

ADDENDUM to MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project Name: Miner's Ridge Family Apartments

PLUS #: PCPM 2010 0046

State Clearinghouse #: 2001122014

INTRODUCTION

On January 12, 2006 the Placer County Planning Commission adopted the Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration ("Mitigated Negative Declaration") for the Ridge View Villas Planned Residential Development Project (also known as Silver Bend Townhomes) (SCH 2001122014). The Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the impacts of constructing a 64-unit townhome project on the project site. The project site comprises 6.19 acres and is located approximately 700 feet west of the Lincoln Way/Silver Bend Way intersection, behind the Raley's shopping center, in the Bowman area, APNs 054-171-031 and -032; 054-171-035 through -038.

The Miner's Ridge Family Apartments project proposes modifying the previously approved entitlements for a 64-lot Planned Residential Development (Ridge View Villas) to allow for a 64-unit apartment development on the same site. The Miner's Ridge Family Apartments will consist of eight two-story residential buildings, each with eight apartments, a community building, a swimming pool, and a tot lot. The complex will include 12 one-bedroom/1 bath, 32 two-bedroom/2 bath, and 20 three-bedroom/2 bath units. This Addendum addresses these proposed modifications to the approved project.

REGULATORY BACKGROUND

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Addendum to a certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Negative Declaration is needed if minor technical changes or modifications to the proposed project occur (CEQA Guidelines § 15164). An addendum is appropriate only if these minor technical changes or modifications do not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts. The Addendum need not be circulated for public review (CEQA Guidelines § 15164[c]); however, an addendum is to be considered by the decision making body prior to making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines § 15164[d] and Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance Section 18.16.090).

This Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration demonstrates that the environmental analysis, impacts, and mitigation requirements identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain substantively unchanged by the situation described herein, and supports the finding that the proposed project does not raise any new issues and does not exceed the level of impacts identified in the

previous Mitigated Negative Declaration.

EVALUATION OF PROJECT MODIFICATIONS

The proposed Miner's Ridge Family Apartments would require modification of the existing entitlements in two ways:

1. A Conditional Use Permit modification to change the project from a 64-unit condominium (Planned Residential Development) to a 64-unit apartment development.
2. A Minor Boundary Adjustment to reconfigure the existing parcels on the project site.

In preparing this Addendum, all of the potential impacts identified on the CEQA "Environmental Checklist Form" were considered. For all impact areas, County staff review has concluded that the proposed modifications to the existing entitlements are consistent or comparable with the original approved project and therefore would have no new impact(s) not already identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

The following table provides a summary and comparison of the approved townhome project (Ridge View Villas) and the proposed apartment project (Miner's Ridge):

	Proposed Project	Existing Entitlement
	Miner's Ridge Apartments	Ridge View Villas Townhomes
Project Site Size	6.2 acres	6.2 acres
Project		
Unit Count	64	64
Density	10.3 units/acre	10.3 units/acre
Number of Buildings	9	23
Population	147 residents	147 residents
Parking		
Garage Spaces	0	128
Driveway Parking	0	8
Parking Stalls	132	21
Total Parking Spaces	132	157
Parking Ratio	2.1 spaces/unit	2.5 spaces/unit
Pervious Area		
Landscaped Areas	2.48 acres	2.58 acres
Undisturbed Area (ungraded)	1.22 acres	0.41 acres
Total Pervious Area	3.70 acres	2.99 acres
Impervious Area		
Parking/Drive Aisle/Streets	1.61 acres	1.24 acres

Roof	0.89 acres	1.97 acres
Total Impervious Area	2.50 acres	3.21 acres
Detention Provided	28,580 cubic feet (0.66 acre feet)	21,258 cubic feet (0.49 acre feet)
Tree Impacts		
Oak Trees Encroached	6	9
Oak Trees Removed	43	62

As shown in the table above, the proposed project modifications will not increase the number of residential units or the population to be housed on-site compared to the approved project. The proposed modifications will increase pervious area and stormwater detention on the site, and reduce impacts to oak trees. Although parking spaces are reduced in number, the project as modified will comply with the requirements of County Code for apartment developments.

In addition, County Environmental Health Services (EHS) has reviewed the *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Phase II Environmental Assessment* dated January 29, 2010 and the *Geotechnical Engineering Investigation*, dated February 18, 2010, both prepared by Krazan and Associates, Inc. These reports supplement the technical analysis prepared by Krazan in conjunction with the Mitigated Negative Declaration (see *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Update* dated May 3, 2005) and contain supplemental analysis and evaluation of previously-described site conditions, including the historic use of portions of the site as an orchard and as a repository for fill material from off-site construction activities.

Based upon the analysis and conclusions of these reports, EHS has recommended the following conditions:

1. Prior to submittal of Improvement Plans submit results of soil sampling to EHS for review and approval. Sampling shall be conducted according to a soil sampling plan that reflects the site specific conditions including future plans for the fill material. In areas of the project site where fill is not present, sampling shall be performed in accordance with the State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control August 2002 "Interim Guidance for Sampling Agricultural Fields for School Sites." In areas of the project site where fill is present, a site specific sampling plan shall be developed. This sampling plan shall indicate (at a minimum) the extent of fill on the project site, the depth of the fill materials, the proposed depth of fill materials to be removed, the destination of the fill material and whether new imported fill material will be used at the project site. This sampling plan shall be submitted to EHS for review and approval prior to implementation.
2. If the fill material is to be excavated and removed from the project site, it shall be properly characterized prior to removal from the project site and properly disposed at an appropriate disposal facility.

3. If imported fill material will be used, prior to placement of the fill material on the project site, it shall be sampled in accordance with the State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control "Information Advisory, Clean Imported Fill Material", dated October 2001.
4. If soil sample concentrations exceed residential screening levels or background concentrations for any constituents of concern, this site will be referred to the DTSC Voluntary Cleanup Agreement program for further review and/or assessment.
5. If this project is referred to the DTSC Voluntary Cleanup Agreement program, the project applicant will be required to complete any remedial action required by DTSC and provide EHS with a "No Further Action" or equivalent letter with regard to residual contamination from past uses of the project site. The "No Further Action" or equivalent letter shall be provided to EHS prior to approval of the Improvement Plans.
6. Concrete, asphalt and any other solid waste materials discovered during excavation and removal of fill material shall be properly disposed.
7. If at any time during the course of constructing the proposed project, evidence of underground storage tanks, septic tanks and/or individual water wells are encountered or suspected, the applicant shall immediately stop project activities in the affected area of the site and contact EHS. Project activities in the affected area shall remain stopped until there is resolution of the issue to the satisfaction of EHS.
8. Any water wells associated with prior uses of the property shall be properly destroyed by a licensed well driller, under permit with EHS.
9. Any existing septic systems associated with prior uses of the property shall be properly destroyed under permit with EHS.
10. The drilling of individual water wells on any lot within the project area is prohibited.
11. The discharge of fuels, oils or other petroleum products, chemicals, detergents, cleaners or similar chemicals to the surface of the ground or to drainage ways on or adjacent to the site is prohibited.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In summary, the analysis of this Addendum concludes that that the implementation of the project modifications would not result in impacts that were not identified in the previously approved Mitigated Negative Declaration. None of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or Negative Declaration have occurred, and thus an Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration is appropriate to satisfy CEQA requirements for the proposed project.

APPLICABLE REPORTS IN CIRCULATION

This Addendum is written as an addition to the Ridge View Villas Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration, adopted January 12, 2006. A copy of this document is available for review at the County of Placer Community Development Resource Agency, located at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT / RESOURCE AGENCY

Environmental Coordination Services

11414 B Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603 ☎ (530) 886-3000 ☎ (530) 886-3003
http://www.placer.ca.gov/planning ✉ ljlawren@placer.ca.gov

Subsequent **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

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

The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this Negative Declaration has been prepared.

Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has thus been prepared.

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

PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: Silver Bend Townhomes (PCUP 2768) – Conditional Use Permit

Description: The project proposed a Planned Development consisting of a 64-unit tentative map/townhome development with a community recreation building and a swimming pool.

Location: 360 Silver Bend Way, Auburn, near the edge of the American River Canyon

Project Proponent: North Auburn Silver Bend LP, 3128 Willow Avenue, Suite 101, Clovis, CA 93612

County Contact Person: Charlene Daniels **Telephone No.** (530) 886-3000

PUBLIC NOTICE

The comment period for this document closes on **November 28, 2005**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the Planning Department public counter and at the Auburn County Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Planning Commission. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Placer County Planning Department at (530) 886-3000 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. at 11414 "B" Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603.

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



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT / RESOURCE AGENCY
Environmental Coordination Services

11414 B Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603 ☎ (530) 886-3000 📠 (530) 886-3003
<http://www.placer.ca.gov/planning> ✉ ljlawren@placer.ca.gov

INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with the policies of the Placer County Board of Supervisors regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, this document, constitutes the Initial Study on the proposed project. This Initial Study provides the basis for the determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment. If it is determined that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report will be prepared which focuses on the areas of concern identified by this Initial Study.

I. BACKGROUND

Title of Project: Silver Bend Townhomes (PCUP 2768) – Conditional Use Permit

Environmental Setting: The site comprises 6.09 acres and is located near the edge of the American River Canyon. This site is currently vacant, contains several large piles of rocks and fill dirt, and has previously been used as a pear orchard. The majority of the site is characterized by annual grassland (4.4 acres) and the remainder of the site, particularly along the east and south property lines, contains oak woodlands (1.6 acres)

Original Project Description: The project originally consisted of a 72-unit apartment complex with a community recreation building and a swimming pool. A density bonus increased the maximum permitted density from 60 units to the requested 72 units. The county adopted the mitigated negative declaration in 2002.

Revised Project Description: The project has been revised to Planned Development consisting of a 64-unit tentative map/townhome development with a community recreation building and a swimming pool. A density bonus is requested to increase the number of units from 60 units to 64. The following is a summary of the impacts between the two projects:

Description of comparison	New proposed project	Original project
Number of units	64	72
Density	10.3 units/acre	11.6 units/acre
Number of buildings	23	9
Total offsite disturbed parcel area	24,512 sf/0.56 ac	18,679 sf/0.43 ac
Parking, drive aisle, and streets (onsite)	54,014 sf/1.24 ac	67,518 sf/1.55 ac
Roof	86,054 sf/1.97 ac	53,275 sf/1.22 ac
Total impervious area	140,068 sf/3.21 ac	120,793 sf/2.77 ac
Landscape area (includes sidewalks & hardscape)	117,916 sf/2.7 ac	125,017 sf/2.87 ac
Undisturbed area (ungraded area)	17,819 sf/0.41 ac	20,851 sf/0.48 ac
Total pervious area	135,735 sf/3.12 ac	145,868 sf/3.35 ac
Rough grading CUT	17,520 cu yd.	25,558 cu yd.
Rough grading FILL	9,320 cu yd.	17,988 cu yd.
Max CUT	±8 ft	±7 ft
Max FILL	±12 ft	±11 ft
Oak trees encroach	±9	±7
Oak trees removed	±47	±33
Total parking (excludes on street parking)	157 (2.38 spaces per unit)	162 (2.25 spaces per unit)
Detention provided	21,258 cu ft/0.49 ac ft	18,122 cu ft/0.42 ac ft

225

Environmental Issues
 (See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

II. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- A. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers.
- B. "Less than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are negligible and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- C. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from Section IV, EARLIER ANALYSES, may be cross-referenced).
- D. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- E. All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA, Section 15063 (a) (1)].
- F. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. Earlier analyses are discussed in Section IV at the end of the checklist.
- G. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans/community plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

I. LAND USE PLANNING: Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Conflict with general plan/community plan/specific plan designation(s) or zoning, or policies contained within such plans? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by responsible agencies with jurisdiction over the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Be incompatible with existing land uses in the vicinity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

- f. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

Discussion:

Planning Department:

Item 1c: The project site is zoned multi-family and this area is intended to serve as a transition between the commercial area located to the west of the site and the rural residential area to the east. This site is currently vacant. A solid 6' wood fence and landscaping are proposed along the east and northeast property line to provide a land use buffer between the project and the adjoining rural residential area. In addition, a 20' wide oak buffer will be provided, off-site, along the east property line to establish their buffer. Although Silver Bend Road will be widened from east of Lincoln Way to the project entrance, all other improvement will be constructed on site and will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community.

Mitigation Measures:

Item 1c: The project's improvement plans shall include a solid 6' wood fence and landscaping shall be installed along the east and northeast property line to provide an effective land use buffer to the uses to the east. The fence shall be included in the Design Review submittal and also shown on the improvement plans.

Air Pollution Control District:

Items 1a-1f: The Auburn/Bowman Community Plan (ABCP) EIR identified significant air quality impacts with buildout of the land use designations within that Plan. The proposed project will contribute to these impacts. The applicant has not identified any measures to mitigate their air quality impacts as required in the Goals and Policies of the ABCP. The district has identified measures below to mitigate this project's air quality impacts. The applicant can propose others that result in the same emission reduction as those listed in Item #5 of this initial study.

2. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the proposal

- a. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
- b. Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
- c. Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Discussion:

Planning Department:

Items 2a-2b: Utility services will be extended to the proposed project, a land use, which is consistent with the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan. There are currently sewer pipes available in Lincoln Way and the Raley's shopping center property. Although the relatively short extension of these pipes could help in the future development of adjoining multiple-family zoned property, this extension is not considered to be major and therefore the impacts are considered to be less than significant. Since this project is in the redevelopment area, 15% of the units shall be affordable to moderate, low, and very low income households.

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
---	-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

3. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS: Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

a. Unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Planning Department:

Item 3c: The site elevation ranges from about 1,580 ft along the northern border to around 1,540 feet in the southeast corner of the property. The revised project proposes a significant reduction in grading activities and proposes to cut approximately 17,520 cubic yards and fill approximately 9,320 cubic yards of the earth. To minimize the amount of earthwork for the project, the developer will be installing retaining walls and utilizing step foundations for the various buildings to reduce the impacts to a level that is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

Item 3c: The developer will utilize step foundations in several buildings and retaining walls to reduce the amount of earthwork required to construct the project.

Engineering & Surveying Division:

Item 3a: The project is proposed on the same property as the previously proposed Silver Bend Apartments project. The revised project conceptual site plan by TSD Engineering, Inc., is dated September 2, 2005. Less rough grading cut/fill activities are proposed with the revised project, as less pad grading is necessary. Maximum depth of cuts are proposed at approximately 8 feet, while maximum depth of fills are proposed at approximately 12 feet. The previous project proposed approximate maximum cuts of 7 feet and approximate maximum fills of 11 feet. These do not differ significantly. The Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report for the Proposed Silver Bend Apartments, dated July 12, 2001, is still applicable for this project review, as no grading or geological alterations have occurred to the site since its completion. The Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report did not indicate any changes in geologic substructures expected as a result of this project. There were concerns raised regarding existing fill material on-site, which could result in unstable earth conditions on a localized basis. There is no indication that any major slope instability will be caused as a result of this project.

Items 3b-3c: Per the conceptual grading plan by TSD Engineering, Inc., dated September 2, 2005, the total disturbed area

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

of the proposed project is roughly equivalent in comparison to the previous project area of disturbance. The proposed project would disturb 6.2 acres and result in significant increases in the amount of impervious surface present on the site. Approximately 3.21 acres of impervious area will be created on site as compared to the previously proposed project (2.77 acres). To construct the improvements proposed, significant disruption of the soils on-site will occur, including compaction for roadways and foundations. Grading as proposed will result in the construction of retaining walls throughout the site. However, less rough grading cut/fill activities are proposed with the revised project, as less pad grading is necessary. Maximum depth of cuts are proposed at approximately 8 feet, while maximum depth of fills are proposed at approximately 12 feet. The previous project proposed approximate maximum cuts of 7 feet and approximate maximum fills of 11 feet. These do not differ significantly. Impacts due to grading and disturbance of soils will be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of the following mitigation measures, as previously applied to mitigate similar project impacts.

Mitigation Measures:

Items 3a-3c:

1. 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 ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION for review and approval. The plans shall show all conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees. (NOTE: Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction cost 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 ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.

2. 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, formerly Chapter 29), 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 ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION 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. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION.

Submit to the ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION 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 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/ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.

Environmental Issues*(See attachments for information sources)*

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

3. Submit to ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION, 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:

- A) Road, pavement, and parking area design
- B) Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable)
- C) Grading practices
- D) Erosion/winterization
- E) Special problems discovered on-site, (*i.e.*, groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.)
- F) Slope stability
- G) Recommended practices for dewatering in the event necessary

Once approved by the ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION 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, would lead to structural defects, additional investigations, prior to issuance of Building Permits will be required. This shall be so noted in the CC&Rs, the Improvement Plans 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.

Engineering & Surveying Division:

Item 3e: The proposed project is within an area identified as having steep slopes, as previously identified in the Silver Bend Apartments MND, EIAQ #3591. Less rough grading activities are proposed as compared to the previous project, and roughly the same amount of soil disturbance is proposed. The proposed project could potentially disturb over 6 acres and result in significant increases in the amount of impervious surface present on the site. To construct the improvements proposed significant disruption of the soils on-site will occur, creating a potential for contamination of storm runoff with disturbed sediment or other pollutants introduced through typical grading practices. This disturbance will likewise create increased risk of erosion on-site during construction. The site is within an area identified as having Steep Slopes (Auburn/Bowman Comm. Plan, Figure 13) with an increased potential for erosion. Discharge of concentrated runoff after construction could also contribute to erosive impacts in the long-term. These impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of the following mitigation measures, as previously applied to mitigate similar project impacts.

Mitigation Measures:**Item 3e:**

1. Staging Areas: 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.

2. Prepare and submit with the project Improvement Plans, a drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the LDM and the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. "Best Management Practice" (BMP) measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.

3. Projects 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 ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION evidence of a state-issued WDID number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.

Environmental Issues
 (See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

4. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall submit an engineer's estimate detailing costs for facilities to be constructed with the project which are intended to be County-owned or maintained. County policy requires the applicant prepare their cost estimate(s) in a format which is consistent with the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, 34th Standard (GASB 34). The engineer preparing the estimate shall use unit prices approved by the ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION for line items within the estimate. The estimate shall be in a format approved by the County and shall be consistent with the guidelines of GASB 34.

Item 3g: The previous project included 72 apartment units as compared to the proposed 64 town home project. Less density and fewer dwelling units result in less of an impact due to exposure of people and property to geologic and geomorphological hazards than the previously analyzed project. However, the proposed project will create 64 town home dwelling units with associated parking and circulation areas on the site. A portion of this construction would occur in previously disturbed areas. These are areas identified in the Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report for Proposed Silver Bend Apartments, dated July 12, 2001, where evidence exists of past fill placement which may not have been inspected and performed sufficiently to ensure only acceptable risk to the proposed structures. Location of this project in a previously disturbed area, existing site limitations identified in the July 12 Report, and the site's location in Seismic Zone 3 could potentially expose people and property to significant geologic and geomorphological hazards. The implementation of the following mitigation measures, as previously applied to mitigate similar project impacts, will ensure that these impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures:

Item 3g:

1. Any unsuitable fill or debris identified in the Geotechnical Engineering Report(s) to be prepared and submitted with the Improvement Plans, or discovered during construction, shall be hauled off-site to an appropriately permitted facility. The applicant may propose to treat unsuitable soils to make them suitable. Any treatment of this sort must be recommended by the Geotechnical Engineering Report(s) and the applicant shall obtain the approval of the ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION prior to implementation of the treatment process.

4. WATER Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Discharge into surface waters or other alterations of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Changes in currents, or the course of direction of water movements? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions of withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations, or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Environmental Issues
(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| g. Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Impacts to groundwater quality? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i. Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j. Impacts to the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to, Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

Engineering & Surveying Division:

Items 4a, 4b & 4d: The total impervious area of the proposed project is 3.21 acres as compared to the original project's proposed 2.77 acres of impervious surface. This increase of roughly half an acre is not considered to be significant when the same mitigation measures as previously identified in the MND are applied to the new project. The applicant is still proposing a detention basin in roughly the same location as the previous project, and water will flow off the property in the similar direction as pre-project conditions, as previously proposed. The detention basin will increase in size from 0.42 acre-feet (original project) to 0.49 acre-feet (proposed project). The basin is shown on the conceptual grading plan by TSD Engineering, Inc., dated September 2, 2005. The necessary increased storage capacity can be constructed on site and no new mitigation measures are required from those previously applied. Staff finds that this project's impact on stormwater runoff quantity due to development of the site will be less than significant, if the following mitigation measures are implemented.

Mitigation Measures:

Items 4a, 4b & 4d:

1. The following off-site drainage facilities shall be evaluated in the drainage report for condition and capacity and shall be upgraded, replaced, or mitigated as specified by ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION:

A) the existing 18-inch culvert identified in the preliminary drainage report draining into an existing drain junction box in Foresthill Road

The applicant understands that any upgrade or replacement identified as necessary during Improvement Plan review may require additional environmental review prior to actual implementation. The applicant shall address this issue prior to approval of Improvement Plans. This includes analysis of the structure and any associated environmental review required.

2. Storm water run-off shall be reduced to pre-project conditions 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 ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION. The ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION may, after review of the project drainage report, delete this requirement if it is determined that drainage conditions do not warrant installation of this type of facility. In the event on-site detention requirements are waived, this project may be subject to payment of any in-lieu fees prescribed by County Ordinance. No retention/detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

3. Drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting runoff on individual lots, shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and shall be in compliance with applicable stormwater quality standards, to the satisfaction of ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION. These facilities shall be constructed with subdivision improvements and easements provided as required by ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the homeowners' association.

Items 4c, 4j: The total impervious area of the proposed project will increase by roughly half an acre as compared to the

Environmental Issues*(See attachments for information sources)*

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

original project proposal. Although not a significant increase, this will result in more stormwater flows and water quality impacts than previously identified. The construction phase of this project will disturb soils on-site. This creates a potential for increased erosion and subsequent discharge of material into surface waters. In this area the local drainage eventually could impact the American River. Through the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for minimizing contact with potential stormwater pollutants at the source and erosion control methods, the potentially significant impact to water quality can be reduced to less than significant levels. In the post-development condition, the residential portion of the proposed development has the potential to introduce stormwater contaminants such as sediment, nutrients, bacteria and viruses, oil and grease, metals, organics, pesticides, and trash. Activities that could potentially contribute to stormwater pollution are car washing, yard fertilizing and irrigation, household products storage, pets, and refuse collection areas. In addition, the post-development commercial portion of the project could potentially introduce contaminants such as oil and grease, sediment, nutrients, metals, organics, pesticides, and trash from activities such as parking lot runoff, outdoor storage, landscape fertilizing and maintenance, and refuse collection. Staff considers these water quality impacts to be potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce these potential impacts to a level less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:**Items 4c, 4j:**

1. Storm drainage from 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 (e.g. sediment, oil/grease, etc.), as approved by ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION. With the Improvement Plans, the applicant shall verify that proposed BMPs are appropriate to treat the pollutants of concern from this project. 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.
2. Water quality "Best Management Practices" (BMPs) shall be applied according to guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, or for Industrial and Commercial, (or other similar source as approved by the ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION). 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. BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to all those identified in the approved "BMP Plan" and minimizing drainage concentration from impervious surfaces, construction management techniques, mulching, hydroseeding, erosion protection at culvert/pipe outfall locations, infiltration trenches, double can sediment traps, and fossil filters as proposed in the preliminary drainage narrative prepared by A.R. Associates, sediment traps, basins or other BMP's approved by ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION to address potential dewatering. All BMPs shall be maintained as required to insure effectiveness. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION upon request.
3. This project is located within the area covered by Placer County's municipal stormwater quality permit, pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II program. Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said permit. BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff in accordance with "Attachment 4" of Placer County's NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (State Water Resources Control Board NPDES General Permit No. CAS000004).
4. Provide the following easements/dedications on the Improvement Plans and Final Map to the satisfaction of the ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION and DRC:
 - A) Provide private easements for existing or relocated water lines, service/distribution facilities, valves, etc., as appropriate.

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
---	-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

B) An Irrevocable Offer of Dedication for easements as required for access to, and protection and maintenance of, storm drainage retention/detention facilities, as well as water quality enhancement facilities (BMP's). Said facilities shall be privately maintained until such time as the Board of Supervisors accepts the offer of dedication.

C) Slope easements for cuts and fills outside the highway easement.

If the applicant is unable to obtain easements on the two adjacent properties to the west for the slope easements for the roadway, the site plan will have to be altered to obviate the need for slope easements off site. In this event, a revised site plan will be submitted to the DRC for review and the DRC will decide whether further environmental analysis is required based on the proposed revisions.

5. Create a County Service Area (CSA) Zone of Benefit or annex to an existing CSA Zone of Benefit, if appropriate. The CSA will be established concurrent with and on the Final Map. In the event that the CSA is abolished by the Board of Supervisors, or the CSA is otherwise not able to function, the homeowners' association shall be responsible for all services previously provided by the CSA. The CSA shall provide the following services:

A) Road maintenance for the portion of Silver Bend Way to be improved by the applicant.

B) Storm drainage maintenance for facilities located within public easements including structural stormwater quality enhancement facilities (BMP's).

C) Maintenance of detention facilities by the homeowners' association will be required.

6. Storm drainage from 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 (e.g. sediment, oil/grease, etc.), as approved by ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION. With the Improvement Plans, the applicant shall verify that proposed BMPs are appropriate to treat the pollutants of concern from this project. 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.

7. Drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting runoff on individual lots, shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the County Stormwater Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and shall be in compliance with applicable stormwater quality standards, to the satisfaction of ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION. These facilities shall be constructed with subdivision improvements and easements provided as required by ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the homeowners'/property owners' association.

8. Projects 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 ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION evidence of a state-issued WDID number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.

5. AIR QUALITY Would the proposal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? Cumulative	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have the potential to increase localized carbon monoxide levels at nearby intersections in exceedance of adopted standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues
 (See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

d. Create objectionable odors?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

Air Pollution Control District:

Item 5a: The applicant did not provide an Urbemis7G emission estimate model as requested in the District's January 17, 2001 letter. The District ran the model and determined that construction emissions will be above the District's significance thresholds while long-term operational emissions will be below the District's project alone significance thresholds. The project will contribute to significant cumulative air quality impacts occurring within Placer County. The project would need to implement the following mitigation measures, or other similar measures proposed by the applicant, to mitigate the project's construction and cumulative air quality impacts. These measures are needed for the project to be consistent with the ABCP and the District's Air Quality Attainment Plan.

Mitigation Measures:

Item 5a:

Construction

1. The applicant shall submit a construction emission/dust control plan to the District with measures to control diesel exhaust and dust emissions. The District should be contacted for sample plans and recommendations on the measures to be contained in the Plan.
2. The applicant needs to determine if serpentine rock will be disturbed as part of this project. If so, then the construction emissions/dust control plan must contain measures to control potential asbestos emissions.
3. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed District Rule 202 Visible Emission limitations.
4. No open burning of removed vegetation during infrastructure improvements. Vegetative material will be chipped or delivered to waste to energy facilities.
5. Implement or contribute to a native tree-planting program to offset the loss of existing trees at the construction site.
6. Utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary power generators.
7. Contact the APCD engineer to determine if any of the equipment to be used on the construction site or during operation (i.e. heater for pool) requires stationary source Authority to Construct/Permit to Operate permits.)
8. If the project site is found to contain naturally occurring asbestos (NOA), the applicant will be required to comply with the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, And Surface Mining Operations. An implementation plan to comply with this air toxic control measure should be developed and approved during the environmental review process. Submit plan to District per asbestos ATCM.
9. Use of low VOC coatings per District Rule 218 Architectural Coatings.

Operational

1. Install low nitrogen oxide (NOx) hot water heaters.
2. Open burning shall be prohibited through CC&Rs on all lots
3. The project shall implement an offsite mitigation program, coordinated through the Placer County Air Pollution Control District, to offset the project's long-term ozone precursor emissions. The applicant provides monetary incentives to sources of air pollutant emissions within the project's general vicinity that are not required by law to reduce their emissions. Therefore, the emission reductions are real, quantifiable and implement provisions of the 1994 State Implementation Plan. The offsite mitigation program reduces emissions within the region that would

Environmental Issues
(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

not otherwise be eliminated and thereby "offsets" the project's increase to regional emissions.

4. In lieu of the applicant implementing their own offsite mitigation program, the applicant can choose to participate in the Placer County Air Pollution District Offsite Mitigation Program by paying an equivalent amount of money into the District program. The actual amount of emission reductions needed through the Offsite Mitigation Program would be calculated when the project's average daily emissions have been determined. The amount of emissions would be reduced by any on site measures implemented by the project
5. Tree planting of California native species in excess of that already required.
Install natural gas barbecues (if natural gas is available) within the project site.
6. Only US EPA Phase II certified wood-burning devices shall be installed in single-family residences. Masonry fireplaces must have installed UL listed decorative natural gas fireboxes. The emission potential from each residence shall not exceed 7.5 grams per hour.
7. Landscape with native drought-resistant species (plants, trees and bushes) to reduce the demand for gas powered landscape maintenance equipment.

Provide sidewalks along Silver Bend Way and any other roadway/pedestrian improvements recommended by the Placer County Department of Public Works.

6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION Would the proposal result in:

a. Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Engineering & Surveying Division:

Item 6a: This project will contribute to traffic impacts on Lincoln Way and the Auburn Ravine/Forest Hill Road interchange at I-80. While the level of service (LOS) will be D at the interchange, this is considered acceptable in the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan. This policy and the impacts of Community Plan buildout on traffic are discussed in the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan EIR.

Fewer trips are expected as a result of this town home project as compared to the original apartment project, as there are 8 less dwelling units. However, regardless of the site-specific impacts, the project will have a cumulative impact on the County's transportation system network. The cumulative impact can be partially mitigated by payment of traffic mitigation fees to be used for improvements identified in the Placer County Capital Improvements Program (CIP).

This project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Auburn/Bowman Fee District), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) will be required and shall be paid to Placer County ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION prior to issuance

Environmental Issues*(See attachments for information sources)*

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

of any Building Permits for the project:

A) County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code

The current total combined estimated fee is \$2,192 per townhouse. The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If either the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs

Item 6c: The proposed town home project presents the same impact to existing accesses onto Silver Bend Way as the previously proposed apartment project. The applicant has proposed the following mitigation measures to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures:**Item 6a, 6c:**

1. It has been identified that improvement of Silver Bend Way required to serve this project will impact 4 driveways accessing Silver Bend Way. These driveways accesses shall be reconstructed to a Plate 27-2, LDM standard if providing access to a single-family residence and the appropriate Plate 27-1, LDM standard if a different type of access. Access to the parcels or uses affected shall be maintained throughout construction of Silver Bend Way.

2. Traffic on Silver Bend Way shall be accommodated during construction of the improvements to allow ingress and egress for residents and businesses. The applicant shall request approval, as necessary, for road closure/detour 30-days in advance of commencing project construction affecting such closure. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall provide a construction detour/signage plan for review and approval by the ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION.

The applicant is advised that all road closures and detours on public roads are subject to the discretionary approval of the Director of Public Works. The applicant is advised that such approval is not guaranteed by this condition. The applicant is further advised that half-street closures only will be considered.

Item 6e: The proposed town home project presents the same hazards for pedestrians or bicyclists as the previously proposed apartment project. The project will create additional opportunities for pedestrians living in or passing through the project to be exposed to risk of falling from the highway cut along Foresthill Road. Pedestrians wishing to access Lincoln Way or the commercial centers adjacent to Lincoln Way would not currently have a fully improved pedestrian access to utilize. The applicant has proposed the following mitigation measures to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures:**Item 6e:**

1. Construct a fence along the property boundary with Foresthill Road. The fence shall be a minimum of 6-feet high, as measured from finished grade. Said fence shall be approved by the DRC prior to Improvement Plan approval. This fence shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and constructed with the project improvements.

2. Improve Silver Bend Way off site from the westerly project boundary to the existing improved section of Silver Bend Way, approximately 400 feet west, as shown on the Silver Bend Road Offsite Improvements Sheet dated September 2, 2005 by TSD Engineering, Inc., to the following standard:

A) Pavement width 24' minimum (12' minimum each travel lane)

B) 5'-wide multipurpose walkway separated from the roadway, with surfacing to be Portland Cement Concrete, or other as approved by the DRC, and with the route to be approved by the DRC

Additional widening may be required to accommodate transitions, auxiliary lanes, intersection geometrics, bikelanes, or conformance to existing improvements. The roadway structural section shall be designed for a Traffic Index of 7.0, but said section shall not be less than 3" AC/8" Class 2 AB, unless otherwise approved by ENGINEERING & SURVEYING DIVISION.

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
---	-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the proposal result in impacts to:

a. Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including, but no limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Locally occurring natural communities (e.g., oak woodlands, mixed conifer, annual grasslands, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Significant ecological resources including: 1) Wetland areas including vernal pools; 2) Stream environment zones; 3) Critical deer winter ranges (winter and summer), migratory routes and fawning habitat; 4) Large areas of non-fragmented natural habitat, including but not limited to Blue Oak Woodlands, Valley Foothill Riparian, vernal pool habitat; 5) Identifiable wildlife movement zones, including but not limited to, non-fragmented stream environment zones, avian and mammalian routes, and known concentration areas of waterfowl within the Pacific Flyway; 6) Important spawning areas for anadromous fish?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Planning Department:

Items 7a-7c: There are approximately 65 native oak trees, 6" in diameter or more, on the site. The majority of these trees will be removed as a result of project construction. The revised project results in an increased impact to the native oak trees. Sixteen additional trees will either be impacted or removed for a total of 56 trees. Nine trees are not anticipated to be impacted. The original biological report prepared for the project states that there are no jurisdictional wetlands located on the property. In addition, the site is not suitable for deer migration since the west side is developed and the east side is too steep.

The site contains habitat suitable for one special status plant species – “big scale balsam root” and the Brandegee’s Clarkia.

Special Status Plant Surveys were conducted on April 29th and May 10th, 2005 for the Brandegee’s Clarkia and the Big Scale Balsam Root. These surveys were conducted during a seasonally appropriate time to detect these species and they were not found. The biological study concluded that no further plant survey should be required prior to construction.

A revised raptor study dated June 3, 2005, was conducted on the site. No raptor nesting activity was observed during the field surveys. However, taller trees located throughout the site may provide suitable nesting habitat for raptors such as red shouldered hawk, red tail hawk, and possibly white tail kite.

Mitigation Measures:

Items 7a-7c: The developer will mitigate the tree removal by replacing trees on-site with 15-gallon trees, on a per tree basis. If replacement tree planting is authorized, the trees must be installed by the applicant and inspected and approved by the DRC prior to the issuance of a final Certificate of Occupancy by the Placer County Building Department. At its discretion, the DRC may establish an alternate deadline for installation of mitigation replacement trees if weather or other circumstances prevent the completion of this requirement.

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
---	-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

If proposed construction is to occur at any time during the typical nesting season of March 1 to August 31, a preconstruction survey for nesting raptors should be conducted. A preconstruction survey should be conducted by a qualified biologist, no more than 30 days prior to the initiation of proposed development activities.

8. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and state residents? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

Planning Department:

Item 8b: The project will utilize non-renewable resources and will be constructed to the standards established in the California Uniform building Code. Since this project is a multi-family type of development, it will utilize resources more efficiently than in a typical detached single-family development.

9. HAZARDS Would the proposal involve:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

Planning Department:

Item 9e: CDF reviewed the proposed project and determined that it would have a less than significant fire hazard if the following provisions are incorporated into the project design.

Mitigation Measures:

Item 9e:

1. Provide a fire flow of 2,500 gpm @20. Individual hydrants shall be capable of flowing 1,500 gpm @20 psi.
2. Hydrant locations shall be approved by Placer County Fire Department with hydrant spacing no more than 300 feet.
3. Fire suppression appurtenances shall be visible from driving surface with no vegetation exceeding 6 inches in height within 36 inches of any hydrant, post indicator valve, fire department connection or other fire service related device.
4. The complex shall not contain gated roadways, speed bumps or any other device that may slow Fire Department

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
---	-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

- response.
5. Building numbers shall be visible from the access street or road fronting the property, clearly visible from both directions of travel on the road/street. Said numbers shall be a minimum 3 inch letter height, 3/8 inch stroke, reflectorized, and contrast with their background, or may be a minimum 5 inches high and contrast with their background.
 6. Exterior wall covering within the reduced fire safe setback shall be non-combustible
 7. Rafter tails within this area shall be enclosed with non-combustible material
 8. Attic and underfloor vents shall be covered with 1/8 inch non-combustible mesh
 9. Provide a minimum 30" setback from property line on the East and North sides, or obtain a 20' fire suppression easement from the adjoining property owners
 10. Any driveway or dead end road within the complex greater than 150' shall have an approved Hammerhead/means of turning around
 11. Provide one week notice prior to scheduled road closures and requested inspections
 12. Provide Fire Department access to all common areas. Access may be provided by one or more Knox boxes located throughout the complex
 13. Stairwells, landings and walkways shall be sized to accommodate an ambulance gurney plus 2 feet

10. NOISE: Would the proposal result in:				
a. Increases in existing noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of people to noise levels in excess of County standards?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:				
a. Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Sheriff Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:
Planning Department:
Items 11a & 11c: The project will result in the construction of 64 residential units and will impact the public service providers of the area. However, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:
Items 11a & 11c:
 1. See mitigation measures noted in 9e for fire protection
 2. The developer shall pay the adopted school impact fees prior to the issuance of a building permit as provided for in California Code 65995.

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
---	-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Power or natural gas? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Communication systems? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Sewer, septic systems, or wastewater treatment and disposal facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Storm water drainage? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Solid waste materials recovery or disposal? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Local or regional water supplies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

Planning Department:

Items 12a-12g: The project will impact local facilities and services systems by adding 64 residential units to the area. All local agencies have been notified of the project and none of the agencies have indicated a need for new systems or supplies or that the project will result in the need to substantially alter existing systems.

13. AESTHETICS Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Create adverse light or glare effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

Planning Department:

Items 13a-13c: The project is screened from I-80 by existing development and is setback approximately 150' from Foresthill Road. A revised cross section dated July 8, 2005 demonstrates that the building will be located outside the line of site from Foresthill Road and therefore will not be visible from this roadway. The buildings have been designed to be consistent with the architectural guidelines of the Placer County Design Guidelines Manual. The proposed building elevations have a substantial amount of articulation and have significant breaks in the roofline. Wood is also one of the building materials proposed for the building.

The applicant is proposing to use high-pressure sodium lights with 200 watts or less. The height of the freestanding lights will not exceed 14'. Full-cutoff light fixtures are also proposed. In order to break up the appearance of large retaining walls, landscaping is proposed at the top of these walls which is designed to cascade over the wall.

Environmental Issues
(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

14. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Disturb paleontological resources? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Disturb archaeological resources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Affect historical resources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

Planning Department:

Items 14b-14e: The cultural resources report concluded that no prehistoric sites were recorded during the survey and that the proposed project would not have an effect on the historic resources. Although this impact is considered to be less than significant, the consultant recommends that a condition be added to state that: "If construction activities uncover artifacts, bone, or exotic rock (particularly obsidian), then a qualified archeologist should be contacted to examine the deposit and determine its nature and significance. State law requires that if bone is discovered which might be human, the County Coroner must be contacted. If the Coroner determines that the bone is Native American in origin, he will contact the Native Heritage Commission in Sacramento to identify most likely descendants."

15. RECREATION: Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Affect existing recreational opportunities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

Planning Department:

Items 15a-15b: The project will create 64 additional residential units in the project area and this will impact existing parks and will increase the demand for recreational facilities

Mitigation Measures:

Items 15a-15b:

The applicant will pay the County's park dedication fee on a per unit basis. The applicant is also providing a recreational room and a pool on-site

III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------|
| A. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants | NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | YES <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|------------------------------|

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) NO YES
- C. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? NO YES

Discussion:

Planning Department:

Site development and future road improvements will result in the loss of oak trees and alteration of the natural terrain. Additional preconstruction surveys are required to verify that the project will not have an impact on nesting raptures The revised project has some impacts which have increased from the original project including the number of oak trees which are impacted/removed, and the amount of impervious surface.

The project alone will not significantly impact the environmental resources or the public service facilities in the Bowman area. The project is consistent, in the cumulative context, with the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan, which identifies this area for future multi-family development. The environmental impacts of the proposed project on a cumulative basis are significant and both impacts and mitigation measures have been addressed in the A/BCP and EIR. That EIR has identified and analyzed a number of cumulatively significant impacts to which this project contributes.

Engineering & Surveying Division:

This project will contribute to traffic impacts on Lincoln Way and the Auburn Ravine/Foresthill Road interchange at I-80. While the level of service (LOS) will be D at the interchange, this is considered acceptable in the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan. This policy and the impacts of Community Plan buildout on traffic are discussed in the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan EIR. The site-specific traffic impacts are considered to be significant. The mitigations included for Item 6 will reduce these site-specific impacts to a less than significant level.

Air Pollution Control District:

The short-term construction and long-term operational air pollutant emissions resulting from this project have been adequately evaluated in the Auburn-Bowman Community Plan environmental document. Implementation of the measures listed in Item #5 of this initial study, or other similar measures, will ensure that the project adequately mitigates its contribution to cumulative air quality impacts occurring within the project vicinity and Placer County.

IV. EARLIER ANALYSIS

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [State CEQA guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets.

- A. **Earlier analyses used.** Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
- B. **Impacts adequately addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

C. **Mitigation measures.** For effects that are checked as "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087.

Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 31083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151;
Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino, 202 Cal. App. 3d 296 (1988); *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337 (1990).

V. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

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

VI. DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

VII. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments Consulted):

Planning Department, Charlene Daniels
 Engineering & Surveying Division, Rebecca Maddex
 Environmental Health Services, Dana Wyingner
 Air Pollution Control District, Yushuo Chang

Signature: Charlene Daniels
 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON

10/12/05
 Date