention and detention facilities, and an approximately 20-acre stormwater basin constructed west of Brewer Road. Standing water provides breeding opportunities for mosquitoes, provided temperatures are high enough, there are available nutrients, and if the water were present long enough for mosquitoes to complete their four life stages (egg, larval, pupal, and adult). (DEIR, p. 6.7-26.)

Mosquitoes are common in the region. Mosquitoes (vectors) can carry diseases that afflict humans, and they also transmit several diseases and parasites that can affect dogs and horses. These include dog heartworm, West Nile virus, Eastern equine encephalitis, malaria, dengue, and yellow fever, among others. Development of the project would increase the number of people who could be exposed to mosquito populations that could increase through the creation of additional water features, as described above. (DEIR, p. 6.7-26.)

As described in the Stormwater Management Plan prepared for the proposed project, the basins would be designed so that standing water would not accumulate within the basins, and complete discharge of the basin treatment volumes would occur within 72-hours of the completion of storm drain discharges. However, if not managed properly, the wetland, park, and open space corridor areas within the Plan Area could have the potential to become locations for mosquito breeding, thus exposing people to diseases transmitted by mosquitoes. This is considered a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-26.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.7-8 a) *During construction, all grading shall be performed in a manner to prevent the occurrence of standing water or other areas suitable for breeding of mosquitoes and other vectors.*
- b) *The Placer Mosquito Abatement District shall be granted access to perform vector control in all common areas including drainage, open*

space corridor and park areas in perpetuity. Such access shall be a condition of approval of all tentative maps approved within the Plan Area.

- c) *Prior to grading, the applicant shall prepare a Preserve Management Plan which shall include information on compatible mosquito and vector control methods that are appropriate for the various habitat types within the natural open space areas.*

(DEIR, p. 6.7-26.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-9: **Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could expose people and the environment to hazards and hazardous materials through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions. This impact is *less than significant*.**
(DEIR, p. 6.7-27.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

The project, in conjunction with cumulative development in south Placer County, would include areas designated for commercial and research uses. Cumulative development would also include construction and continued operation or development of new light-industrial uses and/or public/quasi-public facilities (e.g., PGWWTP and the Roseville Energy Park). These types of development would increase the use of hazardous materials within the area, resulting in potential health and safety effects related to hazardous materials use. For the most part, potential impacts associated with project development would be confined to the University and commercial areas. Hazardous materials incidents would typically be site-specific and would involve accidental spills or inadvertent releases. Associated health and safety risks would generally be limited to those individuals using the materials or to persons in the immediate vicinity of the materials. Thus, the project's contribution to increased use of hazardous materials; and associated exposure risks, would not be cumulatively considerable. Airborne toxic air contaminant emissions from commercial and University sources are addressed in the cumulative analysis for air quality. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 6.7-1(a) through (d) and 6.7-2 would ensure cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials use would be *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-27.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-10: Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could expose people to hazards associated with soil or groundwater contamination. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-27.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

For any projects in south Placer County that would involve development or redevelopment of an existing site in which soil or groundwater contamination may have occurred, the potential exists for release of hazardous materials during construction and/or remediation of those sites. There is also potential for existing wells, if not properly destroyed, to allow surface contamination to reach groundwater. Placer County Environmental Health Services has oversight of these wells and any abandoned wells must be properly destroyed under permit from Environmental Health Services. In addition, the California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 74-90, Section 23, contains standards for the abandonment of water wells no longer in use; those standards would apply to all development in the County, including the proposed project. For individuals not involved in construction activities, the greatest potential source of exposure to contaminants would be airborne emissions, primarily through construction-generated dust. Other potential pathways, such as direct contact with contaminated soils or groundwater, would not pose as great a risk to the public because such exposure scenarios would typically be confined to the construction zones. Moreover, an individual who is near the construction zone of one source would not likely be exposed to maximum levels off-site from another source. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-27.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-11: **The proposed project, in combination with other development in south Placer County, could increase the use of recycled water for irrigation in publicly accessible areas. This impact is less than significant.** (DEIR, p. 6.7-28.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

As development continues in south Placer County, it is anticipated that new areas accessible to the public (e.g., parks, recreation fields, landscape medians) would continue to be irrigated with recycled water from the wastewater treatments plants (e.g., PGWWTP) as part of the overall water supply strategy for the area. Recycled water used for areas accessible to the public must be treated to adopted standards and applied in accordance with adopted regulations. Development of the project, in combination with development in south Placer County and potential future projects in the region would increase the number of people who could use areas irrigated with recycled water. Recycled water used for irrigation in the Plan Area would be obtained from the same sources, and all treatment methods would continue to comply with adopted standards established by laws and regulations. Although new areas would be irrigated, there would be no direct correlation between the use of recycled water and the number of people working, residing, or visiting areas irrigated with recycled water. Therefore, the project's contribution to impacts associated with the use of recycled water would not be cumulatively considerable. This would be a *less-than-significant cumulative impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-28.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-12: **Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could result in a cumulative increase in the number of people**

and structures that could be exposed to wildland fire hazards. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-28.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

Development in south Placer County, including the proposed project, would result in an increase in the number of people and structures that could be exposed to wildland fires where urban land interfaces with rural land. Placer County General Plan policies 8.C.1 through 8.C.10 have been established to provide a safe environment for residents in the County, decrease the risk from fires (including wildland fires), and to provide a level of service sufficient for emergency response times. The County enforces the CBC and UFC through the issuance of building permits and conditions of approval. As stated in Draft EIR Section 6.10, Public Services, the County ensures that fire and emergency services are at levels that can provide sufficient services to reduce the risk of loss, injury, or death from wildland fires. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-28.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-13: **Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could result in a cumulative increase in the number of people and structures that could be exposed to aircraft hazards. This impact is *less than significant*.** (DEIR, pp. 6.7-28 to 6.7-29.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

There are several permitted airports, airstrips, and helicopter facilities in the greater Sacramento metropolitan area, which includes south Placer County. With few exceptions, each facility must be permitted by Caltrans Division of Aeronautics, which enforces and monitors compliance with federal aviation regulations. Any new facility must secure all required land use approvals. Approach and departure paths are established for each facility, and the use of airspace over the greater Sacramento region is governed by federal and State regulations. (DEIR, pp. 6.7-28 to 6.7-29.)

Development of the proposed project, in combination with cumulative development, would increase the number of people in the region who could be exposed to aircraft crash hazards on the ground. However, the frequency, location, and severity of aircraft accidents (which are extremely rare) at any one location would be site-specific and would be limited to the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be considered a *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-29.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-14: Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could temporarily affect local roadway emergency access routes during construction activities, but there could be no long-term or permanent changes in emergency routes or access. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-29.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

Construction-related activities and developments within south Placer County that alter, close, or in other ways affect traffic on area roadways could interfere with emergency response access or response times or affect evacuation routes by lane narrowings to accommodate underground utility installations or roadway improvements (e.g., road widenings). If project restrictions coincide with other closures from adjacent projects, emergency response access or response times could be adversely affected. However, the County requires all project applicants to prepare and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan for projects that would obstruct vehicle traffic. This would allow the

County to manage affected roadways so that effects would not be cumulatively considerable. As noted in the discussion of Impact 6.7-8, the proposed extension of Watt Avenue would provide new access to the area, which would be considered a benefit of the proposed project. The impact is considered a *less-than-significant cumulative impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.7-29.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.7-15: **The proposed project, in combination with other development in south Placer County, could result in an increase in the extent of new or improved stormwater basins that could temporarily store water. The basins could provide breeding opportunities for mosquitoes. Cumulative development could also increase the number of people who could be exposed to mosquito hazards. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.7-29 to 6.7-30.)**

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3).)

Explanation:

Mosquitoes are common in the region. Development of the project, in combination with development in south Placer County and potential future projects in the region would result in the construction of additional stormwater drainage improvements, such as detention or retention basins or improvements to natural waterways to temporarily store stormwater runoff. New areas would be developed in south Placer County, resulting in an increase in the population who could be exposed to mosquito hazards. As discussed in connection with Impact 6.7-9, health and safety risks associated with mosquito breeding would be reduced with the implementation of Mitigation Measures 6.7-9(a) through (c). Further, mosquito abatement services are currently performed routinely by the Placer Mosquito Abatement District, which would protect the population. This would be *less-than-significant cumulative impact*. (DEIR, pp. 6.7-29 to 6.7-30.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Standards of Significance

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the Placer County General Plan, and the Placer County Municipal Code. For the purpose of this EIR, impacts to hydrology and water quality are considered significant if the proposed project would:

- Substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in localized flooding on- or off-site;
- Substantially increase the amount of runoff in a manner that would result in localized flooding on- or off-site;
- Substantially increase exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year flood;
- Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge standards;
- Cause increases in sediment and other contaminants generated during construction or operation that would result in degraded surface water quality in violation of existing ambient water quality standards of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basin Plan adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board;
- Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;
- Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;
- Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff;

- Otherwise substantially degrade water quality;
- 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; or
- Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.

Impact 6.8-1: **The proposed project could increase peak runoff rates and volumes which could exceed the capacity of local drainages and result in on- and off-site flooding hazards. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, pp. 6.8-18 to 6.8-22.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Development of the proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surface coverage over that which currently exists by converting approximately 1,157.5 acres of undeveloped agricultural land to urban uses, approximately 316 acres of which would be dedicated to open space, parks, and landscape setbacks. The increase in the amount of impervious urban land use surfaces such as roofs, parking lots, sidewalks, hardscape, and roads would increase the rate of surface runoff entering Curry Creek by limiting ground infiltration. In addition, development and grading would alter the existing runoff patterns and conveyance capacities on the project site. Figures 2-8 and 2-9 in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR show the proposed project drainage improvements. Increased flows and altered drainage patterns could increase the potential for localized and downstream flooding. (DEIR, pp. 6.8-18 to 6.8-19.)

Consistent with PCFCWCD standards, peak flow runoff rates were determined for the proposed project to identify drainage features that would be necessary to mitigate post-development flows to acceptable levels, to the extent that such features would not exacerbate downstream peak flows. Draft EIR Table 6.8-2 summarizes the estimated pre-project peak flow rates in cubic feet per second (cfs) from modeled scenarios presented in the Preliminary Drainage Master Plan at points where Curry Creek sub-watersheds drain through the project site. (DEIR, p. 6.8-19.)

As illustrated by the data in Draft EIR Table 6.8-3, the proposed project would result in peak flows increasing with greater storm events from each sub-watershed node modeled in the Preliminary Drainage Master Plan. Tables 6.8-3 and 6.8-4 show peak flow rates

would be reduced through project design and through proposed drainage improvements, including designed channels, culverts, and detention features or lakes. (DEIR, p. 6.8-19.)

The proposed project would use several types of drainage facilities to reduce peak flow discharges from the project site. The principle method of attenuating peak flows would be through the use of excavated and channelized detention basins adjacent to existing channels, and a lake storage area. Other types of attenuation facilities proposed include constructed wetland areas, water quality basins, and channelized detention areas upstream of peak flow regulating culverts. (DEIR, p. 6.8-21.)

Draft EIR Table 6.8-5 shows the difference between the pre-project unmitigated flows and the post-project mitigated runoff peak flows for the same sub-watershed nodes. The modeling results show that there would be localized increases in peak flows for the two-through 500-year storm events in a variety of post-project sub-watersheds. The data presented in Draft EIR Table 6.8-5 show that with the proposed project, peak flow rates would be reduced in Curry Creek for all storm events from the two through 100-year storm events exiting the project site at Brewer Road, as required by the PCFCWCD. These decreases would also result in a measurable decrease in the peak flows at the confluence of Curry Creek and the Pleasant Grove Creek Canal, or at downstream locations exiting Placer County, such that increased flood risk would not occur downstream of the proposed project. (DEIR, p. 6.8-21.)

These proposed detention and volumetric drainage facilities, located within the boundaries of the project site and just west of Brewer Road, would not increase peak flow rates and flooding depths downstream of the project site, and would not increase water surface elevations at the upstream boundary of the project site. Further, the lake storage area provides conveyance and storage mitigation volumes necessary to contain the post-project peak flow rates for the two-, 10-, and 100-year events per PCFCWD standards. A dual detention/retention basin constructed on the western side of Brewer Road would receive flows directly from the lake storage area in the project site and operate at the same elevation and storage of the lake, thus extending the amount of storage for project site runoff before flowing downstream. Although the proposed project Preliminary Drainage Master Plan would meet the PCFCWCD SWMM criteria for peak discharge rates and included conveyance of fully developed off-site unmitigated flows, a comprehensive operation and maintenance plan and fee program for the proposed stormwater facilities has not been prepared or approved by Placer County. Therefore, the proposed project could result in a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, pp. 6.8-21 to 6.8-22.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.8-1 a) *Prior to recordation of the first Large Lot, Final Map, or any improvement plan approval, a Final Project Drainage Master Plan shall be prepared and submitted to the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department*

(ESD) for review and approval. Similarly, drainage plans for any off-site improvement areas shall be prepared and submitted for review. The Final Drainage Master Plan and other drainage plans (Drainage Plans) shall ensure that peak flows from developed areas do not exceed pre-development conditions and shall be in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal. The drainage facilities shall be designed for future, fully developed, unmitigated flows from upstream development. Regional detention and retention basins, regional water quality basins, as well as regional drainage channel improvements, shall be incorporated with appropriate design information along with appropriate phasing information. The Drainage Plans shall include specific operation and maintenance responsibilities, inspection schedules, and reporting requirements. The Drainage Plans shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall include all drainage elements outlined in the Preliminary Drainage Master Plan used for analysis in this EIR or other elements determined by Placer County ESD to be equally effective.

- b) New development applications (including backbone infrastructure) within the Plan Area shall be accompanied by site-specific project drainage reports consistent with the approved Final Project Drainage Master Plan. The project drainage reports shall be reviewed and approved by the ESD during the Subsequent Conformity Review Process and prior to improvement plan approval for new development. The drainage report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall be in conformance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and Placer County Code. The project applicant shall be financially responsible for all stormwater drainage facility maintenance requirements. The project drainage report shall include, at a minimum, written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, potential increases in downstream flows and volumes, proposed on-site improvements, and drainage easements, if necessary, to accommodate flows from the site. The drainage report shall demonstrate compliance with all mitigation measures included in this EIR.
- c) Drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting runoff, 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, to the satisfaction of the ESD. These facilities shall be constructed with proposed project improvements, and easements provided as required by the ESD. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by a Master Homeowners Association, Community Services District, or other responsible entity to be determined by Placer County prior to any development approval.

- d) *New development applications within the Plan Area shall describe the location, size, and ownership of any stormwater conveyance facility in the Final Project Drainage Master Plan and shown on improvement plans. The developer shall submit a letter to the ESD from the entity controlling the canal describing any restrictions, requirements, easements, etc. relative to project construction. Said letter shall be provided to the ESD prior to the approval of improvement plans.*
- e) *A County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD), or other entity for operation and maintenance of the stormwater facilities shall be formed for the Plan Area prior to recordation of the first Large Lot Final Map. This entity would have the ability to participate in design, inspect and accept facilities, and determine appropriate funding levels necessary to operate and maintain these facilities. A drainage facility operation and maintenance special tax or special assessment, with a provision for increases, indexed to the Consumer Price Index (CPI), shall be approved by the landowners (voters) of the Plan Area prior to recordation of the first Large Lot Final Map in the Plan Area. An indexing formula for operations and maintenance of drainage facilities shall also be in place prior to recordation of the first Large Lot Final Map.*
- f) *New development shall not alter the post-development mitigated drainage shed boundaries identified in the Final Drainage Master Plan in any way that would increase the peak flow runoff or runoff volumes.*
- g) *New development shall reduce post-development storm water run-off peak flows and volumes to pre-development levels through the installation of retention/detention facilities. Retention/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 ESD. Retention/detention facilities shall be designed to be consistent with the approved Master Drainage Plan. Construction of regional retention/detention facilities shall occur prior to or concurrent with the initial development of the Specific Plan. No retention/detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.*

(DEIR, pp. 6.8-23 to 6.8-24.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.8-2: **The proposed project could increase the amount (volume) of stormwater which could exceed the capacity of Curry Creek, exacerbating on- or off-site flooding. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, pp. 6.8-24 to 6.8-25.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Increases in stormwater runoff flows generated by the proposed project, as described in Impact 6.8-1, would also increase the amount (volume) of stormwater runoff from the project site that would enter Curry Creek. Results of the hydrologic and hydraulic modeling for the proposed project indicate that the project site would generate a volume increase of approximately 168.7 acre-feet of runoff to Curry Creek during the 8-day 100-year design storm (the PCFCWCD SWMM required storm event for modeling post-project runoff volumes). The increase in stormwater volume, if not mitigated, could increase downstream and upstream water surface elevations and, in turn, exacerbate on- and off-site flooding. Accordingly, the proposed project would include drainage system improvements that would retain this increase in runoff volume in the lake storage area, in unmodified floodplain areas, in excess storage in the basin to the west of Brewer Road, and through a series of weirs to regulate the timing of volume releases from the storage areas beyond the 100-year design event as required by the PCFCWCD. The proposed project could use off-site volumetric storage at the Reason Farms retention facility if it was operational in time for use by the proposed project and if the City of Roseville codified a formal fair-share fee system. Although these proposed facilities have been designed to reduce post-project increases in stormwater volume to pre-project conditions and convey flows from off-site developed and unmitigated areas upstream, an operation and maintenance plan for these facilities has not been prepared. Therefore, the proposed project could result in volumetric increases in Curry Creek and on- or off-site flooding. This is considered a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, pp. 6.8-24 to 6.8-25.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.8-2 a) *Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (d).*
- b) *As an option to on-site mitigation for volumetric increases resulting from the proposed project, the proposed project could mitigate for volumetric impacts through the purchase of volumetric storage capacity at a facility approved by PCFCWCD and ESD. The Reason Farms Facility is an approved facility that is planned to be constructed within the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed. If the proposed project were to use this facility for volumetric mitigation, construction of the Reason Farms Facility must*

be complete and the facility in operation before the proposed project is constructed.

(DEIR, p. 6.8-25.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.8-3: **The proposed off-site infrastructure improvement areas could increase impervious surfaces which could affect stormwater runoff rates and volumes. This impact is *potentially significant*.**
(DEIR, p. 6.8-25.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Construction of off-site infrastructure would result in an increase in impervious surfaces and stormwater runoff rates and volumes. Because the final design for off-site improvements are not available, the Preliminary Drainage Master Plan did not include the off-site improvements in the stormwater runoff models. Without adequate design for off-site infrastructure stormwater runoff, impacts would be *potentially significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.8-25.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.8-3. a) *Prior to approval of plans for off-site infrastructure areas or the recordation of the first Large Lot Final Map, the applicant shall prepare an addendum to the Preliminary Drainage Master Plan or include in the Final Project Drainage Master Plan modeling of runoff rates and volumes from off-site infrastructure areas. The modeling shall be used to adequately reduce post-project stormwater runoff flows and volumes.*

b) *Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (g).*

(DEIR, p. 6.8-25.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.8-4:

The proposed project could increase the amount (volume) of treated wastewater discharged into Pleasant Grove Creek which could exceed the capacity of the creek, exacerbating on- or off-site flooding during the 100-year storm event. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.8-25 to 6.8-26.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

The proposed project would result in an increase in the local population and, thus, an increase in wastewater treatment and discharge at the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP), if project wastewater is treated at PGWWTP. A discussion of the proposed project's impacts on capacity at the PGWWTP is discussed in detail in Section 6.11, Utilities. The proposed project would generate 1.2 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater that could be treated at the PGWWTP. At this time, the PGWWTP uses 6.5 mgd of its permitted 12 mgd of average daily dry weather flow (ADWF) capacity. Combined with the proposed project flows, the demand for treatment and discharge would increase to 1.2mgd. Although the project site is currently outside the 1996 Wastewater Master Plan boundary, there is adequate capacity to serve the project. Further, the PGWWTP is permitted through a NPDES permit issued by the CVRWQCB (NPDES No. CA0084573, Order No. 5-00-075) to discharge treated wastewater up to the 12 mgd treatment and discharge capacity. (DEIR, pp. 6.8-25 to 6.8-26, FEIR p. 2-25.)

On January 15, 2006 a technical memorandum analyzing the impacts of increased future wastewater flows to and discharges from the PGWWTP was completed by Merritt Smith Consulting. The overall increase in flow to the PGWWTP analyzed was for a number of planned projects outside the current PGWWTP service area, including the proposed project. The projected increase of 1.2 mgd would result in increases in discharge volumes into Pleasant Grove Creek. Results of modeling of the increase in flows to Pleasant Grove Creek during the 100-year storm event showed that water surface elevations in downstream areas would rise approximately 0.01 foot approximately one mile upstream of the Sutter/Place County line, but would not result in any increase downstream of this point to the Pleasant Grove Canal.

Expansion of treatment capacity of the PGWWTP beyond that planned for in the 1996 Wastewater Master Plan EIR would require modification to the PGWWTP's NPDES permit to accommodate additional effluent discharges to Pleasant Grove Creek. Such modification would require approval by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. If any modifications to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit are required, the WWTP operator would address modifying the

allowable discharge amounts. Additional environmental review may be required as part of the approval process. The ability to treat wastewater flow from the Plan Area is contingent upon receiving this discharge permit from the RWQCB. (FEIR p. 2-1.)

Therefore, increases in discharges of treated wastewater to Pleasant Grove Creek from the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant impact* to downstream flooding during the 100-year storm event. (DEIR, p. 6.8-26.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.8-5: **The proposed project could construct residences and other structures within the pre-construction 100-year FEMA floodplain, potentially exposing people and structures to flooding. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, pp. 6.8-26 to 6.8-27.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

As shown in Draft EIR Figure 6.8-3, major portions of the project site (pre-construction) are within an area subject to 100-year flood hazards as defined by FEMA. Development of the proposed project under these conditions would place residential and institutional land uses in areas subject to the existing (pre-construction) 100-year floodplain. (DEIR, p. 6.8-26.)

The County requires that house pad elevations be two feet above the 100-year floodplain water surface elevation (or finish floors at three feet above the same elevation) to protect structures and occupants from flood hazards. To accommodate development in those areas and to provide required freeboard, the proposed project would construct stormwater drainage facilities that would prevent 100-year flows in Curry Creek from overtopping the banks of the channels, culverts, and lake storage areas and prevent flooding of occupied structures. The Preliminary Drainage Master Plan provides detailed HEC-RAS output tables showing that post-project drainage facilities would reduce all upstream and most on-site water surface elevations such that flooding limits would be confined within

channels and generally provide three feet of freeboard to finish floor of adjacent proposed structures. The modeling results can be seen in the post-project floodplain shown in Draft EIR Figure 6.8-4. Although the proposed project drainage improvements would reduce or maintain the 100-year water surface elevations and peak flows and would not increase on- or off-site flooding, an operation and maintenance plan for these facilities has not been prepared. Therefore, the proposed project could result in increases in water surface elevations resulting in on- or off-site flooding. This is considered a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, pp. 6.8-26 to 6.8-27.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.8-5 a) *Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (g).*
- b) *No grading activities of any kind may take place within the post project 100-year floodplain as identified in the Final Drainage Master Plan, except as necessary to construct and maintain drainage improvements. The post-project 100-year floodplain shall be designated as a development setback line on improvement plans and final subdivision maps, unless greater setbacks are required by other mitigation measures or conditions of approval.*
- c) *The Final Drainage Master Plan shall show the limits of the future unmitigated fully-developed 100-year floodplain (after development) for the North and South channel tributaries to Curry Creek on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) filed with the appropriate Final Map(s) and designate same as a building setback line unless greater setbacks are required by other conditions contained herein. Channel construction and/or improvements with new development shall provide sufficient freeboard for the 100-year modeled storm event and shall be identified with floodplain delineations. Subsequent site specific developments shall identify the 100-year floodplain in the site specific drainage report and Improvement Plans.*
- d) *The Final Drainage Master Plan shall demonstrate that the proposed project would not increase the 100-year floodplain water surface elevation upstream or downstream of the project area.*
- e) *New development applications within the Plan Area shall identify the limits of existing and proposed floodplains in the Final Drainage Master Plan. Channel/swale construction and/or improvements with new development shall be designed in accordance with the PCFCWCD Storm Water Management Manual, shall provide sufficient freeboard for the 100-year event and shall be identified with floodplain delineations.*

- f) *New development shall show finished house pad elevations two feet above the 100-year floodplain water surface elevation (or finished floor at three feet above same elevation) for lots near 100-year floodplain identified in the proposed channels for the North and South tributaries to Curry Creek on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet filed with the appropriate Final Map. Pad elevations shall be certified by the project engineer on "As-Built" plans submitted to the ESD following project construction. Benchmark elevation and location shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) to the satisfaction of DRC.*

(DEIR, p. 6.8-27.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.8-6: Construction activities for the proposed project could result in sediment and other construction-related pollutants entering local drainages. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.8-29.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Construction of the proposed project would involve earth-disturbing and building activities that could result in the discharge of sediment or other pollutants (e.g., petroleum products or building materials such as paints and cement) to Curry Creek and, ultimately, the Sacramento River via runoff from the construction site. Because activities associated with project development would disturb more than one acre of land, contractors would be required to obtain and comply with the State General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit. Performance standards for obtaining and complying with the General Permit are described in NPDES General Permit No. CAS000002, Waste Discharge Requirements, Order No. 99-08-DWQ. The General Permit is intended to ensure compliance with state water quality objectives and water protection laws and regulations, including those related to waste discharges. (DEIR, p. 6.8-29.)

General Permit applicants are required to prepare a SWPPP and retain it at the construction site. The County requires that contractors obtain and comply with the State General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit. The SWPPP must specify BMPs designed to minimize sedimentation and release of construction-related constituents into

Curry Creek. Examples of BMPs that could be used during construction of the proposed project, which can be found in the California Stormwater Quality Association's (CASQA) *Stormwater Best Management Practices Handbook for Construction*, include, but are not limited to, geotextiles, silt fences, hydroseeding, hydraulic mulch, soil binders, straw mulch, fiber rolls, earthen dikes and drainage swales, velocity dissipation devices, streambank stabilization measures, sediment traps, inlet filters, and tire washes. The General Permit was modified in April 2001 (SWRCB Resolution No. 2001-046) to require permittees to implement specific sampling and analytical procedures to determine whether the BMPs used at construction sites are effective. Although implementation of these State requirements would reduce project-related construction impacts, Placer County administers the oversight of implementation of construction BMPs. Therefore, the timing of construction BMPs could result in *potentially significant impacts*. (DEIR, p. 6.8-29.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.8-6 a) *Any project within the Plan Area with ground disturbance exceeding one-acre that is subject to the State NPDES General Construction Permit shall obtain such permit from the CVRWQCB and shall provide to the ESD evidence of a State-issued NPDES General Construction Permit number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.*
- b) *During the Subsequent Conformity Review process and prior to Improvement Plan approval, new development shall submit to the ESD, for review and approval, an erosion control plan consistent with the County's Grading Ordinance. The erosion control plan shall indicate that proper control of siltation, sedimentation and other pollutants will be implemented per NPDES General Construction Permit requirements and County ordinance standards. The plan shall propose BMPs to reduce erosion and water quality degradation during construction to the maximum extent practicable.*

(DEIR, p. 6.8-29.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.8-7: **Implementation of the proposed project could result in urban pollutants entering local drainages, which could result in degradation of water quality from stormwater runoff. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.8-30.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

As discussed in Impacts 6.8-1 and 6.8-2, the increase in impervious surfaces resulting from the construction of buildings and paved areas would increase the rate and amount of stormwater runoff. Activities that could increase the types or quantities of non-naturally occurring pollutants in stormwater runoff due to project development could include motor vehicle operations, littering, careless material storage and handling, landscaping, and pavement wear. Pollutants typically associated with urban uses, such as those that could be developed as a result of the proposed project, include oil and grease, coliform bacteria, petroleum hydrocarbons (gas and diesel fuels), nitrogen, phosphorus, and heavy metals such as lead, copper, and zinc. Pesticides, herbicides, and other landscape maintenance products typically used in landscaping activities could also be present. (DEIR, p. 6.8-30.)

The proposed water quality features described in the Preliminary Drainage Master Plan include the following treatment measures (see Figure 6.8-5 for a map of water quality basins):

- Directing some flows to sheet discharge across grassy or open spaces;
- The placement of water quality interceptor devices;
- The placement of water quality sediment basing within detention facilities and channels; and
- Use of rock-line ditches below pipe outlets.

Other BMPs would include prompt re-vegetation of disturbed areas and sizing stormwater quality basins per the criteria developed by the Regional Stormwater Coordination Group, which incorporated flow-based volumetric treatment control BMPs from the CASQA Handbook. Although implementation of the Preliminary Drainage Master Plan would include structural water quality BMPs, the absence of an operation and maintenance plan for these facilities could have a *potentially significant impact* on stormwater quality in Curry Creek or the Sacramento River. (DEIR, p. 6.8-30.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.8-7 a) *Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (g).*
- b) *The proposed water quality facilities shall be identified and designed in the Final Drainage Master Plan and submitted to Placer County for*

review and approval. All water quality facilities identified in the Final Drainage Master Plan shall be constructed with the installation of the backbone infrastructure. The Final Drainage Master Plan shall also include the method or methods for funding the long-term maintenance of the proposed water quality facilities.

- c) *New development projects within the Plan Area shall submit a site-specific BMP plan to the County, for review and approval, showing the on-site locations and effectiveness of the BMP facilities proposed for long-term water quality impact reduction during the Subsequent Conformity Review process and prior to Improvement Plan approval. The plan shall include a method or methods for financing the long-term maintenance of the proposed site-specific facilities.*
- d) *All BMPs for water quality protection, source control, and treatment control shall be developed in accordance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook for Construction and New Development/Redevelopment (or other similar source approved by the ESD) for the applicable type of development and/or improvement. The BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff. Flow or volume based post-construction 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. Provisions shall be included for long-term maintenance of BMPs. All BMPs shall reflect the Best Available Technologies (BAT) available at the time of implementation and shall reflect site-specific limitations. The County shall make the final determinations as to the appropriateness of the BMPs proposed for each project.*
- e) *Stormwater runoff from the proposed project's on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed water quality treatment facilities (BMPs) for removal of pollutants of concern (i.e. sediment, oil/grease, etc.), as approved by the ESD. With the Improvement Plans, the applicant shall verify that proposed BMPs are appropriate to treat the pollutants of concern from this project. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation, for effective performance of BMPs. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Prior to Improvement Plan or Final Map approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible County maintenance. No water quality*

facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

- f) *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 under the jurisdiction of the Central Valley RWQCB. 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).*

(DEIR, pp. 6.8-30, 6.8-32.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.8-8: **The proposed project, in combination with the buildout in the Curry Creek watershed, could result in stormwater peak flows that could result in on- or off-site flooding. This impact is potentially significant.** (DEIR, p. 6.8-33.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Cumulative development in Placer County and the City of Roseville, which includes the Curry Creek watershed, would increase the amount of impervious surface cover, which would, in turn, generate stormwater runoff peak flows. The increased runoff to the streams in the watershed would also increase the amount of stormwater runoff. This would result in a cumulatively significant impact. As noted previously in this section, several modifications to existing channels and structures are planned, and would be designed to convey the future increase in stormwater volume due to upstream developments. (DEIR, p. 6.8-33.)

As discussed above in Draft EIR Impact 6.8-1, the proposed project would result in a net decrease in peak flow rates for the two- through 100-year storm events, modeled pursuant to the PCFCWCD's SWMM, after the site is developed and with drainage improvements.

As further described in Impact 6.8-1, the proposed project currently does not include an operation and maintenance plan to prevent future degradation of the planned drainage features and the Preliminary Drainage Master Plan does not account of the off-site improvement areas. Therefore, the proposed project could result in a considerable contribution to flow increases in Curry Creek and downstream reaches, which would be considered *significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.8-33.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.8-8 a) *Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (g).*
- b) *Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-5(b) through (e).*

(DEIR, p. 6.8-33.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.8-9: **The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of the Placer County and City of Roseville General Plan, could result in stormwater volumes that could result in on- or off-site flooding. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.8-33.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Cumulative development in Placer County and the City of Roseville, which includes the Curry Creek watershed, would also generate an increase in the amount (volume) of stormwater runoff. This is considered a significant cumulative impact. Results of the hydrologic and hydraulic modeling for the proposed project indicate that the proposed project would generate an increase of approximately 168.7 acre-feet of runoff for the 8-day 100-year design storm event that would be mitigated through designed retention and detention facilities on the project site. However, without a comprehensive operation and maintenance plan, the proposed project could result in volumetric increases in Curry Creek and on- or off-site flooding resulting in a considerable contribution to cumulative increases in runoff volumes in the watershed and downstream areas of Sutter County. This would be considered a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.8-33.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.8-9 a) *Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (g).*
b) *Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-5(b) through (e).*

(DEIR, p. 6.8-34.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.8-10: **The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of Placer County and the City of Roseville General Plans, could result in degradation of water quality from stormwater runoff. This impact is *potentially significant*.**

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the degradation of water quality from stormwater runoff as a result of the proposed project, in combination with the buildout of Placer County and the City of Roseville General Plan. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

The proposed project would drain to Curry Creek and its tributaries, which is part of a larger watershed. The changes in water quality that could occur as a result of construction activities and urban runoff in the proposed Plan Area would not be expected to differ substantially from other urban development that contribute flows to the Curry and Pleasant Grove Creeks and the Cross Canal watersheds. (DEIR, p. 6.8-34.)

Urban development results in increased impervious surfaces, which increase the rate and amount of runoff and can alter existing surface water quality. The primary sources of water pollution include runoff from roadways, parking lots, landscaped areas, industrial activities (including wastewater treatment plants), non-storm water connections to the drainage system, accidental spills and illegal dumping. Runoff from roadway and parking lots could contain levels of oil, grease, and heavy metals. Runoff from landscaped areas could contain concentrations of nutrients, i.e. fertilizers and pesticides. (DEIR, p. 6.8-34.)

As stated previously in this section, the County has developed the *Placer County Stormwater Management Plan 2003-2008* (SWMP) in compliance with NPDES Phase II regulations. The Placer County SWMP is a comprehensive program designed to reduce

pollution in stormwater runoff in western portions of the County. Further, the City of Roseville has developed its own SWMP in compliance with NPDES Phase II regulations. Both the County and the City require that erosion control plans be prepared and approved to reduce water quality impacts during construction activities and that contractors obtain and comply with the State General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit. General Permit applicants are required to prepare a SWPPP. The SWPPP specifies BMPs designed to minimize sedimentation and release of products into Orchard Creek. Further, new development applications are required to include stormwater quality design features to prevent urban pollutants from entering natural drainages, though even state-of-the-art BMPs do not eliminate all pollutants from stormwater. Although these measures are in place, older urban development without modern water quality features can result in a cumulative significant impact to water quality. (DEIR, p. 6.8-34.)

Although implementation of the proposed project Preliminary Drainage Master Plan and RUSP Design Criteria and Guidelines would include water quality BMPs in compliance with NPDES Phase II regulations, lack of an operation and maintenance plan for these facilities and for the off-site improvement areas could result in a considerable contribution to cumulative water quality impacts. This would be considered a *significant impact*. (DEIR, pp. 6.8-34 to 6.8-35.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.8-10 *Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-7(a) through (f).*

(DEIR, p. 6.8-35.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.8-11: **The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of Placer County and the City of Roseville General Plans, could result in the construction of residences and other structures within the pre-construction 100-year FEMA floodplain. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.8-35.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with the construction of residences and other structures within the pre-construction 100-year FEMA floodplain as a result of the proposed project, in combination with the buildout of Placer County and the City of Roseville General Plan. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

Development of the proposed project, in addition to buildout of Placer County and the City of Roseville General Plans would place residential and institutional land uses in areas subject to the existing (pre-construction) 100-year floodplain as mapped by FEMA. This is considered a significant cumulative impact. (DEIR, p. 6.8-35.)

The County requires that house pad elevations be two feet above the 100-year floodplain water surface elevation (or finish floors at three feet above the same elevation) to protect structures and occupants from flood hazards. To accommodate development in those areas and to provide required freeboard, the proposed project would construct stormwater drainage facilities that would prevent 100-year flows in Curry Creek from overtopping the banks of the channels, culverts, and lake storage areas and prevent flooding of occupied structures. The Preliminary Drainage Master Plan provides detailed HEC-RAS output tables showing that post-project drainage facilities would reduce all upstream and most on-site water surface elevations such that flooding limits would be confined within channels and generally provide three feet of freeboard to adjacent proposed structures. (DEIR, p. 6.8-35.)

Although the proposed project drainage improvements would reduce or maintain the 100-year water surface elevations and would not increase on- or off-site flooding, an operation and maintenance plan for these facilities has not been prepared. Therefore, without a comprehensive operation and maintenance plan and inclusion of off-site improvement areas in the Preliminary Drainage Master Plan, the proposed project could result in increases in water surface elevations resulting in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts. This would result in a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.8-35.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.8-11 a) *Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (g).*
- b) *Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-5(b) through (e).*

(DEIR, p. 6.8-36.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.8-12: The proposed project, in combination with buildout of Placer County and City of Roseville General Plans within the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed, could result in an incremental increase in the amount (volume) of treated wastewater discharged to Pleasant Grove Creek. This could exceed the capacity of the creek and exacerbate on- or off-site flooding

during the 100-year storm event. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.8-36.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.
(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

The proposed project, in combination with buildout of Placer County and City of Roseville General Plans within Pleasant Grove Creek watershed, would result in an increase in the local population and, thus, an increase in wastewater treatment and discharge at the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP). An increase in treatment at the PGWWTP would result in an increase in discharge of treated wastewater in Pleasant Grove Creek. Although there is adequate capacity to serve the proposed project's flows, cumulative wastewater flows, including from the proposed project, would increase to a total of approximately 23.4 mgd. This increase was planned for in previous master plans and EIRs, as discussed in Section 6.11, Public Utilities, in this EIR. The cumulative increase in wastewater discharge would result in an increase in water surface elevations of 0.07 feet or less in the reach upstream of Reason Farms. Downstream of Reason Farms, the cumulative increase in water surface elevations would be 0.03 feet to zero just upstream of the transition to the Pleasant Grove Canal, and would remain at zero to the Sutter County line. This slight increase in water surface elevation along a relatively short stretch of Pleasant Grove Creek would not exceed the capacity of the creek and would not exacerbate on- or off-site flooding. Therefore, this would be considered a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact to water surface elevations downstream of the PGWWTP during the 100-year storm event. (DEIR, p. 6.8-36.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.8-13: The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of Urban Growth Areas that could be served by the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant, could result in degradation of water quality from increased wastewater discharge to Pleasant Grove Creek. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.8-36 to 6.8-39.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

The following discussion is based upon the technical memorandum prepared to address the cumulative impacts on water quality and aquatic resources in Pleasant Grove Creek, that would occur at buildout of the Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) that would contribute wastewater flows to the PGWWTP (see Draft EIR Appendix D). The assessment in the technical memorandum is based on the cumulative assessments included in the City's 1996 Master Plan EIR (which are inherently "cumulative" in nature) and the 2004 West Roseville Specific Plan EIR. (DEIR, p. 6.8-36.)

The technical memorandum contains some conservative assumptions, including the following:

- The total estimated future flow of 23.3 mgd from the PGWWTP is 6.2 mgd *less than* the 29.5 mgd future flow projected and evaluated in the 1996 Master Plan EIR.
- The analysis assumes all of the dry weather flow would be discharged. However, dry season discharge to Pleasant Grove Creek would be less than the average dry weather flow generated because a portion of the flow would be returned to the UGAs as recycled water for irrigation instead of being discharged to Pleasant Grove Creek.
- The West Roseville Specific Plan EIR includes Mitigation Measure 4.11-5, which conditions issuance of building permits on obtaining all the necessary permits to treat, discharge, and reuse flows from the specific Plan Area.

(DEIR, p. 6.8-37.)

The 1996 Master Plan EIR identified significant impacts to Pleasant Grove Creek water quality resulting from an increase in water temperature and elevated levels of trace metals and organic pollutants. The impact of the UGAs with respect to these constituents is discussed below. Other constituents of potential concern (i.e., toxicity, mercury, pH, biostimulatory substances, dissolved oxygen, and taste and odors) are also discussed. (DEIR, p. 6.8-37.)

Temperature

The 1996 Master Plan EIR identified elevated temperature as being a significant impact to the water quality in Pleasant Grove Creek. The 1996 Master Plan EIR included the following to mitigate for this impact:

- Install cooling towers if necessary (Mitigation Measure 7-4)

(DEIR, p. 6.8-37.)

Consistent with this mitigation measure, the City installed temperature cooling units at the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (DCWWTP). The City has not installed cooling units at PGWWTP because salmonid fish are not present there (due to lack of habitat), which is reflected in the less stringent receiving water temperature limit in the PGWWTP NPDES permit relative to that in the DCWWTP NPDES permit. (DEIR, p. 6.8-37.)

During periods when flow is present in Pleasant Grove Creek (Pleasant Grove Creek is naturally a seasonal stream), additional flows from the PGWWTP (generated within the UGAs) would cause additional temperature increases in Pleasant Grove Creek, downstream of the PGWWTP outfall. The increase in water temperature in Pleasant Grove Creek would be directly related to the incremental increase in wastewater flow from the UGAs being treated and discharged at the PGWWTP. During those periods when flow (other than effluent from PGWWTP) is not present in Pleasant Grove Creek, incremental UGA flows would not affect water quality in Pleasant Grove Creek. (DEIR, p. 6.8-37.)

As the capacity of the PGWWTP is expanded to accommodate flows from the UGAs, cooling units would be added, if necessary, to address the increased wastewater flow needing cooling, thereby assuring continued compliance with the temperature objectives in the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan) and thermal protection of aquatic resources. (DEIR, p. 6.8-37.)

Trace Metals and Organic Pollutants

The 1996 Master Plan EIR identified the introduction of elevated levels of trace metals and organic pollutants as a significant impact to the water quality in Pleasant Grove Creek. The 1996 Master Plan EIR identified the following mitigation for this impact:

- Install advanced treatment facilities (Mitigation Measure 7-2)
- Institute metals source controls/pre-treatment (Mitigation Measure 7-3)

(DEIR, p. 6.8-39.)

During those periods when flow is present in Pleasant Grove Creek, additional flows from the PGWWTP (generated within the UGAs) would cause the percentage of water in the Pleasant Grove Creek channel composed of treated effluent, downstream of the

PGWWTP outfall, to be higher, all other factors (e.g., creek hydrology) remaining the same. Consequently, instream concentrations of trace metals and organic pollutants downstream of the outfall would increase in proportion to the incremental increase in wastewater flow from the UGAs being treated and discharged at the PGWWTP. During those periods when flow (other than effluent from PGWWTP) is not present in Pleasant Grove Creek, incremental UGA flows would not affect water quality in Pleasant Grove Creek. (DEIR, p. 6.8-38.)

Aquatic Life Toxicity

The PGWWTP currently performs three-species bioassay testing of its effluent quarterly. Based on the bioassays tests a No Observable Effect Concentration (NOEC) and an Inhibition Concentration for a set percentage effect (IC25) were identified. The three-species bioassay results for the PGWWTP for all four quarterly tests performed since discharge and bioassay testing began in 2004, show that the undiluted effluent is non-toxic to aquatic life. (DEIR, p. 6.8-38.)

Mercury

The current NPDES permit contains a mercury mass-loading limit of 1.71 pounds per year for the combined discharge of the DCWWTP and the PGWWTP. The current NPDES permits have a combined permitted flow of 30 mgd, and the total incremental UGA flow (from areas outside the 1996 EIR area) is 12 mgd, for a total flow of 42 mgd or a 1.4-fold increase. This flow increase factor is less than 4.9, indicating that the combined incremental flow of all UGAs would not cause the mass loading limit to be exceeded. (DEIR, p. 6.8-38.)

pH

The NPDES permit for the PGWWTP has an effluent limitation that requires discharges to have a pH between 6.5 and 8.5 units. Based on the current science regarding pH requirements of freshwater aquatic life (the beneficial use most sensitive to creek pH) the Central Valley RWQCB is processing a Basin Plan amendment that would remove the 0.5-unit change requirement of the current pH objective, leaving a receiving water pH of between 6.5 and 8.5 units (RWQCB 2002). Once the PGWWTP is expanded to accommodate future cumulative flows, the higher rate of discharge would not cause Pleasant Grove Creek pH to fall below a pH of 6.5 or be raised above 8.5. (DEIR, p. 6.8-38.)

Biostimulatory Substances (Nutrients)

The 1996 Master Plan EIR indicated that algal growth in Pleasant Grove Creek is limited by factors other than nutrient availability. This indicates that nutrients in effluent would not stimulate algal growth in the creek. Consequently, nuisance level plant or algae communities are not expected to develop in Pleasant Grove Creek, downstream of the

PGWWTP outfall, under the future cumulative condition when higher rates of effluent discharge, including UGA flows, result in a greater proportion of creek water being constituted by treated effluent. (DEIR, p. 6.8-39.)

Dissolved Oxygen

The 1996 Master Plan EIR mitigation measures to address receiving water quality degradation impacts are as follows:

- Install advanced treatment facilities (Mitigation Measure 7-2, which is assumed to include mitigation for oxygen-related impacts since dissolved oxygen impacts were not addressed in particular in the 1996 Master Plan EIR).
- Institute metals source controls/pre-treatment (Mitigation Measure 7-3).

(DEIR, p. 6.8-39.)

As the capacity of the PGWWTP is expanded to accommodate flows from the UGAs, any advanced treatment facilities that the City constructs and operates to comply with its NPDES limitations would be expanded (or initially constructed for an expanded capacity) to address the increased wastewater flow from the UGAs, thereby assuring continued compliance with all Basin Plan objectives. (DEIR, p. 6.8-39.)

Tastes and Odors

The Basin Plan states that "Waters shall not contain taste or odor producing substances in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to domestic or municipal water supplies or to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses." No history of taste and odor problems exists in Pleasant Grove Creek at locations downstream of the PGWWTP discharge. Municipal water supply taste and odor problems are often associated with algae production in source waters. (DEIR, p. 6.8-39.)

Effluent quality under the future cumulative condition would be maintained at essentially equivalent or possibly higher quality levels (if additional or more restrictive NPDES limits are permitted by the RWQCB), relative to current effluent quality. Therefore, no taste and odor problems would be expected in the future, once the PGWWTP is adequately expanded/upgraded, as necessary, and permitted to treat the incremental flows, including UGA flows. (DEIR, p. 6.8-39.)

Conclusion

The technical memorandum determined, after recent analysis, that continued compliance with 1996 Master Plan EIR Mitigation Measures 7-2, 7-3, and 7-4 would be sufficient to reduce cumulative impacts from PGWWTP discharges into Pleasant Grove Creek related

to temperature change, introduction of trace metals and organics, and changes in dissolved oxygen to a *less-than-significant level*. (DEIR, p. 6.8-39.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

I. NOISE

Standards of Significance:

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the Placer County General Plan, and the Placer County Code. For purposes of this EIR, implementation of the proposed project would have a significant adverse impact if it would cause any of the following:

- Sensitive uses to be exposed to excessive groundborne vibration levels. While CEQA states that the potential for any excessive groundborne vibration levels must be analyzed, it does not define “excessive”, and there are no federal, State or local standards for groundborne vibration. Consequently, this analysis uses the Federal Railway Administration’s vibration impact thresholds for sensitive buildings, residences, and institutional land uses. These thresholds are 80 VdB at residences and buildings where people normally sleep (e.g., nearby residences and day care facility) and 83 VdB at institutional buildings;
- Maximum noise levels at surrounding uses to exceed the noise performance standards specified in Section 9.36.060 of the Placer County Code;
- Be inconsistent with the noise standards in the Placer County General Plan or Placer County Noise Ordinance, or if noise levels exceed the 60 dBA Ldn/CNEL noise level standard at sensitive land uses;
- A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; or
- A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

(DEIR, p. 6.9-10.)

The CEQA Guidelines do not define the levels at which increases in ambient noise are considered "substantial." The 1992 Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON) produced the following recommendations for determining if a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would increase ambient noise levels. These recommendations allow for greater increases in noise levels with the proposed project if the existing ambient noise levels are low, and a lower increase in noise levels with the proposed project if the existing ambient noise levels are high. Based on this information, the following thresholds would apply to the operational characteristics of the proposed project:

- If ambient noise levels are below 60 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL, a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would increase the noise level by 5 dBA or more at existing sensitive receptors;
- If ambient noise levels are between 60-65 dBA, a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would increase the noise level by 3 dBA or more at existing sensitive receptors;
- If ambient noise levels are greater than 65 dBA, a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would increase the noise level by 2 dBA or more at existing sensitive receptors.

(DEIR, pp. 6.9-10 to 6.9-11.)

Impact 6.9-1: Construction of the proposed project could generate noise in the existing noise environment. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.9-11 to 6.9-12.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

During construction of the proposed project, noise levels would be produced by the operation of heavy-duty equipment and various other construction activities. Table 6.9-4 shows noise levels 50 feet from the types of construction equipment that would most likely be used during construction of the project. As development occurs, construction noise generated by could affect some receptors on a periodic basis throughout project construction until the proposed project is completely built out.. Because no buildings currently exist on the proposed project site, there would be no demolition-related noise. (DEIR, p. 6.9-11.)

The project site is located in an area where few sensitive receptors exist nearby. The few receptors that do exist in the vicinity are scattered rural residences to the south and north of the site. The closest residence to the south is approximately one-half mile from the southern boundary of the proposed project site. One residence is directly adjacent to the northern border of the project site. (DEIR, p. 6.9-11.)

Noise from non-vehicular sources is reduced at the rate of approximately 7.5 dB for every doubling of distance from the noise source when the intervening terrain is not hard or reflective, such as concrete or pavement. Based on this reduction factor and the typical noise levels from construction equipment at 50 feet shown in Draft EIR Table 6.9-4, receptors would only be exposed to noise levels above the Placer County Code Maximum Sound Level Standard of 70 dB during the day when construction would occur within 300 feet of the receptor. Construction activity at the northern edge of the project site could occur within 300 feet of the residence adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. Receptors to the south of the project site are more than 300 feet from the site's southern border, and thus would not be exposed to construction noise levels of more than 70 dB at any time. (DEIR, pp. 6.9-11 to 6.9-12.)

While the land to the south of the proposed project site is currently undeveloped, the County recognized that this area may be suitable for urban or suburban development and the County designated this area as a "Future Study Area" in the General Plan. The County is considering a portion of the Future Study Area for development as the Curry Creek Community Plan. New residences and other sensitive receptors in this new development could also be exposed to noise levels in excess of the maximum 70 dB daytime Sound Level Standard when project construction occurs within 300 feet of the southern border of the proposed project site. (DEIR, p. 6.9-12.)

Because construction noise would not be permanent, and would occur intermittently during any 24-hour period, noise impacts would not be measured against the noise standards in the General Plan. The Code standards are the more appropriate standards to use when evaluating construction noise impacts because the Code sets a 70 dB limit on maximum noise levels at the property line of a receptor. Because most development would be 300 feet or more from the northern and southern portions of the site, existing and future receptors would be exposed to construction noise levels that would exceed the Code Sound Level standards in Table 1 of Section 9.36.060 of the Code (see above) for only a portion of the building period. Also, some receptors may be subject to construction noise from throughout the entire project construction. However, as mentioned in the regulatory setting, the Code exempts construction noise from the other provisions of the Code that regulate noise, provided that construction occurs within the prescribed time periods, that effective mufflers are fitted to gas- and diesel-powered equipment to reduce noise levels as much as possible, and that all construction equipment is maintained in good working order. So long as construction activity complies with these measures, Placer County has determined that construction noise is an acceptable part of development in the County. (DEIR, p. 6.9-12.)

However, because construction noise could potentially affect receptors with noise levels in excess of the 70 dB limit set by the Code, this impact would be considered *significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.9-12.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.9-1 *Construction activities shall take place between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday (during daylight savings time), between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday (during standard time), and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Saturday and all construction equipment shall be fitted with factory installed muffling devices and maintained in good working order.*

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.9-2: **Construction activities associated with the proposed project could produce groundborne vibration. This impact is potentially significant.** (DEIR, pp. 6.9-13 to 6.9-14.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

In addition to noise, construction activity can also produce vibration. Construction-related vibration is normally associated with high impact equipment such as jackhammers and pile drivers, and the operation of some heavy-duty construction equipment such as trucks and bulldozers. Draft EIR Table 6.9-5 shows typical vibration levels for construction equipment. (DEIR, p. 6.9-13.)

Construction-related vibration has two potential effects. First, vibration at high enough levels can disturb people trying to sleep. Thresholds for this vibration have been developed by the Federal Railway Administration, which has determined that any vibration over 80 VdB can be a significant impact at places where people sleep. Second, groundborne vibration can potentially damage the foundations and exteriors of existing, older structures. Groundborne vibration that can cause this kind of damage is typically limited to high impact equipment, especially pile-drivers. There are no existing structures on the project site, so there would be no potential for damage due to vibration. (DEIR, p. 6.9-13.)

As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 6.9-1, there are currently few sensitive noise receptors in the vicinity of the proposed project site. One existing residence is located within 50 feet of the proposed project's northern boundary near Brewer Road; all other existing receptors are at least one half mile from the project site. Only the existing receptor adjacent to the project's northern boundary would be within 50 feet of construction activity on the proposed project site. Grading at the northern portion of the project site could potentially subject this residence to vibration levels in excess of 80 VdB, levels that could possibly disturb sleep. At the southern boundary, the nearest receptor is approximately one half mile from the project boundary. Accordingly, these receptors would not be subject to vibration levels in excess of 80 VdB as a result of project construction. (DEIR, p. 6.9-13.)

The only vibration issue for new uses internal to the Plan Area would be disturbance of users. Structural damage to buildings as a result of vibration is only an issue with older buildings. New buildings developed in the Plan Area would not be prone to structural damage from construction vibration. As with offsite receptors, new receptors developed onsite would be separated from future development by the width of the bordering street and the setback of receptors from the street. This would ensure that 50 foot distances would be maintained between receptors and construction activity. Additionally, grading effects on adjacent users would be of short duration and would occur during the daytime when there is little potential for sleep disturbance. (DEIR, p. 6.9-13.)

Because construction activity could take place within 50 feet of the existing residence adjacent to the northwest border of the Plan Area, vibration levels in excess of 80 VdB could be realized. This would be a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.9-14.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.9-2 *The construction contractor shall not grade within 50 feet of any existing residence between 7 p.m. and 7 a.m.*

(DEIR, p. 6.9-14.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.9-3: **During operation of the proposed project, sensitive receptors could be exposed to ambient noise levels that exceed County standards. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, pp. 6.9-14 to 6.9-16.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Development of the Plan Area would eventually increase the number of people living and working in the area. Traffic on local roads would increase as uses in the Plan Area develop, exposing uses in the vicinity of these existing roads to traffic-generated noise. Traffic on local roads that would be internal to the Plan Area would expose new Plan Area receptors, such as schools or residences, to traffic-generated noise. (DEIR, p. 6.9-14.)

Project-generated traffic on existing local roads surrounding the proposed project has been estimated in the RUSP traffic study, and the resulting off-site traffic noise has been predicted. Draft EIR Table 6.9-6 presents off-site traffic noise levels for both existing and existing-plus-project conditions. As shown, the proposed project would add slightly to roadway noise levels, but in every case the increases would be less than 3.0 dBA Ldn. This indicates that project-generated traffic noise would be barely perceptible to most people. (DEIR, p. 6.9-14.)

According to the preliminary traffic volume estimates for local roads within the Plan Area, some residential development in the Plan Area would be exposed to transportation noise levels above those allowed in Draft EIR Table 9-3 of the Placer County General Plan. The traffic noise levels along interior Plan Area roads are shown in Draft EIR Table 6.9-7. The residences that could be exposed to traffic noise levels above 60 dBA Ldn would be those along University Avenue, 8th Street, and residential parcels backing Watt Avenue. 16th Street south of University Avenue would also experience traffic noise levels in excess of 60 dBA Ldn (60.7 dBA). Development along this roadway segment is designated as commercial mixed-use, which allows residential uses, but these units would not have outdoor activity areas (backyards) fronting onto 16th Street and thus would not be exposed to excessive noise levels. Noise levels along Watt Avenue adjacent to the project site would be approximately 71 dB, which would exceed County standards. The Specific Plan proposes that the residential units along Watt Avenue would back up to the road. A soundwall would be a feasible method to ensure that noise levels in the activity area of the units (the backyard) would not exceed noise standards. However, the units along University Avenue and 8th Street would front the road, which makes a soundwall infeasible. To determine potential noise impacts in the outdoor activity areas for these units, the noise levels were modeled based upon a potential development configuration that would be allowed under the RUSP Development Standards and Design Guidelines, as described above in Methods. The modeling results in Draft EIR Table 6.9-8 show that noise levels in the backyards of these units would range from 50 dBA to 60 dBA Ldn. However, because other designs could ultimately be constructed, the noise levels in the backyards could exceed 60 dBA. (DEIR, p. 6.9-15.)

Because the proposed local roadway network on the interior of the Plan Area is predicted to cause new residences to be exposed to traffic noise in excess of the Noise Exposure Standards in the Placer County General Plan, the proposed project would have a significant impact. (DEIR, p. 6.9-16.)

The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) is currently in the process of planning for Placer Parkway, a regional high-speed roadway that would connect SR 65 in Placer County (east of the Plan Area) with SR 99 in Sutter County (approximately 10.5 miles to the west). Three of the five potential alignments of the planned Placer Parkway would be routed to the north of the project site, the closest being within 300 feet of the western portion of the Plan Area, which could be developed with residential and school uses. Based upon the *Draft Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement/ Program Environmental Impact Report*, the 60 dBA contour could extend as much as 1,700 feet from the centerline of the Placer Parkway alignment. Thus, portions of the Plan Area could be exposed to transportation noise levels that exceed the County General Plan standards for outdoor activity areas (60 dBA) and exceed the interior standard for residential and school uses (45 dBA). This would be considered a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.9-16.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.9-3 a) *For residences located along Watt Avenue and University Boulevard, a project-specific acoustical analysis shall be prepared in full compliance with Table 9-2 of the Placer County General Plan and submitted concurrently with project design plans for review and approval by Placer County Planning Department. The project design shall incorporate noise reductions measures recommended in the noise analysis, to the maximum extent feasible, to reduce noise levels in the rear yard activity areas of residences; in known outdoor activity areas of other sensitive uses; or at the property line of a sensitive receiving non-residential land use if the outdoor activity areas are unknown. Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB Ldn/CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures and in adhering to the RUSP Development Standards and Design Guidelines, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dB Ldn/CNEL may be allowed, provided that available exterior noise level reduction measures have been implemented and interior noise levels are in compliance with Table 9-3 of the Placer County General Plan.*
- b) *Prior to construction of noise-sensitive uses in areas within 1,700 feet of the centerline of the selected Placer Parkway alignment (or the closest proposed alignment if one has not been selected), a project-specific acoustical analysis shall be prepared in full compliance with Table 9-2 of the Placer County General Plan and submitted concurrently with project design plans for review and approval by Placer County Planning*

Department. If it is determined that noise levels exceed Placer County standards, the project design shall incorporate noise reductions measures, to the maximum extent feasible, to reduce noise levels in the rear yard activity areas of residences; in known outdoor activity areas of other sensitive uses; or at the property line of a sensitive receiving non-residential land use if the outdoor activity areas are unknown. Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB Ldn/CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures and in adhering to the RUSP Development Standards and Design Guidelines, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dB Ldn/CNEL may be allowed, provided that available exterior noise level reduction measures have been implemented and interior noise levels are in compliance with Table 9-3 of the Placer County General Plan.

(DEIR, pp. 6.9-16 to 6.9-17.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.9-4: **Aircraft noise could affect new receptors developed as part of the proposed project. This impact is *less than significant*.**
(DEIR, pp. 6.9-17 to 6.9-18.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

A private, non-paved airstrip is located immediately south of the western (University) portion of the project site, approximately 2,700 feet east of Brewer Road. The airstrip runs north/south with the north end of the airstrip located directly adjacent to the RUSP property. To comply with the General Plan, the Regional University Specific Plan includes a 2,000 foot buffer, measured from the end of the airstrip, for any residential use or structure, occupied office, classroom, administration building, athletic facilities, such as recreation center, stadium, gymnasium, performing arts center, maintenance building or other occupied university building. No buffer is required for maintenance buildings, corporation yards, or expansive, low-population outdoor recreation facilities, such as athletic fields, open space, parks, or parking lots. The buffer would remain in place until such time as the County determines the private airstrip is no longer a legally permissible use on the property or the property owner voluntarily relinquishes any right of use that would result in any overflight of the University portion of the RUSP. With the 2,000-foot

buffer, noise from any flights from the airstrip would not substantially affect the noise environment at any sensitive uses in the Plan Area. (DEIR, p. 6.9-17.)

The Plan Area is located approximately five miles north of the northern property line of the McClellan Park Airport property in Sacramento County. The Sacramento County Airport System operates the McClellan Park Airport. An Airport Planning Policy Area (APPA) was developed for McClellan Park that initially included noise contours that extended into Placer County, including portions of the Plan Area. However, the APPA has since been revised and no longer extends into Placer County. Average daily noise impacts from operations at the McClellan Park Airport would not substantially affect receptors within the Plan Area. Therefore, this would be a *less-than-significant impact*. (DEIR, pp. 6.9-17 to 6.9-18.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.9-5: Noise from the University athletic fields, including a stadium, that could be developed as part of the proposed project could affect sensitive receptors. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.9-18 to 6.9-19.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with noise from the University athletic fields, including a stadium, that could be developed as part of the proposed project. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation:

The proposed project includes an amendment to Placer County General Plan Policy 9.A.2, which would be amended to read: "The County shall require that noise created by new non-transportation noise sources be mitigated so as not to exceed the noise level standards of Table 9-1 as measured immediately within the property line of lands designated for noise-sensitive uses: provided, however, the noise created by occasional

events occurring within a stadium on land zoned for university purposes may temporarily exceed these standards as provided in an approved Specific Plan.” Therefore, the project as proposed would not be inconsistent with the General Plan. Placer County’s Noise Ordinance (Placer County Code 9.36.030) includes an exemption for “the normal operation of public and private schools typically consisting of classes and other school-sponsored activities.” Therefore, noise generated at the proposed stadium would not violate the Noise Ordinance. (DEIR, p. 6.9-18.)

The campus would include athletic facilities, which could include a stadium with a capacity of up to 20,000 spectators. It is unknown what events would take place at this stadium, if it is constructed as part of the University campus. However, possible activities include football and soccer games, track and field competitions, and concerts. The stadium would not be a constant noise source, but would only produce noise during periodic events, which could last from a few hours on a given day to most of the day for events such as track meets. (DEIR, p. 6.9-18.)

The stadium is shown in the conceptual plan for the University as being located in the southeast portion of the campus, adjacent to the Community Mixed Use area in the Community. This area of the Community is intended to include a mix of retail and business uses as well as residential. Although noise generated by activities at the school would be periodic and exempt from the Noise Ordinance, nearby receptors could be exposed to noise levels that are generally considered incompatible with residential uses. Design of the stadium would be required to consider nearby sensitive uses and implement design features that would minimize potential impacts. (DEIR, p. 6.9-18.)

Stadiums that accommodate large crowds can increase noise levels in the area surrounding the stadium during sporting events. Noise monitoring was performed at the San Francisco Giants Ballpark during one game with a reported attendance of 17,560.7. The monitoring data, indicated that both crowd noise and noise from the public address system (announcements and music) produced noticeable noise. Maximum crowd noise inside the stadium reached 80 – 90 dBA and the public address system reached 85 – 87 dBA. Outside the park, noise levels were measured between 60 – 63 dBA for crowd noise and 55 – 57 dB for PA system noise. The proposed University stadium would be smaller than the San Francisco Giants Ballpark, but it may not have the noise attenuating properties of a professional stadium. For instance, the Giants Ballpark is largely enclosed, with barriers intervening between the field of play and offsite receptors. College stadiums are typically more open at the ends of the field, with fewer noise-buffering barriers that would serve to attenuate noise generated at the stadium. (DEIR, p. 6.9-18.)

Most concerts featuring current, popular music usually average sound levels of approximately 105 dBA Leq in order to satisfy audience expectations. Some genres of popular music produce higher average sound levels (110 to 115 dBA) in the “very low” and “low” (bass) frequency ranges. Typical maximum sound levels (Lmax) for all performance types would be 5 to 10 dBA higher than the average sound levels and

occasionally may reach 15 dBA above average levels, meaning that maximum sound levels could reach 120 to 130 dBA, depending on the genre of music. (DEIR, p. 6.9-19.)

Any receptors built in the vicinity of the stadium could be exposed to noticeable noise during events at the stadium. Actual noise levels would depend on the distance between the stadium and the nearest receptors, the design of the stadium, and the overall ambient noise levels around the stadium and in the surrounding area. Currently, it is not known how the stadium would be designed and used, or what would be developed in the area around the stadium. Consequently, noise effects cannot be accurately estimated. Therefore, because the design of the stadium and the noise impacts of the stadium are not known at this time, this would be considered a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.9-19.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.9-5 *Design of the stadium shall incorporate measures, as deemed appropriate by the County, to reduce noise effects to the maximum extent possible on nearby sensitive receptors. Possible measures include increasing setbacks between the stadium and off-site residential receptors, orientation of the stadium such that noise is directed away from residential receptors, or construction of intervening non-sensitive uses between the stadium and sensitive receptors to attenuate stadium noise. The effectiveness of the measures shall be demonstrated in a project-specific noise study, which shall be submitted concurrently with the stadium design plans. The study shall be subject to review and approval by the Placer County Development Review Committee.*

(DEIR, p. 6.9-19.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Significant and unavoidable.

Impact 6.9-6: **Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other construction in the vicinity of the project site, could expose receptors to noise. This impact is less than significant.**
(DEIR, pp. 6.9-19 to 6.9-20.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

455

As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.9-4, construction noise from the Plan Area could reach up to 88 dBA at 50 feet. Since this noise would decrease at approximately 7.5 dBA per doubling of distance, construction would need to be at least one quarter mile away from the nearest receptors if maximum noise levels are to be less than the acceptable levels specified in the Placer County Code. As shown in Impact 6.9-1, construction within 300 feet of a receptor could expose that receptor to maximum daytime noise levels in excess of the 70 dB allowed in Table 1 of Section 9.36.060 of the Placer County Code. Consequently, if a receptor were within 300 feet of project-related construction and also within 300 feet of construction from another development, a cumulative impact could occur. (DEIR, pp. 6.9-19 to 6.9-20.)

As shown in Impact 6.9-1, only the residence adjacent to the northern boundary of the proposed project site would be within 300 feet of project-related construction activities. No other development is currently anticipated in the area that would place construction within 300 feet of this receptor simultaneously with project construction. Consequently, there would be a *less-than-significant cumulative impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.9-20.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.9-7: Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other construction in the vicinity of the project site, could generate groundborne vibration. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.9-20.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.
(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 6.9-2, proposed project construction would have vibration impacts that would be less than significant. For a cumulative impact to occur, project-related construction would have to occur within 50 feet of a receptor simultaneously with construction of some other development in the area. Construction at distances greater than 50 feet from a receptor would not have the capacity to add to any cumulative vibration effect. However, numerous pieces of equipment operating within 50 feet of a receptor would have a combined effect that could result in substantial VdB

levels. The only other development that could occur adjacent to the proposed project site during project construction is the Curry Creek Community Plan. There are no receptors that are 50 feet from both the Curry Creek Community Plan property line and the RUSP property line. Consequently, the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.9-20.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.9-8: Operations of the proposed project could add to cumulative ambient noise levels. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.9-20.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 6.9-3, the Plan Area would be developed over time, with full buildout potentially occurring in approximately 10-15 years. Other development would occur in the area before buildout occurs. A cumulative impact would occur if total development would raise noise levels substantially over existing conditions. As shown in Draft EIR Table 6.9-9, cumulative noise levels along selected roadways would be substantially greater than existing noise levels. Consequently, the cumulative impact would be significant. However, because of the project's size relative to cumulative development in the County, as shown in Draft EIR Table 6.9-10, the cumulative contribution of the proposed project would be less than one dBA Ldn at any of the analyzed roadway segments. This would not be a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact. While some noise may be generated on the site of the University from non-traffic sources, such as the proposed stadium, this noise would be intermittent and infrequent. Consequently, non-transportation noise would not add noticeably to the overall 24-hour noise environment. This would be a *less-than-significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.9-20.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.9-9: **The Plan Area could experience a cumulative noise impact from airport noise. There would be *no cumulative impact*.**
(DEIR, p. 6.9-22.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.
(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

As discussed in Draft EIR Impact 6.9-4, noise from the private airstrip south of the University portion of the project site and noise from the McClellan Park Airport would not have a significant noise impact on the Plan Area. Since there are no other airports or airstrips nearby that could combine with the less-than-significant noise from the McClellan Park Airport, there would be *no cumulative impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.9-22.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

J. PUBLIC SERVICES

Law Enforcement

Standards of Significance:

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

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered law enforcement facilities;
- Result in the need for new or physically altered law enforcement facilities, the

construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives; or

- Be inconsistent with the goals and policies in the *Placer County General Plan*.

(DEIR, p. 6.10-4.)

Impact 6.10-1: **The proposed project could increase the demand for police protection services requiring additional personnel. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, pp. 6.10-4 to 6.10-5.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

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

It should also be noted that the University would likely provide public safety services for the campus. A full-time campus security staff could provide general patrol, front gate operation, emergency response and dispatch, and parking enforcement. However, local law enforcement services would be required for major emergencies, criminal investigations, and other specialized services. Nonetheless, to ensure a conservative analysis, the University's residential population was included in the impact analysis as a conservative estimate of law enforcement resources needed to serve the entire project. (DEIR, p. 6.10-5.)

Development pursuant to the Specific Plan would increase the demand for additional sworn and non-sworn officers and support staff to adequately serve the Specific Plan area. This demand for sworn and non-sworn officers, and support staff is a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-5.)

Mitigation Measure:

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-5.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-2: **The urban response time standards set forth in the Placer County General Plan could be unattainable from the existing Sheriff's service center in Loomis. Development of the proposed project could require new facilities, including a Sheriff's service center, equipment, and patrol vehicles. This impact is potentially significant.** (DEIR, pp. 6.10-5 to 6.10-6.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

The proposed project will ultimately result in an increase in population of 10,037 residents. The demand for between 11.0 and 14.3 sworn officers, 1.1 non-sworn officers, and 0.6 to .08 support staff will result in a need for between 12 and 15 vehicles as well as equipment and new law enforcement facilities to house the additional personnel. (DEIR, pp. 6.10-4 to 6.10-5.)

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

construction of a new service center in the Placer Vineyards development are being analyzed in the Placer Vineyards EIR. (DEIR, p. 6.10-6.)

As currently proposed, the RUSP could co-locate a Sheriff Service Center with the fire station on the land designated for public or quasi-public use. However, the demand for additional personnel, equipment, and facilities is considered a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-6.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.10-2 a) *The project developer(s) shall comply with Placer County Policy 4.H.4, which*

requires that all future development either fund or develop law enforcement facilities. Compliance with Policy 4.H.4 shall include formation of a County Service Area (CSA) or Community Facilities District (CFD) for the construction or cost of a 2,500-square foot equipped Sheriff's service center prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.

b) *The project developer(s) shall enter into a Development Agreement with Placer County prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map for facilities, staffing, and the purchase and scheduled replacement of the number of equipped vehicles needed as determined by the Sheriff in the same frequency and manner currently used by the County in its patrol vehicle replacement program. All patrol vehicles shall include the necessary equipment to accomplish the mission of the Placer County Sheriff's Department or as otherwise required by the Sheriff.*

(DEIR, p. 6.10-6.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant

Impact 6.10-3: **Public safety could be compromised if the Specific Plan does not adequately consider public safety issues in its design. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.10-6.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

General Plan Policy 4.H.5 calls for project design to consider public safety issues, including crime prevention through environmental design. The Specific Plan Design Guidelines do not include specific guidance or provisions with regard to public safety considerations. In the absence of such guidance, Specific Plan development could result in improvements that do not provide adequate access and visibility for law enforcement personnel, or that otherwise degrade public safety. This is a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-6.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.10-3 *Law enforcement personnel shall have access to and visibility of schools, parks and open spaces; pedestrian areas shall be well lighted and designed in such a manner as to maximize the safety of pedestrians, and buildings shall be designed and sited to provide a safe environment. Improvement plans submitted for review and approval by the Placer County Planning Department shall be accompanied by a written explanation regarding the manner in which the design of the improvements achieves compliance with these requirements.*

(DEIR, pp. 6.10-6 to 6.10-7.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-4: **Construction of a sheriff's service center and related facilities within the Specific Plan area could lead to physical impacts on the environment. This impact is less than significant.** (DEIR, p. 6.10-7.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

As currently proposed in the RUSP, a sheriff Services Center would be co-located with the fire station proposed on the land designated for public or quasi-public use. The physical impacts associated with the development of any sheriff facilities within the Plan Area are analyzed in the technical sections of the Draft EIR. (DEIR, p. 6.10-7.)

If the Sheriff's Department determines that another site for the service center outside of the Plan Area is more appropriate, further environmental review would be required to determine any potential impacts. The physical environmental impacts associated with the provision of a sheriff service center in the Plan Area are addressed in this EIR and no additional impact is identified. Therefore, the impact would be *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-7.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-5: Cumulative impacts on law enforcement services could occur due to development of the proposed project. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.10-7 to 6.10-8.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.
(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

Development in the South Placer region would increase the population and increase the demand for law enforcement and public safety services. In order to maintain adequate staffing levels and response times, additional Sheriff's Department staff, equipment, and facilities would be required. Consistent with the adopted General Plan policies, each development project would be required to contribute its fair share of funds toward the provision of these services. (DEIR, p. 6.10-7.)

Cumulative development, including the proposed project, would require the construction of new or expansion of existing sheriff facilities in order to continue to meet County service standards. As noted previously, a service center could be co-located with the fire station to provide sheriff services to the Plan Area. The physical environmental impacts of providing the Plan Area service center are addressed in this EIR. (DEIR, p. 6.10-7.)

Law enforcement services are provided based on established service standards and goals. Cumulative development in western Placer County would be subject to standards outlined in the *Placer County General Plan*. Given current policies, implementation measures, and the mitigation measures outlined in Draft EIR Section 6.10 (Mitigation

Measures 6.10-1, 6.10-2a, 6.10-2b, and 6.10-3), the cumulative impact on police protection would be *less than significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.10-7 to 6.10-8.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Fire Protection

Standards of Significance:

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-11.)

Impact 6.10-6: **Development of the proposed project could require additional personnel to serve new fire stations. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.10-12.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

The proposed Specific Plan, at full buildout, would include 4,387 dwelling units, which would generate a population of 10,037. This development would convert the Specific Plan area from agriculture to urban uses over the next 10 to 15 years. Development pursuant to the Specific Plan would result in the need for additional personnel to provide fire protection and emergency medical services to serve the Specific Plan area. Draft EIR Table 6.10-2 describes County staffing ratios for fire protection personnel needed to serve the Specific Plan area. (DEIR, p. 6.10-12.)

Staffing of the proposed fire stations in the Specific Plan area may not meet Placer County level of service standards; therefore, this impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-12.)

Mitigation Measure:

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-12.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-7: **Development of the proposed project could require additional fire protection infrastructure including construction of fire stations and purchase of fire trucks and equipment to serve the proposed project. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, pp. 6.10-12 to 6.10-13.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or

avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Development of the proposed Specific Plan area will result in the need for additional fire protection infrastructure including new fire stations, trucks, and equipment necessary to provide fire protection services. According to the Placer County Fire Department, a minimum of one fully-funded and equipped fire station would be required. (DEIR, pp. 6.10-12 to 6.10-13.)

The proposed project includes a 2.2-acre site designated for public use, which would be developed with a fire station. If the Placer County Fire Department determines that an alternate location outside of the project site is more appropriate for the construction of a fire station, that project would be subject to separate environmental review. Because the fire station would be constructed within the Specific Plan area, the physical impacts associated with the construction of this fire station are analyzed in the technical sections of this EIR and no additional physical environmental impact is identified. However, the need for additional fire protection infrastructure and equipment in the Specific Plan area is a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-13.)

Mitigation Measure:

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-13.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-8: Development of the proposed project could create additional fire hazards in large open space/natural areas and utility corridors by limiting pre-suppression and suppression accessibility. High fuel loading could result in areas of restricted or limited access. Development of residential areas in close proximity to utility infrastructure and open space areas increases the potential for fire related hazards. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.10-13 to 6.10-14.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

The introduction of development and people to the Specific Plan area could expose residents to a risk of fire hazard in open space/natural areas and utility corridors by limiting pre-suppression and suppression accessibility and in adjacent agricultural areas when crops are dry. As more people and activities are present in the area, the potential for wildland fires increases. As more development occurs, the potential to restrict access to open space areas for fire suppression and fuels management could also increase. This is considered a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, pp. 6.10-13 to 6.10-14.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.10-8 a) *Development and subdivision design shall include adequate setbacks, as determined by the Placer County Fire Department, between open space/corridor areas and structures. Fire pre-suppression and suppression access easements to utility corridors and open space areas shall be required as part of the subdivision map process. Building envelopes or another method shall ensure separation of structures, and shall ensure access, as deemed appropriate by the Placer County Fire Department prior to approval of any tentative subdivision map.*
- b) *A County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD), or other entity for sustainable park maintenance shall be formed for the Specific Plan area prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.*

Funds for a fuels reduction program for open spaces and corridors shall be included in the financing arrangement by a vote of the landowners prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. The maintenance entity shall establish and identify ongoing funding for a continuous maintenance program for vegetation (both wildland and landscaped) in any and all open space, vacant areas, and landscape trail, easement and corridor areas within the Specific Plan area prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.

- c) *The developers shall fund a fire-safe plan for the subdivisions adjacent to wildland (natural, landscape, and corridor) areas. The fire-safe plan shall include a fuels management plan, and recommend building separations and distances from wildland areas, evacuation and access routes, fire safety zones and maintenance schedule prior to approval of tentative subdivision maps.*

(DEIR, p. 6.10-14.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-9: **Construction of fire stations and related facilities within the Specific Plan area could lead to physical impacts on the environment. This impact is *less than significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.10-14.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

The proposed project includes a 2.2-acre site designated for a fire station. Analysis of impacts related to construction within the Specific Plan area is included in each of the topical areas contained in this Draft EIR. No additional impacts related to construction of fire stations would occur. This impact is, therefore, *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-14.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-10: Cumulative impacts on fire services could occur due to development of the proposed project. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-15.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.
(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

Development in the South Placer region would increase the population and demand for fire protection services. In order to maintain adequate staffing levels and response times, additional fire fighters, equipment, and facilities would be required. Consistent with the adopted General Plan policies, each development project would be required to contribute its fair share of funds toward the provision of these services. (DEIR, p. 6.10-15.)

The expansion of existing or construction of new fire stations would be required to maintain adopted service levels in the cumulative scenario. The Fire Department would decide where to locate new stations to best serve the Community. Because fire station locations are unknown at this time, the physical environmental effects of constructing future fire stations would be potentially significant. (DEIR, p. 6.10-15.)

The proposed project would reduce the cumulative impact by providing a fire station that would serve the project site and vicinity, alleviating cumulative demand for fire protection services. The physical environmental effects resulting from construction of the Plan Area fire station are evaluated in this EIR. Therefore, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact is not considerable, and the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-15.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Schools

Standards of Significance:

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

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

Impact 6.10-11: **Buildout of the Specific Plan area could substantially increase the public school student population, exceeding current school capacities. This impact is *less than significant*.** (DEIR, pp. 6.10-22 to 6.10-24.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.
(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

Existing educational facilities are unable to accommodate the projected growth from the Specific Plan area. It is proposed that the residential portion of the Plan Area would be served by the CUSD, GJUHSD, and EJESD. The proposed project includes a 10-acre public elementary school site located in the Public Hub within the Community; the elementary school site is currently within the CUSD boundaries. A kindergarten through 8th grade school is planned in the North Residential Village, within the EJESD boundaries. In the northeastern corner of the University site, land has been reserved for a 40-acre private high school, which is proposed to serve approximately 1,200 students. (DEIR, pp. 6.10-22 to 6.10-23.)

The number of students that would be generated in the Specific Plan area is determined by the number of residential units in the Specific Plan area multiplied by student generation rates of the local school districts, as presented in Draft EIR Table 6.10-6. At buildout, the Specific Plan area would generate approximately 1,793 new students in the region, with approximately 942 attending schools in the CUSD, 274 in the GJUHSD, and 577 in the EJESD. Existing educational facilities are unable to accommodate the projected growth from the Specific Plan area. (DEIR, p. 6.10-23.)

Student enrollment projections for the Specific Plan are based on student generation rates provided by the CUSD, EJESD, and GJUHSD in 2007. According to these figures, a total of 821 elementary students, 371 middle school students and 601 high school students would reside in the Specific Plan area upon full buildout, thereby totaling 1,793 students (see Draft EIR Table 6.10-6). In the eastern portion of the Community, the proposed project would generate 422 elementary students, 193 middle school students, and 327 high school students in the CUSD, for a total of 942 students. In the western portion of the Community and University, the proposed project would generate a total of 851 students, including 274 high school students who would attend school in the GJUHSD, and 399 elementary and 178 middle school students who would attend EJESD schools. (DEIR, p. 6.10-23.)

Since 1996, student generation within the CUSD service area has gone down. A variety of factors have influenced the lowering of enrollment generation factors between 1996 and 2001. In this area, the closure of McClellan Air Force Base may have influenced this downward trend. Other factors may include better data, changes in demographics such as age, socio-economic levels, subsequent development and type of development. Enrollment projection factors included in District Master Plans will continue to change with characteristics of the population throughout the development of the Specific Plan area. (DEIR, p. 6.10-24.)

The following analysis is based upon the current generation rates, which would result in a more conservative estimate, given that the proposed project includes a University community, which would likely generate fewer students since undergraduate students tend to have fewer children. Based on current generation rates, the RUSP would generate approximately 1,793 students who would attend schools as described below. By the time the Plan Area is fully built out, it is likely that other specific plan developments will have commenced and schools closer to the Plan Area will have been completed. Students generated in the western portion of the Plan Area, including the University, would attend schools in the EJESD and GJUHSD, while students generated in the eastern portion of the Plan Area would attend CUSD schools. (DEIR, p. 6.10-24.)

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

students, for a total of 577. Until these schools in the Plan Area are built, students generated in the CUSD would attend one of the elementary schools in CUSD, and students generated in the EJESD would attend either Elverta Elementary School or Alpha Technology Middle School. (DEIR, p. 6.10-24.)

The proposed project would generate approximately 193 grade 7 and 8 students and 327 high school students in the CUSD portion of the Plan Area. CUSD middle school students would initially attend Riles Middle School, which may necessitate the addition of temporary classrooms. Ultimately, these students would attend a middle school closer to the Plan Area, which would be built in either the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan or a future development project. High school students would initially attend Center High School, which may also necessitate the addition of temporary classrooms. It is anticipated that these students would ultimately attend schools closer to the proposed project, such as those in the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, area once they are developed. The proposed project would generate approximately 274 high school students in the GJUHSD. These students generated in the GJUHSD would initially attend Rio Linda High School, which may also require the addition of temporary classrooms. (DEIR, p. 6.10-24.)

Since Proposition 1A was passed by the voters and SB 50 was passed by the Legislature, school fees generated by new development are currently deemed sufficient mitigation of any impacts based on generation of students on school facilities. Because of the passage of Proposition 1A and SB 50, County General Plan Policy 4.J.13, described above, may be unenforceable. The impact is considered *less than significant*, provided school impact fees are collected pursuant to State law. (DEIR, p. 6.10-24.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-12: A change in school district boundaries could adversely affect one or more of the three school districts. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-25.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

Procedures are provided in the Education Code to protect the interests of all affected districts, when changes are proposed. The proposed change, and similar modifications for similar purposes, would be viewed as minor in nature and would permit the boundary to follow a logical dividing line as the area builds out. This is considered a *less-than-significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-25.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-13: Construction of schools within the Specific Plan area could lead to physical impacts on the environment. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-25.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.
(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

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

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-14: The proposed project could contribute to cumulative increases in demand for schools. This impact is *less than significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.10-25 to 6.10-26.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

The proposed project, in combination with other planned development in the region, would result in more students for each of the school districts serving the area. The existing schools would not be adequate to serve all the students from proposed new development and existing facilities would likely be expanded and new schools constructed to accommodate the new students. As discussed above, the Placer Vineyards development is proposing to construct nine new schools that would serve the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, as well as other development in the area. Ultimately, the CUSD, EJESD and GJUHSD would determine its facility needs through a master planning process, which includes coordination with the jurisdictions (e.g., Placer County) responsible for approving new development. Through this planning process, the school districts can plan for future demands on their facilities. As each development is approved, the project would be required to pay development fees consistent with SB 50 to the appropriate school district to be used by the district(s) to either expand existing facilities or construct new facilities to accommodate planned growth. The school sites included in the Regional University Specific Plan are addressed in the Draft EIR. The environmental impacts associated with any new schools planned for the Placer Vineyards development or the proposed Placer Ranch or Curry Creek development would be analyzed in EIRs that would be considered by the Placer County Board of Supervisors. If other schools are required elsewhere, the appropriate school district would be required to complete environmental review. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be considered *less than significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.10-25 to 6.10-26.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Parks and Recreation

Standards of Significance

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-32.)

Impact 6.10-15 **Development of the Specific Plan area could result in an inadequate amount of developed passive and active parkland and related facilities. This impact is *potentially significant*.**
(DEIR, pp. 6.10-32 to 6.10-33.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Based on a buildout population of 7,577 in the Community, there will be a need for a minimum of 38 acres of improved parkland and 38 acres of passive parkland in the Specific Plan area to meet the parkland dedication and improvement requirements set forth in Draft EIR Table 6.10-10. (DEIR, p. 6.10-32.)

The Community portion of the proposed project would include 63.8 acres of open space and 39.6 acres of park land. The active parkland would be distributed among a variety of park types, as suggested by General Plan Policy 5.A.3 (see Draft EIR Table 6.10-6). The Plan Area, as proposed, would include a 22.1-acre Community Park, an 8.5-acre neighborhood park, a 2.8-acre University Village Pocket Park, and three 2-acre pocket parks. (DEIR, p. 6.10-32.)

The County parkland level of service standards would require that the Community include recreational facilities as follows (see Draft EIR Table 6.10-9): eight tot lots, three playgrounds, one tennis court, one volleyball court, one basketball court, three hardball diamonds, three softball/Little League diamonds, four youth soccer fields, and four adult soccer fields. Other facilities could be constructed, including a skateboard park, tennis courts, a half-court basketball court, restrooms, maintenance areas, and a recreation building/center. The project's contribution toward the development of the actual facilities constructed at each park site may vary as set forth in the Development Agreement. (DEIR, p. 6.10-33.)

The 63.8 acres of open space within the Community would include open space corridors and easements that would provide for trails, stormwater conveyance, water quality treatment and flood detention, opportunities for wetland migration, and buffers between different types of land uses. The open space areas would be improved with trails and landscaping, qualifying as "greenways" under General Plan Policy 5.A.4. (DEIR, p. 6.10-33.)

The proposed project also calls for private open space areas within the University. According to the proposed project, the open space areas within the University would be privately owned and maintained, but access would be offered to visitors. The University Arboretum, if constructed, would include trees, shrubs, and plants cultivated for educational purposes. In addition, approximately 183.5 acres of the University would remain open space. A vernal pool complex in the southwest corner of the University would comprise 17 acres of the open space area. The remaining open space would be used for a combination of stormwater detention, lakes, and riparian habitat restoration. (DEIR, p. 6.10-33.)

Placer County would decide which residents and open space can be applied to satisfy its General Plan requirements. (DEIR, p. 6.10-33.)

The Community portion of the proposed project (population 7,577) would require approximately 38 acres of park land and 38 acres of open space. The Community would exceed the open space requirement with the 63.8 acres provided; the planned 39.6 acres of park land would exceed the requirements. However, the proposed project does not include the specific facilities that would be included in the proposed park areas. As stated above, park facilities include such improvements as tot lots, playgrounds, tennis courts, volleyball courts, basketball courts, hardball diamonds, softball/Little League diamonds, youth soccer fields, adult soccer fields, restrooms, maintenance areas, and a recreation building/center. Because the project does not include provisions for specific facilities, this is a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-33.)

Mitigation Measure:

6.10-15 *Project developers in the Specific Plan area shall comply with the requirements of the General Plan by dedication and improvement of a*

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

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

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

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

(DEIR, pp. 6.10-33 to 6.10-34.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-16: **Additional population in the Specific Plan area may result in increased reliance upon park facilities and services in neighboring jurisdictions. This impact is less than significant.**
(DEIR, p. 6.10-34.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

At full buildout, the Specific Plan area will have 4,387 residences and an estimated population of 10,037. The Community portion of the plan area would have 3,157 residences and an estimated population of 7,577. Based on the population of the Community, the County requires a minimum 38 acres of improved parkland and 38 acres of passive parkland. It is assumed that residents of the University would primarily use the private open space areas and recreational facilities on campus. (DEIR, p. 6.10-34.)

Although it cannot be guaranteed that project residents will not use facilities in Roseville and Sacramento County, the proposed Specific Plan includes 39.6 acres of active parkland and 68.3 acres of open space dedicated for active and passive recreation, which meets or exceeds the County's standard. Additionally, the University portion of the proposed project includes 183.5 acres of open space and additional private recreational facilities that would be open to visitors. Between recreational facilities within both the Community and University, Community residents and University residents would be adequately served by the open space, park land, and recreational facilities in their respective portions of the Plan Area. This would make it more likely that Plan Area residents would not overuse existing park facilities in surrounding areas and cause physical deterioration. In addition, sharing of facilities is viewed as desirable in some respects, and is the reason trail networks in Sacramento County, Placer County, and Roseville are to be connected. This is a *less-than-significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-34.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-17: Parks within the Specific Plan area have the potential to be poorly maintained if an adequate funding source is not identified. This impact is *potentially significant*. (DEIR, pp. 6.10-34 to 6.10-35.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Existing park fees pay for park infrastructure only. Maintenance dollars would need to be provided to pay for maintenance costs. The Specific Plan proponents are proposing that a

County Service Area or other special district be formed to fund and maintain passive and active parks in the area. (DEIR, p. 6.10-34.)

As noted under Regulatory Setting, Article XIID of the California Constitution was approved by the voters in 1997 (Proposition 218). Article XIID generally requires that assessment fees and charges be submitted to property owners for approval or rejection after the provision of written notice and the holding of a hearing. Lack of adequate funding for park maintenance is a *potentially significant impact*. (DEIR, pp. 6.10-34 to 6.10-35.)

Mitigation Measure:

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-35.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-18: **Development of the Specific Plan area will create a demand for community recreation facilities. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.10-35.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

Based on a projected Specific Plan buildout population of approximately 7,577 in the Community, there will be a demand for community recreation facilities, including one tennis court, one basketball court, three baseball diamonds, three softball diamonds, four adult soccer fields, and four youth soccer fields. These facilities would be constructed as needed to satisfy demand, and would be located throughout project construction in order to serve all residents of the Plan Area. Lack of community recreation facilities to serve the Specific Plan area population could have an impact on similar facilities in Roseville and Sacramento County, and would be a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-35.)

Mitigation Measure:

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-35.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-19: **Development of the Specific Plan area could result in cumulative impacts on passive and active parkland and related facilities. This is a less than significant cumulative impact.**
(DEIR, p. 6.10-36.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

Future development throughout the County, and specifically in the South Placer region, would increase the demand placed on existing parks and recreational facilities, and would require the construction of new parks and recreational facilities and the dedication of additional open space. All future development would be required to dedicate open space and parkland consistent with General Plan policies. New development would also be required to provide recreational facilities. These developments would either provide land

and construct parks and facilities directly, or would provide in-lieu fees to contribute to future construction by Placer County. Because future development would include park and recreational facilities consistent with County standards, and the developers would be required to provide for the funding to construct and maintain those facilities, no cumulative impacts related to parks and recreation would occur. This is a *less-than-significant cumulative impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-36.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Libraries

Standards of Significance

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-39.)

Impact 6.10-20: **Development of the Specific Plan could result in adequate library facilities. This impact is *potentially significant*.** (DEIR, p. 6.10-40.)

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

According to the existing *Auburn-Placer County Library Long-Range Plan*, a population of 10,037 will generate a demand for an additional 4,015 square feet of library space at full buildout. Although the University would include its own library facilities, many students from local colleges and universities in the region often use public library facilities in the area. Draft EIR Table 6.10-11 shows library demand based on population at full buildout. (DEIR, p. 6.10-39.)

A full library facility is proposed in the Placer Vineyards development. If this library is approved and constructed, it would be the closest operating branch to the project site. Under existing conditions, however, the Rocklin Library would serve the future residents of the project site. The Rocklin Library does not meet the adopted standards in the Library Service Plan. (DEIR, p. 6.10-39.)

According to the Director of Library Services, a “full library” is warranted to serve the proposed project. The RUSP does not propose to develop a full library, but a small branch library could be located within the Commercial Planned Development site, or may be co-located with other public community facilities. (DEIR, p. 6.10-39.)

The Placer County Library District would ultimately decide where and if a library is needed to serve the proposed project. The project developer would be required to pay fair-share fees for library services consistent with General Plan Policy 4.A.5. The physical impacts of the new library proposed within the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area and are disclosed in that EIR. If a library is not constructed within Placer Vineyards and one is required to be constructed off-site, the environmental impacts would be analyzed in a separate document at the time the facilities are proposed. (DEIR, pp. 6.10-39 to 6.10-40.)

The City of Roseville operates the nearest library to the Specific Plan area, which could be affected until the proposed permanent facility is developed on the site. The City has requested that construction of the first library begin no later than 2010 and the second by 2015, if the County plans to build two smaller library facilities rather than one larger one. If the County plans only one library facility, construction of that facility should begin no later than 2010. Residents of the area will not have access to a full range of library services until a permanent facility is located in the Specific Plan area and is operational. This is considered a *significant impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-40.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.10-20 a) *Formation of a County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD) or other financing mechanism acceptable to the County shall be required prior to recordation of the first final small lot subdivision map to ensure that immediate funding for adequate library infrastructure consistent with County standards is in place. The Specific Plan developers*

shall enter into a Development Agreement to ensure a fair share contribution to adequate library facilities, and that such facilities are available prior to demonstrated need.

- b) *Completion of one or more branch libraries to provide a minimum of 0.4 square feet per capita and stocking with books and other materials necessary for a functioning library with a minimum of 2.2 volumes per capita and otherwise meeting the standards of the Auburn-Placer County Library Long-Range Plan, including any subsequent amendments, shall occur concurrent with demand.*

- c) *Project developers shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to ensure adequate funding of the Specific Plan's fair share for the ongoing operation and maintenance of library facilities. Such funding mechanism shall be established prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map to ensure that immediate funding for adequate library operations and maintenance is in place.*

(DEIR, p. 6.10-40.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.10-21: *The Specific Plan could contribute to cumulative demand for library services. This is a less than significant cumulative impact.* (DEIR, p. 6.10-41.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

Development throughout the County, including the South Placer region, would increase demand for library services on existing libraries, some of which are already inadequate to serve the current population. Existing libraries would need to be expanded and/or new libraries would need to be constructed. All future development would be required to contribute fair-share fees for library services, consistent with General Plan Policy 4.A.5. (DEIR, p. 6.10-41.)

The Placer County Library provides library services throughout the County, but, because of the need to provide adequate access to all residents throughout the County, the library maintains local branches to provide service. In the case of the proposed project, the library branch that would likely provide primary service to the residents of the project site would also serve other planned growth in the project area. Therefore, the cumulative demand for library services would be served by the library branch funded, in part, by the proposed project. Therefore, this would be a *less-than-significant cumulative impact*. (DEIR, p. 6.10-41.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

K. PUBLIC UTILITIES

Wastewater

Standards of Significance

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

- Fail to meet wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board;
- Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities that could cause significant environmental effects;
- Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments;
- Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; or
- Be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the adopted *Placer County General Plan*.

(DEIR, p. 6.11-7.)

Impact 6.11-1: **The proposed project could fail to meet the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. This impact is *less than significant*. (FEIR, pp. 2-26.)**

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

The proposed project would generate an ADWF of 1.17 mgd. The current ADWF at the PGWWTP is 6.5 mgd. The proposed project is outside the South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA) 2005 service area boundary (2005 SAB) and, as stated on Draft EIR page 2-50 in Chapter 2, Project Description, the expanded SAB would need to be approved by the SPWA Board and the Participants to allow wastewater from the RUSP to be treated by the PGWWTP. In addition, serving areas outside the 2005 SAB could require increased discharge to Pleasant Grove Creek with resulting potential degradation of surface water quality. However, as stated on Draft EIR page 2-49 in Chapter 2, Project Description, prior to increasing discharge beyond currently permitted levels, the treatment plant operator would be required to obtain and comply with a new or amended NPDES discharge permit. Compliance with requirements of the new discharge permit would ensure that discharges contained in the *Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan Draft EIR*¹ (1996 Master Plan EIR) demonstrate that treatment process improvements are available to ensure discharges associated with flows of up to 29.5 ADWF can be discharged to Pleasant Grove Creek without exceeding wastewater treatment requirements. As such, potential water quality impacts due to required increases in wastewater treatment would be *less than significant*. (FEIR, p. 2-26.)

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.11-2: **The proposed project could require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. This impact is *potentially significant*. (FEIR, pp. 2-26 to 2-27.)**

Finding:

¹ City of Roseville, *Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan Draft EIR*, May 1996, SCH # 93092079.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Explanation:

The PGWWTP has a permitted capacity of 12 mgd ADWF to serve development within the 2005 SAB. At this time, the PGWWTP uses 6.5 mgd of its permitted 12 mgd of ADWF capacity. The proposed project, which is outside the 2005 SAB, would generate 1.17 mgd ADWF of wastewater requiring treatment at the PGWWTP. The City of Roseville analyzed flows from areas outside the 2005 SAB in the *South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation Report* (June 2007). That analysis projected 24.1 mgd ADWF for buildout of the Pleasant Grove Service Area, which includes the 2005 SAB, in addition to the eight UGAs specified in the analysis, including RUSP.² The impacts of expanding the GWWTWP to increase capacity and discharge up to 29.5 mgd ADWF has previously been addressed in two environmental impact reports; *Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan Draft EIR*³ (1996 Master Plan EIR) prepared by Environmental Science Associates and Montgomery Watson in May 1996, and the *West Roseville Specific Plan EIR*⁴ prepared by EIP Associates in September 2003. (FEIR, pp. 2-26 to 2-27.)

In the event that additional capacity is required prior to completion of the proposed project, additional treatment capacity could be obtained, as discussed in the 1996 Master Plan EIR. Nonetheless, as more development occurs in the City of Roseville and within the UGAs, the treatment capacity at the PGWWTP could be exceeded prior to completion of the proposed project. If that were to occur, the PGWWTP would need to be expanded in order to

² RMC, *South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation Report*, June 2007.

³ City of Roseville, *Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan Draft EIR*, May 1996, SCH # 93092079.

⁴ City of Roseville, *West Roseville Specific Plan and Sphere of Influence Amendment EIR*, September 15, 2003, SCH # 2002082057.

accommodate demand associated with the project. Therefore, this impact is considered *potentially significant*. (FEIR, p. 2-27.)

Mitigation Measure:

- 6.11-2 a) *Commitments from the wastewater treatment provider to receive anticipated flows from the Specific Plan area at the PGWWTP shall be secured by Placer County prior to County approval of improvement plans for wastewater collection and transmission infrastructure. The County shall comply with General Plan Policy 4.D.2, which requires written certification from the service provider that either existing services are available or needed improvements will be made prior to occupancy to meet wastewater demands of the Specific Plan area.*
- b) *Specific Plan proponents shall participate financially through connection fees and other financial mechanisms in the construction of additional wastewater treatment capacity sufficient to accommodate projected flows and treatment at the PGWWTP. In addition, Specific Plan proponents shall prepare, or shall provide a fair share contribution toward the preparation of any additional CEQA analysis that may be required for plant modifications and/or expansions.*
- c) *For each increment of new development within the Specific Plan area, the County shall confirm that all necessary permits (e.g., NPDES) are in place for either the PGWWTP to discharge additional treated effluent in the amounts associated with the new development. (If any modifications to the NPDES Permit are required, the WWTP operator would address modifying the allowable discharge amounts. The ability to treat wastewater flow from the Plan Area is contingent upon receiving this discharge permit from the RWQCB.) This shall include a determination that development timing will not impede other development for which entitlements have been issued. The requirement for such a showing shall be made a condition of any small lot tentative map approval associated with the new development and shall be verified by the County prior to recordation any final map associated with the new development. Where no small lot tentative map and final map are required prior to non-residential development having the potential to increase wastewater flows, the requirement for such verification, to be demonstrated no later than the time of issuance of building permits, shall be made a condition of approval of project-level discretionary approvals analogous to issuance of small-lot tentative maps.*
- d) *Approval of the Specific Plan shall be premised on concurrent County approval of a financing plan that will provide for funding the necessary*

wastewater collection facilities needed to serve the Specific Plan area, and implemented through approval for formation of a County Service Area (CSA) and a corresponding funding mechanism.

- e) *The Specific Plan proponents shall construct or participate financially in the construction of off-site wastewater conveyance capacity, including lift stations, to accommodate projected wastewater flows that would be generated by development of the Specific Plan.*
- f) *Adequately sized on-site collection facilities, including lift stations, shall be installed for each subdivision in the Specific Plan area concurrent with road construction for individual subdivisions. A "backbone" conveyance system sufficient to serve each subdivision shall be installed prior to issuance of building permits for that subdivision.*
- g) *The Regional University Specific Plan Sewer Master Plan shall be revised prior to submission of any wastewater-related improvement plans to include a detailed description of necessary on-site and off-site lift station components. The Master Plan shall include a plan for dealing with power and pump failure, and pump maintenance. The plan shall identify how necessary pumping capacity will be replicated in the event of pump failure or pump maintenance, and shall provide for on-site back-up power sufficient to run pumps and any odor scrubbers, in the event of power failure. Each lift station shall include a wastewater storage component in the form of an enclosed reservoir or tank sufficient to deal with temporary emergency conditions while backup systems are brought on line, in accordance with sizing standards utilized by the County Department of Facility Services.*

(FEIR, pp. 2-27 to 2-28.)

Significance After Mitigation:

Less than significant.

Impact 6.11-3: **The proposed project, in combination with other developments that would contribute wastewater flows to the PGWWTP, could fail to meet the wastewater treatment requirement of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. This impact is less than significant.** (FEIR, p. 2-28.)

Finding:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

Explanation:

The projected flows to the PGWWTP at buildout, including buildout of the 2005 SAB and the urban growth areas (which include the proposed project), is estimated to be 24.1 mgd ADWF. As discussed in the 1996 Wastewater Master Plan EIR, the potentially significant impacts to Pleasant Grove Creek associated with discharges of up to 29.5 mgd ADWF on water temperature, trace metals, organics, and dissolved oxygen were all reduced to less-than-significant levels⁵ with mitigation measures included in the 1996 Wastewater Master Plan, summarized in Final EIR Table 6.11-4. An increase in the permitted level of discharge could be required prior to buildout, which may result in the need to obtain additional permits from the RWQCB to increase the discharge amount. (FEIR, p. 2-28.)

The current permitted capacity of the PGWWTP is 12 mgd, which is available only to serve development within the 2005 SAB. Any request to expand the 2005 SAB would require appropriate CEQA review and any expansions of capacity beyond 12 mgd would require additional permits for discharge into Pleasant Grove Creek. The demand projected for buildout of the 1996 SAB in the 1996 Master Plan EIR was 20.7 mgd; the recent analysis prepared for the City of Roseville for demand in the UGAs found that demand in the 1996 service area boundaries would actually be 14.6 mgd due to revised flow estimates.⁶ As mentioned previously, treatment capacity expansion to meet the projected 24.1 mgd of all the UGAs analyzed by the City⁷ will be required. The extent to which the PGWWTP would need to expand to treat additional wastewater beyond the 24.1 mgd would depend on which projects would use the plant, subject to approval of the SPWA. Wastewater flows from outside the 2005 SAB would need to be analyzed, since that was the selected alternative in the Wastewater Master Plan EIR. Expansion of the plant to serve such unanticipated flows could result in impacts on the environment associated with construction to increase the capacity of the plant, loss of natural and other resources to expand the footprint of the facility, and degradation of water quality as a result of increased discharges to Pleasant Grove Creek. However, as noted above, prior to any expansion of the PGWWTP, the plant operator would be required to obtain and comply with a RWQCB permit. Compliance with the requirements in the permit would ensure that discharges from the PGWWTP would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements. This would be a *less-than-significant impact*. (FEIR, pp. 2-29.)

Mitigation Measure:

⁵ Merritt Smith Consulting, *Cumulative Analysis of UGA Impacts on Water Quality and Aquatic Resources in Pleasant Grove Creek, Roseville, California*, January 15, 2006.

⁶ RMC, *South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation Report*, June 2007.

⁷ RMC, *South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation Report*, June 2007.