RANCHO DEL ORO ESTATES PROJECT

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Adopted by

Placer County Board of Supervisors

October 5, 2010

92

Attachment F

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page**

1. Introduction 1
2. Description of the Proposed Project 1
3. Procedural History 2
4. General Findings 4
   - A. Impacts Determined to be Less-Than-Significant 5
   - B. Potentially Significant Impacts Reduced to a Less-Than-Significant Level Through Through Mitigation Measures 7
     - 4.1 Biological Resources 7
     - 4.2 Cultural Resources 14
     - 4.3 Visual Resources 17
     - 4.4 Transportation and Circulation 18
     - 4.5 Air Quality 19
     - 4.6 Noise 23
     - 4.7 Soils, Geology, and Seismicity 24
     - 4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality 28
     - 4.9 Public Services and Utilities 33
     - 4.10 Initial Study 36

5. Cumulative Impacts 38
   - A. Potentially Significant Cumulative Impacts Reduced to a Less-Than-Significant Level Through Mitigation Measures 38
     - 5.1 Transportation and Circulation 38
     - 5.2 Air Quality 40
     - 5.3 Hydrology and Water Quality 40
     - 5.4 Public Services and Utilities 41
   - B. Significant Cumulative Impact which Remains Significant and Unavoidable 42
     - 5.5 Biological Resources 42

6. Alternatives 43
   - 6.1 No Project – No Build Alternative 44
   - 6.2 Base Zoning Alternative 45
   - 6.3 Planned Development Alternative 46
7. Statement of Overriding Considerations 47
8. Conclusion 48

1 INTRODUCTION

The Rancho Del Oro Estates Project (proposed project) is to be considered by the Placer County (County) as lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The environmental assessment contained in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) provides a thorough evaluation of significant and potentially significant effects on the environment that would occur as a result of proposed project development.

The State CEQA Guidelines state the following regarding approving a project in Public Resources Code, Section 21081:

> *No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless both of the following occur:*
>
> *(a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant effect:*
>
> *(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.*
>
> *(2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.*
>
> *(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.*
>
> *(b) With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.*

Because the EIR identified significant effects that would occur as a result of the project and in accordance with the provisions of the State CEQA Guidelines, the County hereby adopts these findings as part of the approval of the proposed project.

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project is located on 119.4 acres north of Olive Ranch Road, 0.25 miles east of Cavitt-Stallman Road, in Granite Bay, Placer County. The proposed project site is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 046-090-012. The proposed project includes the following entitlement approvals from Placer County:

- *Rezone* - The proposed project would require County approval of a change in zoning designations from RS-AG-B-100 PD 0.83 (Residential Single-Family, Combining Agricultural, Combining Minimum Building Site of 100,000 square feet, Planned Development Density Limitation of 0.83 units per acre) to RS-B-42 DL 0.83 (Residential Single-Family, Combining Minimum Building Site of 42,000 square feet, Density Limitation of 0.83 units per acre).

- *Tentative Subdivision Map* – The County must review and approve the proposed Tentative Subdivision Map.

Rezone

The GBCP designates the project site as Rural Low Density Residential (0.9 to 2.3 acres per unit), with a density limitation of 0.83 units per acre. The project site is currently zoned RS-AG-B-100 PD 0.83 (Residential Single-Family, Combining Agricultural, Combining Minimum Building Site of 100,000 square feet, Planned Development 0.83 units per acre). The current base zoning would allow up to 42 residential lots on the project site, and up to 63 residential lots if developed as a Planned Development. In order to enable the development of 89 single-family units on the project site, the proposed project would include a rezone of the property to RS-B-42 DL 0.83 (Residential Single-Family, Combining Minimum Building Site of 42,000 square feet, Density Limitation 0.83 units per acre). The Combining Agricultural and Planned Development districts would be removed. The resultant project density would be consistent with the site's current GBCP designation.

Vesting Tentative Map

The proposed Vesting Tentative Map would subdivide the parcel into 89 single-family residential lots. In addition, the proposed project would include the construction of internal roadways with two access points onto Olive Ranch Road, and infrastructure to connect to water delivery and sanitary sewer systems. The residential lots would be a minimum of 42,000 square feet each. In addition, the project site would include eight open space lots ranging in size from 5,748 square feet to 442,464 square feet, and one 22,142 square foot common lot (Lot G).

Off-site improvements include paving a portion of a 20-foot wide emergency response route along the existing private Shadow Oaks Lane. In addition, at the request of Placer County, the proposed project includes the construction and installation of Sewer Line "C," which would serve to replace the existing LS70 sewer pump facility located between Lots 25 and 26 of Lawrence Estates (west of the project site). Sewer Line "C" would connect to the proposed Rancho Del Oro Estates lift station on Common Lot "G." This would enable the sewage from six lots in the adjacent Lawrence Estates subdivision to gravity flow to the Rancho Del Oro Estates lift station via Sewer Line "C."

In addition, the following project objectives have been identified by the applicant:

1. Complete the land use planning of the western end of Olive Ranch Road in a manner consistent with the GBCP and compatible with adjacent development.

2. Create a very high-end subdivision of at least 89 residential lots consistent with, or surpassing, the quality and ambiance of Granite Bay's most prestigious neighborhoods.

3. Create an infill project composed of lots nearly one acre in size that minimizes grading activity to preserve natural resources on-site, to the extent feasible, while at the same time avoiding a sharp deviation from projected residential units in the Granite GBCP, with the resultant drop in school fees, traffic fees, and park fees that a sharp reduction in units would entail, compared to what is currently allowed under the GBCP.

3 PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The County issued a notice of preparation to prepare an EIR for the Rancho Del Oro Estates Project on September 25, 2008, and held a public scoping meeting for the Rancho Del Oro Estates Project on October 15, 2008. The County released a Draft EIR for public comment on December 8, 2009 held a public hearing on the Draft EIR on January 14, 2010, and received public comments on the Draft EIR through January 21, 2010. The County prepared responses to all significant environmental issues raised in public comments and published and released the Final EIR on May 21, 2010.

The County gave due notice of the public hearing to be held by the Planning Commission to consider and act upon the Final EIR for the project, and a public hearing was held before the Planning Commission on July 22, 2010. After closing the public hearing, the Planning Commission duly considered the Final EIR as prepared for the project (which includes the Draft EIR dated December 2009 and the Final EIR, dated May 2010), the comments of the public, both oral and written, and all written materials in the record connected therewith, certified the Final EIR.

On July 22, 2010, the County received an appeal from Mary Ann Stinson and Sandra Harris, on behalf of the Granite Bay Community Association, challenging the Planning Commission's approval of the rezone, vesting tentative subdivision map and certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report. (On July 27, 2010, the county received an appeal an appeal from the project applicant, Tsakopoulos Investments, of various aspects of the Planning Commission's decision to not approve the project as requested, but not challenging any aspect of the environmental document.) Pursuant to Placer County Code section 17.60.110(C)(3), upon the receipt of the appeal, the decision of the Planning Commission was set aside pending final action on the appeal by the Board of Supervisors.

Thereafter, the County gave due notice of a public hearing to be held by the Board of Supervisors to consider and act upon the appeal and the Final EIR for the project, and a public hearing was held before the Board of Supervisors on October 5, 2010. After closing the hearing to public comment, the Board of Supervisors, having considered the Final EIR as prepared for the project (which includes the Draft EIR dated December 2009 and the Final EIR, dated May 2010), the comments of the public, both oral and written, and all written materials in the record connected with the Draft and Final EIR, and the project, makes the following findings:

1. The foregoing statements of procedural history are correct and accurate.

2. The Final EIR has been prepared in accordance with all requirements of State CEQA Guidelines.

3. The Final EIR was presented to and reviewed by the Board of Supervisors. The Final EIR was prepared under the supervision of the County and reflects the independent judgment of the County. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed the Final EIR, and bases the findings stated below on such review and other substantial evidence in the record.

4. The Board of Supervisors finds that the Draft EIR considers a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives, sufficient to foster informed decision making, public participation and a reasoned choice. Thus, the alternatives analysis in the Draft EIR is sufficient to carry out the purposes of such analysis under State CEQA Guidelines.

5. The Board of Supervisors hereby certifies the Final EIR as complete, adequate and in full compliance with CEQA and as providing an adequate basis for considering and acting upon the Project Approval and makes the following specific findings with respect thereto.

6. The Board of Supervisors agrees with the characterization of the Draft EIR and Final EIR with respect to those impacts identified as "less-than-significant" and finds that those impacts have been described accurately and are less-than-significant as so described in the Draft EIR and Final EIR. This finding does not apply to impacts identified as significant or potentially significant that are reduced by mitigation measures to a level characterized in the Draft EIR and Final EIR as less-than-significant or impacts characterized in the Draft EIR and Final EIR as significant and unavoidable. Each of those impacts and the mitigation measures adopted to reduce them are dealt with specifically in the findings below.

7. The Board of Supervisors agrees with the characterization of the Draft EIR and Final EIR with respect to Impact 16-2, "Cumulative loss of biological resources in Placer County and the effects of ongoing urbanization in the region," which is identified as significant and unavoidable. Implementation of the

Mitigation Measures 5-1, 5-3(a), 5-3(b), 5-4, 5-5(a), 5-5(b), 5-6(a), 5-6(b), 5-6(c), 5-9(a), 5-9(b), 5-10(a), 5-10(b), and 5-10(c) would reduce the project-level impacts to biological resources to a less-than-significant level; however, the project's incremental effect would be cumulatively considerable and remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, feasible mitigation does not exist to fully reduce the cumulative biological resources impact to Placer County.

8. All mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR and Final EIR are adopted and incorporated into the Project.

9. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan ("MMRP") will apply to all mitigation measures adopted with respect to the Project pursuant to all of the project approvals and will be implemented.

10. The mitigation measures and the MMRP have been incorporated into the Conditions of Approval for the Vesting Tentative Map and have thus become part of and limitation upon the entitlement conferred by the Vesting Tentative Map and other project approvals.

11. The descriptions of the impacts in these findings are summary statements. Reference should be made to the Draft EIR and Final EIR for a more complete description.

12. The Community Development Resource Agency is directed to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk within five (5) working days in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21152(a) and CEQA Guidelines section 15094.

4 GENERAL FINDINGS

The Board of Supervisors has reviewed the Final EIR for the proposed project, consisting of the Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR, revised sections of the Draft EIR, and the MMRP. The Board of Supervisors has also considered the public record on the project. In addition to this Statement of Findings, the public record for the proposed project is composed of the following elements as well as the mandatory elements of a record set forth in Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e) (a full reference list is provided in Chapter 18 of the Draft EIR):

- Foothill Associates. *Biological Resources Assessment*. November 25, 2008.
- Foothill Associates. *Delineation of Waters of the United States*. October 24, 2006.
- Foothill Associates. *Memorandum Regarding 2005 Rancho Del Oro Biological Resources Assessment*. February 11, 2009.
- Foothill Associates. *Memorandum Regarding Special-Status Fish Species*. January 20, 2009.
- Foothill Associates. *Oak Woodland Analysis*. August 26, 2008.
- Genesis Society. *Archaeological Resources Inventory, Rancho Del Oro Development Project*. April 12, 2006.
- j.c. brennan & associates, Inc. Rancho *Del Oro Environmental Noise Assessment*. March 2009.
- Omni-Means, Ltd. *Rancho Del Oro Transportation Impact Analysis Report*. May 2009.
- Placer County. *General Plan Background Report*. August 16, 1994.

- Placer County. *Countywide General Plan EIR.* October 1993.
- Placer County. *Countywide General Plan Final EIR.* July 26, 1994.
- Placer County. *Countywide General Plan Policy Document.* August 16, 1994.
- Placer County. *Granite Bay Community Plan.* May 1989 (updated June 28, 2005).
- Placer County. *Granite Bay Community Plan Final EIR.* May 2004.
- Raney Planning and Management, Inc. *Rancho Del Oro Estates Draft Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse # 2008092101).* December 2009.
- Raney Planning and Management, Inc. *Rancho Del Oro Estates Final Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse # 2008092101).* May 2010.
- Windmiller, Ric, R.P.A. *Evaluation of Archaeological Sites CA-PLA-1870, CA-PLA-1871, and CA-PLA-1873, Rancho Del Oro Development.* March 2009.
- Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for Rancho Del Oro Estates.* March 2006.
- Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. *Phase II Soil Investigation.* April 2008.
- Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc. *Revised Geotechnical Engineering Study for Rancho Del Oro.* June 2006.

The Board of Supervisors has relied on all of the documents listed above in reaching its decision on the project, even if not every document was formally presented to the Planning Commission or County staff as part of the County files generated in connection with the project. Without exception, any documents set forth above not found in the project files fall into one of two categories. Many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions with which the Board of Supervisors was aware from the approval of the Granite Bay Community Plan (See *City of Santa Cruz v. Local Agency Formation Commission* (1978) 76 Cal.App.3d 381, 391-392; *Dominey v. Department of Personnel Administration* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 729, 738, fn. 6.) Other documents influenced the expert advice provided to County Staff or consultants, who then provided advice to the Board of Supervisors. For that reason, such documents form part of the underlying factual basis for the Board of Supervisors' decisions relating to the approval of the project. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21167.6, subd. (e)(10); *Browning-Ferris Industries v. City Council of City of San Jose* (1986) 181 Cal.App.3d 852, 866; *Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 153, 155.)

After reviewing the public record, as composed of the aforementioned elements, the Board of Supervisors hereby makes the following findings regarding the significant effects of the proposed project, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

Except as stated otherwise in certain cases below, the County agrees with the characterization in the Draft and Final EIR with respect to all impacts initially identified as "less than significant" and finds that those impacts have been described accurately and are less-than-significant as so described in the Draft and Final EIR. This finding applies to the following impacts:

4-1	**Compliance with the GBCP.**
4-2	**Compliance with the Placer County Zoning Ordinance.**
4-3	**Compatibility with existing adjacent land uses and resources.**
5-2	**Impacts to special-status fish species.**
5-7	**Impacts to western spadefoot.**
5-8	**Impacts to California horned lizard.**
5-11	**Impacts related to conflicts with local policies and ordinances.**
7-1	**Impacts to scenic vistas and scenic resources.**
7-2	**Impacts related to the existing visual character or quality of the site and surroundings.**
8-2	**Impacts to study intersections and roadways from the Existing Plus Project scenario.**
8-3	**Impacts related to Existing Plus Project Plus Bayside Church Expansion Plus the Grove at Granite Bay Project Conditions.**
8-4	**Impacts resulting from project-related cut-through traffic.**
8-5	**Impacts related to Modified Site Access.**
8-7	**Impacts to transit facilities.**
8-8	**Impacts related to emergency vehicle access.**
8-9	**Impacts to vehicular safety from design features or incompatible uses.**
8-10	**Impacts resulting from inadequate parking capacity.**
8-11	**Impacts to air traffic patterns.**
9-3	**Development of the project would result in increases in CO emissions.**
9-4	**Impacts related to long-term increases of criteria air pollutants.**
10-2	**Potential exposure of new noise-sensitive uses to existing transportation noise levels exceeding County standards.**
10-3	**Project-related impacts to existing sensitive receptors from increases in traffic noise levels.**
11-3	**Impacts related to seismic activity.**
13-3	**Adequate gas and electricity/cable/telephone services for the proposed project.**
13-5	**Adequate fire protection and emergency medical services available to new residents.**
13-6	**Adequate ratio of law enforcement personnel to residents.**

13-7 **Adequate library services available for new residents.**

14-1 **Impacts related to exposure to naturally occurring asbestos.**

14-2 **Impacts related to soil contamination.**

14-3 **Impact related to wildland fires.**

16-1 **Increases in the intensity of land uses in the region due to the proposed project and all other projects in Placer County.**

16-3 **Disturbance or destruction of previously unknown archaeological resources in combination with other development in Placer County.**

16-4 **Long-term impacts to the visual character of the region from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Granite Bay area.**

16-7 **Project impacts concerning the production of greenhouse gases.**

16-8 **Cumulative increase in project vicinity noise levels.**

16-9 **Long-term geologic and seismic impacts from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Granite Bay area.**

16-12 **Long-term hazards-related impacts from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Granite Bay area.**

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL THROUGH MITIGATION MEASURES

4.1 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO SPECIAL-STATUS PLANTS (IMPACT 5-1)

The wetlands on the project site provide suitable habitat for the following special-status plant species: Ahart's dwarf rush, Bogg's Lake hedge-hyssop, dwarf downingia, legenere, pincushion navarretia, and Sanford's arrowhead. Although impacts to wetland habitats are not anticipated as a result of implementation of the proposed project, the potential disturbance of these special-status plant species would be a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to special-status plant species.

5-1 *Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, focused surveys shall be performed in order to determine the presence or absence of the following special-status plant*

species: Ahart's dwarf rush, Bogg's Lake hedge-hyssop, dwarf downingia, legenere, pincushion navarretia, and/or Sanford's arrowhead. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the identification periods for all of the special-status plant species listed above. If any of the special-status plant species are found, a mitigation plan conceived from consultation with the appropriate agencies shall be prepared. The plan shall detail the various mitigation approaches to ensure no net loss of special-status plants. Mitigation could include, but would not be limited to, avoidance of the plant species, salvage of plant materials where possible, acquisition of credits at an approved mitigation bank, or acquisition and preservation of property that supports the plant species.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 5-1 (Impacts to special-status plants) to a less-than-significant level because focused surveys would be conducted prior to grading that would confirm or deny the presence of the identified potentially occurring special-status plant species. In addition, the mitigation measure provides performance standards for additional measures if any of the species are found during the surveys (including avoidance and/or preservation).

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO FRESHWATER INVERTEBRATES (IMPACT 5-3)

The depressional seasonal wetlands on the project site are potentially suitable habitat for some freshwater invertebrate species, including California linderiella, vernal pool fairy shrimp, and vernal pool tadpole shrimp. Although impacts to the depressional seasonal wetlands on-site are not anticipated, should project construction activities occur within 250 feet of the depressional seasonal wetlands, disturbance of the freshwater invertebrate species within these depressional seasonal wetlands could occur; therefore, a ***potentially significant*** impact would result.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to freshwater invertebrates.

5-3(a) *If impacts to invertebrate habitat cannot be avoided, prior to issuance of a grading permit, protocol-level surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine the presence or absence of freshwater invertebrate species, for the review and approval of the Planning Department. If the species are absent and USFWS accepts the survey findings, further mitigation is not necessary. If the species are present (or if the project applicant chooses to assume presence without conducting the surveys), the applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 5-3(b).*

5-3(b) *Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall coordinate with USFWS to determine appropriate invertebrate habitat mitigation for project impacts. Typically, the USFWS requires compensatory mitigation for impacts to these species at a 3:1 ratio (2:1 preservation and 1:1 creation). Mitigation could include, but would not be limited to, on-site or off-site preservation and creation*

of seasonal wetlands or purchase of seasonal wetland credits at a qualified mitigation bank.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 5-3 (Impacts to freshwater invertebrates) to a less-than-significant level because the measures require protocol-level surveys, and if said surveys confirm presence of freshwater invertebrates, preservation/creation shall be implemented pursuant to the USFWS guidance at the time.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO VALLEY ELDERBERRY LONGHORN BEETLE (IMPACT 5-4)

Elderberry shrubs exist on the project site. Implementation of the proposed project could result in the removal of some of the on-site elderberry shrubs. Because construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed project could impact elderberry shrubs on-site, thereby impacting the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, the project's impact would be ***potentially significant***.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to valley elderberry longhorn beetle.

5-4 *Prior to the initiation of any construction activities that could impact elderberry shrubs, ground disturbance activities shall be restricted by constructing a 100-foot buffer around any existing elderberry shrubs on-site. The 100-foot buffer shall include installation of protective fencing around existing elderberry shrubs. Should avoidance of one or more of the shrubs be infeasible, the applicant(s) shall consult with the USFWS to determine if authorization is needed to remove the elderberry shrubs.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 5-4 (Impacts to valley elderberry longhorn beetle) to a less-than-significant level because the measures require avoidance of elderberry shrubs first; however, if avoidance is not feasible in all circumstances, shrub removal shall only occur after consultation with USFWS.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO WESTERN BURROWING OWL (IMPACT 5-5)

According to the biological resources assessment prepared for the project, the large debris piles in the northern portion of the site provide suitable nesting habitat for burrowing owl, and the on-site grassland provides suitable foraging habitat. Therefore, although the potential for the western burrowing owl to occur on the site is low, impacts related to project implementation could be ***potentially significant***.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to western burrowing owl.

5-5(a) *Prior to issuance of a grading permit, pre-construction burrowing owl surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to initiation of construction activities on the project site and within 250 feet of the project site boundary. Presence or signs of burrowing owls and all potentially occupied burrows shall be recorded and monitored according to CDFG and California Burrowing Owl Consortium guidelines. If burrowing owls are not detected by sign or direct observation, further mitigation is not necessary. If burrowing owls are detected, the project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 5-5(b).*

5-5(b) *Prior to initiation of any construction activities, a 250-foot buffer zone shall be established around each burrow with an active nest until the young have fledged and are able to exit the burrow. In the case of occupied burrows without active nesting, active burrows after the young have fledged, or if development commences after the breeding season (February 1 to August 31), passive relocation, which involves installing a one-way door at the burrow entrance to encourage the owls to move from the occupied burrow, shall be performed by a qualified biologist. The CDFG shall be consulted for current guidelines and methods for passive relocation of any owls found on the site.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 5-5 (Impacts to western burrowing owl) to a less-than-significant level because a pre-construction survey would be conducted prior to grading that would confirm or deny the presence of burrowing owls. In addition, the mitigation measures provide performance standards for relocation if any of the species are found during the survey.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO RAPTORS AND MIGRATORY BIRDS (IMPACT 5-6)

Species of raptors, including the red-shouldered hawk, the red-tailed hawk, and the white-tailed kite, that were observed during reconnaissance surveys have the potential to nest within the mixed oak woodland habitat on-site. In addition, the trees, shrubs, and grasslands on the site provide suitable nesting habitat for a number of common and special-status birds protected solely by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Therefore, the project's impacts to raptors and migratory birds would be ***potentially significant***.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to raptors and migratory birds.

5-6(a) *Prior to issuance of a grading permit, if construction is expected to occur during the raptor nesting season (February 1 to August 31), a pre-construction raptor survey shall be performed to determine if active raptor nests are present on-site.*

The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist not more than 30 days prior to the onset of construction activities. If active raptor nests are not found on or within 500 feet of the project site, further mitigation is not necessary. In addition, if construction activities are proposed to occur during the non-breeding season (September 1 to January 31), a survey is not required and further studies are not necessary. However, if active raptor nests are found on or within 500 feet of the site, the project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 5-6(b).

5-6(b) *During construction, construction activities shall not occur within 500 feet of the active raptor nests until the young have fledged or until the biologist has determined that the nest is not active any longer.*

5-6(c) *Prior to issuance of a grading permit, if any vegetation removal is expected to occur as a result of the project during the typical avian nesting season (February 1 to August 31), a pre-construction survey shall be performed to determine if active migratory bird nests are present on-site. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist not more than two weeks prior to the onset of vegetation removal. If active migratory bird nests are found on-site, disturbance or removal of the nest shall be avoided until the young have fledged and the nest is not active any longer.*

It should be noted that extensive buffers, such as those recommended for nesting raptors, are not necessary for nesting avian species protected solely by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. However, depending on the bird species, site conditions, and the proposed construction activities near an active nest, a small buffer could be prescribed, as determined by the biologist. Alternatively, vegetation removal could be scheduled to avoid all potential impacts. Vegetation removal conducted between September 1 and January 31 will prevent impacts to nesting birds and unfledged young

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 5-6 (Impacts to raptors and migratory birds) to a less-than-significant level because pre-construction surveys would be conducted prior to grading that would confirm or deny the presence of the identified potentially occurring raptor and migratory bird species. In addition, the mitigation measures provide performance standards for avoidance of nests via buffers.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO OAK WOODLAND COMMUNITIES AND SIGNIFICANT TREES (IMPACT 5-9)

Based on the Placer County-approved criteria for the proposed project site, a total of 378 on-site oak trees qualify as significant trees. Only one off-site tree, located along the northern end of the western property line, meets the site's significant tree criteria. Implementation of the proposed project would directly impact a total of 17.55 acres of oak woodland. Indirect impacts to significant trees within 50 feet of subdivision improvements are expected to be avoided or minimal. Because the proposed project would result in direct and indirect impacts to oak woodland on-site, impacts would be ***potentially significant***.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to oak woodland communities and significant trees.

5-9(a) *To mitigate oak woodland losses within the development footprint and to account for habitat fragmentation, the project applicant shall make an in-lieu payment to the County consisting of two separate components, one for the higher value blue oak woodland (37.34 acres), and one lower per-acre payment for the poor quality live oak woodland (40.24 acres) on the project site, along with the very small amounts of valley oak woodland (0.06 acres) and mixed oak woodland (1.27 acres). The payment shall be equivalent to the fair market value of a conservation easement on oak woodland property in Placer County, with such fair market value established at the time of approval of the tentative subdivision map for the project. The in-lieu payment shall be paid at the time set forth below. The funds will include both a conservation component and an in perpetuity management component. These funds will be used by the County to purchase conservation easements to other in-kind oak woodlands in the County.*

5-9(b) *Each "significant" oak tree (24 inches dbh or greater) identified for removal shall be replaced in the following manner:*

1) Subdivision Improvements. For the 69 significant oak trees to be removed because of subdivision improvements, the project shall include planting of on-site 24-inch boxes and 15-gallon trees (cumulatively 25 percent), 5-gallon trees (25 percent), and D-pots (50 percent) at the ratios outlined in Table 5-2.

Table 5-2
Proposed Significant Oak Tree Mitigation Ratios

Condition	Replacement Value/Inch of Impact	Percent of Total Mitigation
24-inch box	1/3	25% Cumulative
15-gallon	1/2	
5-gallon	2/1	25%
D-pot	5/1	50%

Mitigation tree planting shall occur in two open space areas specified on the project site. These planting areas on-site, once planted with replacement oak trees, will also serve as replacement habitat for oak woodland values lost on the project site. Mitigation tree planting shall be installed by the applicant and inspected and approved by the DRC prior to acceptance of improvements by the Engineering and Surveying Department. At its discretion, the DRC may establish an alternate deadline for installation of mitigation replacement trees if weather or other circumstances prevent the completion of this requirement.

2) Lot Development. A total of 2,131 inches of significant oak trees could be potentially impacted by lot development in the project within building lot setbacks on individual lots. Although the actual inches of oak tree

impact from lot development may be substantially less than this total of impacted inches, all 2,131 inches of significant oak trees will be assumed removed for mitigation purposes, at $100.00 per inch at breast height, for a total mitigation of $213,100 for impacts to significant oak trees in individual lots.

Total in-lieu payments (less the amount set forth below) for oak tree mitigation, for both oak woodland impacts and impacts to significant oak trees not mitigated on-site (i.e., for subdivision improvement impacts) shall be totaled and divided by the number of total residential lots in the project, and paid on a per lot basis at building permit issuance for each lot. Each lot will thus pay a fair share of costs of oak tree and oak woodland mitigation costs distributed over the entire project site, except for the in-lieu payment for direct impacts to oak woodland acreage affected by subdivision improvements, or 5.27 acres, which will be paid in lump sum at the time of approval of improvement plans for the project.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 5-9 (Impacts to oak woodland communities and significant trees) to a less-than-significant level because the measures are consistent with the County's approach to oak woodland mitigation and require in-lieu payments and replacement accordingly.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO JURISDICTIONAL WETLANDS OR OTHER WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES (IMPACT 5-10)

The current Tentative Map for the project indicates that of the 3.55 acres of jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the United States on-site, 1.67 acres of the jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. could be impacted by the proposed project, including the following: 0.18-acre of depressional seasonal wetland; 0.07-acre of depressional seasonal marsh; 1.13 acres of riverine seasonal wetland; 0.08-acre of riparian wetland; 0.18-acre of riverine perennial marsh; 0.03-acre of pond; and less than 0.001-acre of ephemeral drainage. Because the project could impact 1.67 acres of jurisdictional wetlands and would include the off-site construction of sewer infrastructure near Miners Ravine, ***potentially significant*** impacts would occur.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to jurisdictional wetlands or other waters of the United States.

5-10(a) *To the extent feasible, the project shall be designed and constructed to avoid and minimize adverse effects to waters of the United States or jurisdictional waters of the State of California within the project area.*

5-10(b) *Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the project site, a Section 404 permit for fill of jurisdictional wetlands shall be acquired, and mitigation for impacts to jurisdictional waters that cannot be avoided shall conform with the USACE "no-net-loss" policy and the USACE Regulatory Guidance Letter No. 02-2 establishing policies and guidance on appropriate mitigation for impacts to*

jurisdictional waters. Mitigation for impacts to both federal and State jurisdictional waters shall be addressed using these guidelines.

If a Section 404 permit is obtained, the applicant must also obtain a water quality certification from the RWQCB under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA).

5-10(c) *Prior to the issuance of a grading permit that would affect any stream crossing, or bed, bank or associated riparian vegetation of the riverine perennial marsh, riverine riparian wetland, or Miners Ravine, a Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be entered into by the applicant, for the review and approval of the CDFG.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 5-10 (Impacts Impacts to jurisdictional wetlands or other waters of the United States) to a less-than-significant level because the measures require avoidance and applicable permitting with USACE, RWQCB, and CDFG.

4.2 CULTURAL RESOURCES

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT MAY DIRECTLY IMPACT A PORTION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE CA-PLA-1870 (RDO#1) BY ROAD CONSTRUCTION, GRADING AND TRENCHING, AND MAY DIRECTLY IMPACT A PORTION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE CA-PLA-1871 (RDO#2A) BY GRADING AND TRENCHING (IMPACT 6-1)

The results of the test excavations show that these sites (RDO#1 and RDO#2) can yield information relevant to the chronology, subsistence/technology, settlement patterning and perhaps ethnicity/boundaries research domains. However, integrity of the archaeological site has been severely compromised by historic and modern ground disturbance, as well as by small burrowing animals. According to the Windmiller study, with these considerations in mind, the site would still be eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 4 and the NRHP under Criterion D for its information potential–even though that potential is limited. Implementation of the proposed project would directly impact a portion of sites RDO#1 and RDO#2a due to road construction, grading, and trenching. Therefore the project's impact would be ***potentially significant***.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to archaeological site CA-PLA-1870 (RDO#1) and archaeological site CA-PLA-1871 (RDO#2a).

6-1 *If any portion of archaeological site CA-PLA-1870 (RDO#1) and/or CA-PLA-1871 (RDO#2a) will be directly impacted by grading and trenching, and avoidance is not feasible, then a data recovery plan shall be prepared for each affected site by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric archaeology. Each data recovery plan must consider the results and recommendations in the Evaluation of Archaeological Sites CA-PLA-1870, CA-PLA-1871 & CA-PLA-1873, Rancho*

Del Oro Development, Placer County, California, which was prepared for the project in March 2009. Each data recovery plan shall be adopted by the County and all proposed field work outlined in the plan, including changes in field work strategy deemed necessary by the archaeologist due to the changing nature of discoveries, must be completed prior to any ground-disturbing activity within 25 feet of each respective archaeological site. Analysis of the finds and preparation of a final data recovery technical report for each site must meet current professional standards.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 6-1 (Implementation of the proposed project may directly impact a portion of archaeological site CA-PLA-1870 [RDO#1] by road construction, grading and trenching, and may directly impact a portion of archaeological site CA-PLA-1871 [RDO#2a] by grading and trenching) to a less-than-significant level because if avoidance is not feasible, the measure requires development of a data recovery plan.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT MAY DIRECTLY IMPACT ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE RDO#2b BY GROUND-DISTURBING ACTIVITY (IMPACT 6-2)

The results of the test excavations show that the site can yield information relevant to the chronology, subsistence/technology, settlement patterning and perhaps ethnicity/boundaries research domains. Integrity of the archaeological site has been compromised by small burrowing animals. Nonetheless, according to the Windmiller study, the site is eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 4 and the NRHP under Criterion D for the site's information potential, although the potential is limited due to size, the sparseness of artifacts, and potential disturbance from Gold Rush and later placer mining. Because site RDO#2b is eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 4 due to the site's potential to yield information important in history or prehistory, the project's impact would be ***potentially significant.***

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to archaeological site RDO#2b.

6-2 *If any portion of archaeological site RDO#2b will be directly impacted by ground disturbing activity including filling, and avoidance by direct burial of the site is not feasible, then the surface of the site's cultural deposit shall be first covered with chain link fencing placed flat on the ground surface and then covered with soil that is chemically compatible with the cultural deposit. An archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric archaeology shall monitor on-site placement of the chain link fencing and burial of the archaeological site. If direct burial of the site or other means of avoidance is not feasible, then the archaeologist must prepare a data recovery plan. The data recovery plan must be adopted by the County and all proposed field work outlined in the plan, including necessary changes in the field work strategy as work progresses, must be completed prior to any ground-disturbing activity within 25 feet of the*

archaeological site. Analysis of the finds and preparation of a final data recovery technical report for the site must meet current professional standards.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 6-2 (Implementation of the proposed project may directly impact archaeological site RDO#2b by ground-disturbing activity) to a less-than-significant level because if avoidance is not feasible, the measure requires development of a data recovery plan.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT MAY INDIRECTLY IMPACT PORTIONS OF THOSE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES ELIGIBLE FOR THE CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES AND LOCATED WITHIN THE OPEN SPACE (IMPACT 6-3)

The proximity of planned residential development in close proximity to sites RDO#1, RDO#2a, and RDO#2b may increase the potential for vandalism. Therefore, portions of the archaeological sites located within the open space area that are eligible for the CRHR would be subject to ***potentially significant*** indirect impacts.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to portions of those archaeological sites eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources and located within the open space.

6-3 *The covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs) for the project shall include a prohibition against any excavation or collecting of artifacts within the open space.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 6-3 (Implementation of the proposed project may indirectly impact portions of those archaeological sites eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources and located within the open space) to a less-than-significant level because the measure requires the prohibition of activities that would impact the sites within the proposed open space areas.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: DISTURBANCE OR DESTRUCTION OF PREVIOUSLY UNKNOWN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES WITHIN THE VICINITY OF THE PROJECT SITE. (IMPACT 6-4)

Given the existence of archaeological resources on the project site, as well as the proximity of the site to Miners Ravine, the possibility exists that previously unknown resources could be discovered near the project site. The proposed project would include construction of an off-site sewer improvement, Sewer Line "C," located between Lots 25 and 26, which are adjacent to a portion of Miners Ravine. Therefore, construction activities associated with buildout of the proposed project's infrastructure could uncover undocumented cultural resources. Should areas containing evidence of prehistoric or historic period activity, such as buried hearths, areas of discolored sediment containing shell, broken fragments of silicate rock, bone, or concentrations of historic period (greater than 45 years old) refuse or features be uncovered, a ***potentially significant*** impact could result from project implementation.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources within the vicinity of the project site.

6-4 *Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor excavation activities associated with the proposed project. The monitor shall be approved by the Placer County Planning Department. Monitoring shall consist of directly watching the major excavation process. Monitoring shall occur during the entire work day, and shall continue on a daily basis until a depth of excavation has been reached at which resources could not occur. This depth is estimated as usually about five feet below grade at the beginning of the project, but may require modification in specific cases, and shall be determined by the monitoring archaeologist based on observed soil conditions. Spot checks shall consist of partial monitoring of the progress of excavation over the course of the project. During spot checks, all spoils material, open excavations, recently grubbed areas, and other soil disturbances shall be inspected to determine if cultural materials are present. The frequency and duration of spot checks shall be based on the relative sensitivity of the exposed soils and active work areas. The monitoring archaeologist shall determine the relative sensitivity of the parcel. If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area.*

Equipment stoppages shall only involve those pieces of equipment that have actually encountered significant or potentially significant deposits, and should not be construed to mean a stoppage of all equipment on the site unless the cultural deposit covers the entire building site. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s). If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect shall be provided on the Improvement Plans for the project. Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 6-4 (Disturbance or destruction of previously unknown archaeological resources within the vicinity of the project site) to a less-than-significant level because the measure requires monitoring during construction and proper protection for any artifacts found.

4.3 VISUAL RESOURCES

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH NEW SOURCES OF LIGHT AND GLARE (IMPACT 7-3)

Development of the proposed project would create new sources of light and glare. The introduction of building and street lighting in any currently undeveloped area would alter existing unlit conditions in those areas. Night lighting associated with residential development would be visible to neighboring properties that would be considered sensitive receptors to the new sources of light and glare. Although the proposed project site is designated for residential development, the proposed project includes a rezone to increase the allowable density. Therefore, the project would introduce new sources of light and glare and a ***potentially significant*** impact would occur.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to new sources of light and glare.

7-3 *Prior to the issuance of building permits, the developer shall submit a lighting plan for the review and approval of the Placer County Building Official. The lighting plan shall include shielding on all light fixtures and shall address limiting light trespass and glare through the use of shielding and directional lighting methods, including but not limited to, fixture location and height. The lighting plan shall comply with the Placer County Design Guidelines for lighting, including, but not limited to, the following:*

- *Maximum height for building and freestanding lighting should not exceed 14 feet.*
- *If property is adjacent to a residential area or residentially zoned property, the lighting should not interfere with these areas.*
- *Lighting shall be directed away from adjacent roadways and shall not interfere with traffic or create a traffic hazard.*
- *Upward lighting shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 7-3 (Impacts associated with new sources of light and glare) to a less-than-significant level because the lighting plan would comply with the Placer County Design Guidelines for lighting, and therefore require measures such as directing light away from adjacent roadways and residential areas.

4.4 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO TRAFFIC FLOW FROM CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC ASSOCIATED WITH DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT SITE (IMPACT 8-1)

Trips to the site during construction would be necessary for delivery of materials and hauling of import fill materials and soils during project construction. On-site staging areas would be established to minimize heavy

equipment trips on the surrounding roadways. However, the project sponsor has not provided information detailing the amount of construction traffic that would access the site during construction and excess construction traffic could create traffic impacts on the surrounding roadway network. Therefore, a ***potentially significant*** impact would result.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to traffic flow from construction traffic associated with development of the project site.

8-1 *In conjunction with submittal of Improvement Plans, a striping and signing plan shall be submitted. The striping and signing plan shall include all on- and off-site traffic control devices and shall be reviewed by the County Traffic Engineer. A construction signing plan shall also be provided with the Improvement Plans for review and approval by the County Traffic Engineer.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 8-1 (Impacts to traffic flow from construction traffic associated with development of the project site) to a less-than-significant level because the County Traffic Engineer will review the traffic control devices and construction signing plan to ensure safe flow of traffic during construction.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES (IMPACT 8-6)

Per requirements of the PCGP and the GBCP, the proposed project would include the construction of a new pathway along the north side of Olive Ranch Road for pedestrian access. The proposed pathway would be used for pedestrian traffic throughout the immediate vicinity of the project site. The project would include the construction of improvements to widen Olive Ranch Road to its ultimate County-required width of 40 feet of pavement. This road section, as shown on the Tentative Map for the project, includes a 4-foot Class II bike lane. Existing and future bicycle traffic in the vicinity of the project site would continue to utilize neighborhood roadways and sidewalks until reaching connection points to the existing bikeways. The proposed project would not create barriers or hazards to bicyclists or pedestrians, nor would the project result in conflicts with the adopted circulation policies pertaining to bicycle and pedestrian access. The introduction of a new pathway along Olive Ranch Road is considered to be a beneficial impact to the project vicinity. However, the pathway design would need to meet the standards of the Americans with Disabilities Association (ADA) and any applicable GBCP standards. Therefore, the potential impacts related to on-site and off-site bicycle and pedestrian facilities are considered ***potentially significant***.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to on-site and off-site bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

8-6 *Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, the project applicant shall ensure that the pathway and sidewalk network meets ADA accessibility requirements, subject to review and approval of the Improvement Plans by the Engineering and Surveying Department.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 8-1 (Impacts to traffic flow from construction traffic associated with development of the project site) to a less-than-significant level because the County Engineering and Surveying Department will review the Improvement Plans for pathway design compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Association (ADA) and any applicable GBCP standards.

4.5 AIR QUALITY

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS RELATED TO FUGITIVE PARTICULATE MATTER EMISSIONS FROM PROJECT-ASSOCIATED CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES (IMPACT 9-1).

Maximum construction emissions would occur during the first phases of construction when clearing, earthmoving, and grading occur. Particulate Matter (PM_{10}) emissions generated by the project (up to 602.56 pounds per day) would exceed the PCAPCD thresholds (82 pounds per day) without mitigation. In addition, particulate matter emitted during construction activities would occur near existing residences, thereby possibly causing a nuisance. Because the proposed project would exceed the PCAPCD threshold established for PM_{10} emissions, a ***potentially significant*** impact would occur.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts from fugitive particulate matter emissions from project-associated construction activities.

9-1(a) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan to the Placer County APCD. This plan must address the minimum Administrative Requirements found in section 300 and 400 of APCD Rule 228, Fugitive Dust. The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving APCD approval of the Construction Emission I Dust Control Plan.*

9-1(b) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The prime contractor shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (i.e. make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower of greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. The inventory shall be updated, beginning 30 days after any initial work on site has begun, and shall be submitted on a monthly basis throughout the*

duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. At least three business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the property owner, project manager, and on-site foreman.

9-1(c) *Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall provide a plan to the Placer County APCD for approval by the District demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NO_X reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, aftertreatment products, and/or other options as they become available.*

9-1(d) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The contractor shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust exceeds Placer County APCD Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust) limitations. The prime contractor shall be responsible for having an individual who is CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE). This individual shall evaluate compliance with Rule 228 on a weekly basis. It is to be noted that fugitive dust is not to exceed 40 percent opacity and not go beyond property boundary at any time. If lime or other drying agents are utilized to dry out wet grading areas they shall be controlled as to not to exceed Placer County APCD Rule 228 Fugitive Dust limitations.*

9-1(e) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, an enforcement plan shall be established, and submitted to the APCD for review, in order to weekly evaluate project-related on- and off-road heavy-duty vehicle engine emission opacities, using standards as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2180-2194. An Environmental Coordinator, CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE), shall routinely evaluate project-related off-road and heavy duty on-road equipment emissions for compliance with this requirement. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits will be notified and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours.*

9-1(f) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The prime contractor shall suspend all grading operations when wind speeds (including instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour and dust is impacting adjacent properties.*

9-1(g) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed District Rule 202 Visible Emission limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits are to be immediately notified to cease operations and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. Additional information regarding Rule 202 can be found at: http://www.placer.ca.gov/Deuartments/Air/Rule.*

9-1(h) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: During construction, no open burning of removed vegetation shall be allowed. All removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on site or taken to an appropriate disposal site.*

9-1(i) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The prime contractor shall be responsible for keeping adjacent public thoroughfares clean of silt, dirt, mud, and debris, and shall "wet broom" if silt, dirt, mud or debris is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares. Dry mechanical sweeping is prohibited.*

9-1(j) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: During construction, traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less.*

9-1(k) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The contractor shall apply water to control dust, as required by Rule 228, Fugitive Dust, to prevent dust impacts offsite. Operational water truck(s) shall be onsite, at all times, to control fugitive dust. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site.*

9-1(l) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel powered equipment.*

9-1(m) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The contractor shall use CARB ultra low diesel fuel for all diesel-powered equipment. In addition, low sulfur fuel shall be utilized for all stationary equipment.*

9-1(n) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: The contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary power generators.*

9-1(o) *Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall include the following standard note on the Improvement Plans: All on-site stationary equipment which is classified as 50 hp or greater shall either obtain a State-issued portable equipment permit or a Placer County APCD issued portable equipment permit.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 9-1 (Impacts related to fugitive particulate matter emissions from project-associated construction activities) to a less-than-significant level because implementation of the measures would reduce emissions of PM_{10} to approximately 66.8 pounds per day, which is below the PCAPCD threshold of 82 pounds per day.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS RELATED TO A TEMPORARY INCREASE IN NO_X EMISSIONS (IMPACT 9-2).

The construction and development of the proposed land uses would result in the temporary generation of emissions resulting from vehicles associated with site grading and excavation, road paving, building construction, worker trips, and the movement of construction equipment. Vehicles and equipment associated with the construction of the proposed project would emit up to 101.26 pounds per day of NO_X. Therefore, construction emissions associated with buildout of the project would exceed the PCAPCD threshold of 82 pounds per day for NO_X. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would result in a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts related to a temporary increase in NO_X emissions.

9-2 *During construction, the project contractor shall use only low-VOC architectural coatings and asphalt in compliance with PCAPCD Rules and Regulations, for review by the County Building Official.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 9-2 (Impacts related to a temporary increase in NO_X emissions) to a less-than-significant level because implementation of the measure would reduce emissions of NO_X emissions to approximately 74.83 pounds per day, which is below the PCAPCD threshold of 82 pounds per day.

4.6 NOISE

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: CONSTRUCTION NOISE IMPACTS TO NEARBY SENSITIVE RECEPTORS (IMPACT 10-1).

Activities associated with the construction of the proposed project would result in elevated noise levels in the immediate project vicinity, with maximum noise levels ranging from 76 to 90 dB at 50 feet. Construction activities would be temporary in nature and are anticipated during normal daytime working hours. Nonetheless, because construction activities would result in periods of elevated noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors, the development of the proposed project could result in an adverse impact with regard to construction noise. In addition, noise would be generated by increased truck traffic on area roadways during the construction phase. Although exempt, construction activities associated with the development of the proposed project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels to the adjacent properties and are considered a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's construction impacts to nearby sensitive receptors.

10-1(a) *Construction activities shall comply with the Placer County Noise Ordinance.*

10-1(b) *Fixed construction equipment, which may include, but not be limited to, compressors and generators, shall be located as far away from sensitive receptors, as feasible. In addition, impact tools shall be shielded or shrouded. Intake and exhaust ports of powered construction equipment shall also be muffled or shielded.*

10-1(c) *A disturbance coordinator shall be appointed for the project site who would receive any public noise-related complaints about construction equipment and practices. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for determining the cause of the complaint(s) and the implementation of any feasible measures to alleviate the complaint(s). The disturbance coordinator's contact information shall be posted throughout the site and adjacent public spaces.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 10-1 (Construction noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors) to a less-than-significant level because the construction activities would comply with the County Noise Ordinance and a disturbance coordinator would alleviate any complaints received.

4.7 SOILS, GEOLOGY, AND SEISMICITY

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: LOSS OF STRUCTURAL SUPPORT DUE TO LIQUEFACTION (IMPACT 11-1).

On-site test pits encountered saturated sands which have a high liquefaction potential. The site is suitable for the proposed development, provided the concerns regarding liquefiable soils and possible loose soils in previously filled areas are addressed by implementation of recommended mitigation measures. As a result, without implementation of the geotechnical investigation recommendations, a ***potentially significant*** impact would result.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts associated with liquefaction.

11-1(a) *The preliminary geotechnical engineering study performed by Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc., dated June 2006, indicated the presence of loose, saturated surface soils or other soil problems which, if not corrected, would lead to structural defects. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall submit for review and approval by the Engineering and Surveying Department a soil investigation of each non-pad graded lot in the subdivision produced by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer (Section 17953-17955 California Health and Safety Code).*

In addition, prior to Final Acceptance of project improvements or consideration of early building permits, and after the completion of pad grading for Lots 8-11, 34, 36, 42, 52, 53, 55, 69, 71, 72, 75, 78, 81, 82, 86, and 89, as well as Lot G, the applicant shall submit for review and approval by the Engineering and Surveying Department a soil investigation of each pad-graded lot produced by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer (Section 17953-17955 California Health and Safety Code). The soil investigations shall include recommended corrective action that is likely to prevent structural damage to each proposed dwelling. The applicant shall include in the Development Notebook or modify the Development Notebook to include the soil problems encountered on each specific lot, as well as the recommended corrective actions. A note that indicates the requirements of this condition shall be included on the Improvement Plans, CC&Rs, and the Informational Sheet filed with the Final Map(s). Once approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department, two copies of the final soil investigations for each lot shall be provided to the Engineering and Surveying Department and one copy to the Building Department for their use.

11-1(b) *The applicant shall submit for review and approval by the Engineering and Surveying Department a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:*

- *Road, pavement, and parking area design*
- *Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable)*
- *Grading practices*
- *Erosion/winterization*
- *Special problems discovered on-site, (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.)*
- *Slope stability*

Once approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the Engineering and Surveying Department and one copy to the Building Department for their use. If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems which, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the soils report will be required for subdivisions, prior to issuance of Building Permits. This certification may be completed on a Lot by Lot basis or on a Tract basis. This shall be so noted in the CC&Rs and on the Informational Sheet filed with the Final Map(s). It is the responsibility of the developer to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report.

11-1(c) *The project applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications, and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Department for review and approval. The plans shall show all conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall*

pay plan check and inspection fees. (NOTE: Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction costs shall be paid). The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or DRC review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.

11-1(d) *All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the DRC. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Department concurs with said recommendation.*

The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. 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. Erosion control shall be provided for where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department.

The applicant shall submit to the Engineering and Surveying Department a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110 percent of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.

If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the Design Review Committee/Engineering and Surveying Department for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the Design Review Committee/Engineering and Surveying Department to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.

11-1(e) *Any proposed subdivision grading beyond that necessary for construction of streets, utilities, and drainage improvements (i.e., mass grading, residential pad grading) must be approved by the Design Review Committee prior to approval of project Improvement Plans. The intent of this condition is to allow detailed Design Review Committee review of lot or contour grading impacts, and to ensure that grading activities do not exceed those indicated on the preliminary grading plan for this project. Grading plans, of a suitable scale and providing specific engineering detail, including limits of grading, identification of trees, existing and proposed contours, drainage patterns, etc., shall be prepared and submitted for Design Review Committee review. If grading, beyond that indicated on the preliminary grading plan, and/or environmental documents is proposed with subdivision construction, the matter shall be referred back to the Planning Commission for consideration.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 11-1 (Loss of structural support due to liquefaction) to a less-than-significant level because the County would review and approve all future grading plans to ensure compliance with the performance standards required for inclusion in the geotechnical engineering report and mitigation measures.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: STRUCTURAL DAMAGE FROM POTENTIALLY EXPANSIVE SOILS (IMPACT 11-2).

The site consists of non-plastic soils, which are relatively non-expansive. Special design considerations regarding expansive soils would not be required with implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in the Geotechnical Engineering Study prepared for the project. As a result, without implementation of the geotechnical investigation recommendations, a ***potentially significant*** impact would result.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impact associated with structural damage from potentially expansive soils.

11-2 *Implement Mitigation Measures 11-1(a), 11-1(b), and 11-1(e).*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 11-2 (Structural damage from potentially expansive soils) to a less-than-significant level because the County would review and approve all future grading plans to ensure compliance with the performance standards required for inclusion in the geotechnical engineering report and mitigation measures.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: CONSTRUCTION-RELATED INCREASES IN SOIL EROSION (IMPACT 11-4).

Grading activities in general on the proposed project site would result in the disturbance and relocation of topsoils, rendering earth surfaces susceptible to erosion from wind and water. Soil erosion, or the loss of topsoil, resulting from grading and excavation of the project site would be considered a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts on construction-related increases in soil erosion.

11-4(a) *The project's ground disturbance exceeds one acre; therefore, the project is subject to the construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. The applicant shall obtain such permit from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board and shall provide to the Engineering and Surveying Department evidence of a state-issued WDID number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.*

11-4(b) *Water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department).*

Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to, the following: Fiber Rolls (SE-5), Hydroseeding (EC-4), Stabilized Construction Entrance (LDM Plate C-4), Storm Drain Inlet Protection (SE-10), Silt Fence (SE-1), revegetation techniques, gravel bags, diversion swales, dust control measures, limiting the soil disturbance, and concrete washout areas.

11-4(c) *Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified on the Improvement Plans and located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.*

11-4(d) *In order to protect site resources, grading activities of any kind shall not take place within the 100-year floodplain of Miners Ravine unless otherwise approved as a part of this project.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 11-4 (Construction-related increases in soil erosion) to a less-than-significant level because an NPDES permit would be obtained and required BMPs would be implemented during construction.

4.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: PROJECT IMPACTS TO THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN AND SURFACE RUNOFF (IMPACT 12-1).

Based on the results of the preliminary drainage report, it was determined that the proposed project including the on-site detention basin would slightly decrease peak flows for Swale A during the 100-year storm event, when compared to the peak flows of both the on- and off-site drainage of Swale A under existing conditions. It should be noted that the preliminary drainage report also includes an analysis of the project's impacts on runoff

within the main stem of Miners Ravine. This analysis determined that the project would have an insignificant impact on peak flow runoff within the main stem of Miners Ravine; therefore, on-site stormwater detention is only recommended for the portion of the project site that drains to Swale A. However, the proposed project does not currently include specific construction plans or an approved, final drainage report for the development; therefore, project implementation could result in ***potentially significant*** impacts to the existing drainage pattern and surface runoff.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to the existing drainage pattern and surface runoff.

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

12-1(b) *Drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting runoff on individual lots, shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and shall be in compliance with applicable stormwater quality standards, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). These facilities shall be constructed with subdivision improvements and easements provided as required by the ESD. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the Homeowners' Association.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 12-1 (Project impacts to the existing drainage pattern and surface runoff) to a less-than-significant level because ESD will review and approve a final drainage report for the project and site-specific BMPs would be implemented.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: CONSTRUCTION-RELATED IMPACTS TO SURFACE WATER QUALITY (IMPACT 12-2).

The proposed project would involve the construction of 89 single-family residential units on a single parcel located just north of Olive Ranch Road. Development activities would include, but not be limited to, new

roadways, bridges, homes, a stormwater detention basin, parking areas, open spaces, and drainage infrastructure, all of which would require grading, excavation, and other construction activities that could cause soil erosion at an accelerated rate during storm events. All such activities have the potential to affect water quality by contributing to localized violations of water quality standards if stormwater runoff from construction activities enters receiving waters. Therefore, as the proposed project could potentially result in short-term impacts to surface water quality, this is considered to be a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's construction impacts surface water quality.

12-2(a) *Implement Mitigation Measure 12-1(a).*

12-2(b) *Water quality BMPs shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD).*

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

All BMPs shall be maintained as required to ensure effectiveness. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 12-2 (Construction-related impacts to surface water quality) to a less-than-significant level because the proper sizing of water quality facilities would be ensured, an NPDES permit would be obtained and required BMPs would be implemented during construction, and the drainage of each individual lot would be reviewed by ESD.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: OPERATIONAL WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION ASSOCIATED WITH URBAN RUNOFF FROM THE PROJECT SITE (IMPACT 12-3).

On-site water quality protection measures included to assist with capturing potential operational pollutants include an on-site water quality pond, four water quality trenches, and three water quality units to be constructed on-site. As the final sizing specifications for the water quality trenches and water quality units have not yet been specified, operational pollutants could enter local waterways during project implementation, which is a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to operational water quality degradation associated with urban runoff from the project site.

12-3(a) *Implement Mitigation Measures 12-1(a) and 12-2(b).*

12-3(b) *This project is located within the area covered by Placer County's municipal stormwater quality permit, pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II program. Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said permit. BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff in accordance with "Attachment 4" of Placer County's NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (State Water Resources Control Board NPDES General Permit No. CAS000004).*

12-3(c) *All storm drain inlets and catch basins within the project area shall be permanently marked/embossed with prohibitive language such as "No Dumping! Flows to Creek" or other language as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping. Message details, placement, and locations shall be included on the Improvement Plans. ESD-approved signs and prohibitive language and/or graphical icons, which prohibit illegal dumping, shall be posted at public access points along channels and creeks within the project area. The Homeowners' association is responsible for maintaining the legibility of stamped messages and signs.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 12-3 (Operational water quality degradation associated with urban runoff from the project site) to a less-than-significant level because the proper sizing of water quality facilities would be ensured, an NPDES permit would be obtained and site-specific BMPs would be implemented, and proper signage discouraging illegal dumping would be included.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: EXPOSURE OF PEOPLE AND STRUCTURES TO FLOOD HAZARDS ON THE PROJECT SITE (IMPACT 12-4).

According to the preliminary hydrology study prepared for the Community Plan area and the two Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) issued by FEMA for the project site (Panel No. 06061C0483G and 06061C0479G, respectively), northern potions of the site along Miners Ravine are located within a 100-year floodplain. The

remaining areas of the project site are areas designated as Zone X, which are outside of the 100-year floodplain located along Miners Ravine. Based on the analysis included within the Rancho Del Oro Subdivision Preliminary Drainage Report (See Appendix P), the proposed project is not anticipated to result in impacts related to flood hazards. However, the proposed project does not currently include specific construction plans or a final drainage study for the project site and flood-related impacts are therefore considered as ***potentially significant***.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to people and structures from flood hazards on the project site.

12-4(a) *Implement Mitigation Measure 12-1(a).*

12-4(b) *Stormwater runoff for Swale A shall be reduced to pre-project conditions through the installation of on-site detention facilities. (On-site stormwater detention is only recommended for the portion of the project that drains into Swale A and not for the project's impacts on runoff within the main stem of Miners Ravine.) Detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD). No detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.*

12-4(c) *The limits of the future, unmitigated, fully developed, 100-year floodplain (after grading) for Miners Ravine shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) filed with the Final Map and shall designate the same as a building setback line, unless greater setbacks are required by other project conditions.*

12-4(d) *Finished house pad elevations shall be shown two feet above the 100-year floodplain line for Lots 5, 6, 7-11, 13, and 14 and finished lift station and chemical building pad elevations shall be shown two feet above the 100-year floodplain line for Lot G on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) filed with the Final Map. Pad elevations shall be certified by a California registered civil engineer or licensed land surveyor and submitted to the Engineering and Surveying Department. This certification shall be completed prior to construction of the foundation or at the completion of final grading, whichever comes first. No construction is allowed until this certification has been received by the Engineering and Surveying Department and approved by the Flood Plain Manager. Benchmark elevation and location shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s), to the satisfaction of the Design Review Committee.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 12-4 (Exposure of people and structures to flood hazards on the project site) to a less-than-significant level because the proper sizing of detention facilities

would be ensured. In addition, setbacks/design review would ensure adequate setbacks from Miners Ravine and that structures are not within the 100-year floodplain.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO IMPORTANT LOCAL WATERSHED OR IMPORTANT SURFACE RESOURCES (IMPACT 12-5).

The proposed project has been designed to minimize potential impacts to local surface waters by gathering and re-depositing local runoff into the drainage system. The proposed storage detention basin to be located in Open Space Lots E and F (southwest corner of site) would collect and store the 325 off-site drainage acres and the 32 on-site drainage acres before being channeled into Miners Ravine. The calculated discharge rates from the storage basin into Miners Ravine would be slightly reduced when compared to pre-project conditions. The remainder of the drainage collected on-site would be conveyed into a water quality storage pond to be located in Open Space Lot I (between Lots 6 and 7). The water quality control pond would be sized for 157 percent of the required storage capacity. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures presented under Impacts Statements 12-2 and 12-3 would reduce potential construction-related and operational pollutants from entering into the local waterways. Without implementing the recommended mitigation measures, potential impacts to the important local watershed and surface resources are ***potentially significant.***

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to an important local watershed or important surface resources.

12-5 Implement Mitigation Measures 12-3(a) through 12-3(c).

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 12-5 (Potential impacts to important local watershed or important surface resources) to a less-than-significant level because the proper sizing of water quality facilities would be ensured, an NPDES permit would be obtained and required BMPs would be implemented during construction, site-specific BMPs would be implemented, and proper signage discouraging illegal dumping would be included.

4.9 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: ADEQUATE WATER SUPPLY AND DELIVERY FOR NEW RESIDENTS (IMPACT 13-1).

The project's additional water demand would not exceed SJWD's existing water supply. With on-site improvements connecting to the existing 12-inch water line in Olive Ranch Road, the proposed project would have adequate water conveyance. It should be noted that the necessary improvements to the water distribution system, including a 12-inch line along the frontage of the project site that would be connected to the 16-inch line at the southeast corner of the site, two 16-inch lines that would be looped southerly to Douglas Boulevard, and one 16-inch line that would be looped northerly to Cavitt Stallman Road, would not result in significant impacts to the site beyond what is analyzed in this EIR. In addition, it should be noted that, pursuant to SJWD requirements, all necessary easements will be required to be obtained prior to constructing the improvements. However, the project applicant has not received a "will-serve" letter from SJWD ensuring that adequate water supply will be made available to serve the project; therefore, a ***potentially significant*** impact could result.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts regarding adequate water supply and delivery for new residents.

13-1 *Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, the project applicant shall receive a water availability letter from SJWD confirming adequate water supply and system service capacity exists to serve the proposed project. The project applicant shall submit water system improvement plans for the review and approval of SJWD and County Planning Department. The project applicant shall fund and construct all necessary water system improvements needed for the project and comply with SJWD requirements and standards. Individual will-serve applications, payment of fees, and charges for each metered connection are required prior to receiving water service to each parcel.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 13-1 (Adequate water supply and delivery for new residents) to a less-than-significant level because confirmation regarding adequate water supply and system service capacity will be obtained prior to approval of Improvement Plans.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: ADEQUATE WASTEWATER FACILITIES FOR NEW RESIDENTS (IMPACT 13-2).

The proposed project is located within the SMD No. 2 service area and the 2005 SAB of the SPWA Systems Evaluation; therefore, the project would not require expansion of existing sewage facilities. However, the project would need additional infrastructure improvements for the conveyance of wastewater. As a result, the proposed project would have a ***potentially significant*** impact related to adequate wastewater facilities for new residents.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts regarding adequate wastewater facilities for new residents.

13-2(a) *The project shall include the construction of a new sanitary sewer system to serve the proposed project. The system shall include a new lift station and sanitary sewer pipelines. All sewage conveyance infrastructure to be constructed on site and in the offsite improvement area shall be included on the project Improvement Plans, which are subject to approval by the Engineering and Surveying Department and the Facility Services Department, Environmental Engineering Division.*

13-2(b) *The project applicant shall provide a Sewer Study and Lift Station Design Report to the Environmental Engineering and Utilities Division for review and approval*

concurrent with submittal of the project Improvement Plans. This Sewer Study, Lift Station Design Report, and sewer utility plan shall be in general conformance with Placer County standards. The lift station for this project shall be designed and constructed to accommodate the ultimate shed area that it will serve. The developer shall have a Registered Civil Engineer develop a master plan for the shed area to determine ultimate flows and the required size of the lift station. The overflow tank shall be sized at least for the existing average dry weather flows of the specific development but the design shall include easements for additional overflow tanks based on the ultimate flows of the entire shed area. Certain costs associated with the over sizing of the lift station to serve the off-site areas may be eligible for reimbursement.

The sewer utility plan shall depict sewage infrastructure extension to the parcels to the east, Sewer Line "A," between parcels 18 and 19 to the eastern property boundary and to the parcels to the north, Sewer Line "B," to the northern property boundary of Common Lot 'G'. The sewer utility plan shall depict the demolition of the existing Lawrence Drive Lift Station and the plan for collection and transmission, Sewer Line "C," of the existing sewage flow from the facility to the new lift station located in Common Lot G. The Sewer Study shall demonstrate that gravity sewer service has been provided to the maximum number of parcels feasible. The Sewer Study shall describe the average daily wastewater generation from the site and the methodology used to derive the estimates. The sewer utility plan shall show paved vehicular access to all sewer manholes. The Sewer Study and Lift Station Design Report shall be approved prior to or concurrent with approval of the Improvement Plans.

13-2(c) *The CC&Rs for the proposed Rancho Del Oro subdivision shall include the following provisions:*

- *Upon presentation of proper identification, Environmental Engineering and Utilities Division personnel and their representatives shall be provided access to all public sewer infrastructure easements for the purposes of inspection, maintenance, and repair of the sewer facilities.*
- *Homeowners shall be prohibited from planting trees or constructing structures or significant landscaping within any sewer easement. Language to this effect shall be included in any easement agreement for easements located onsite or in the offsite improvement area. The requirement shall also be included in the project Development Notebook.*
- *The access entry code for the gate entrance to the project site shall be provided to the Environmental Engineering and Utilities Division for use by their maintenance personnel.*
- *Notification shall be made to all future property owners within 500 feet of the sewer lift station via CC&Rs and Developer's Notebook, that they may experience some unwanted elements associated with the maintenance of the lift station, i.e. truck traffic, noise, alarms, odors, etc.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 13-2 (Adequate wastewater facilities for new residents) to a less-than-significant level because a site-specific sanitary sewer system will be reviewed and approved by the County and confirmation regarding adequate wastewater capacity will be obtained.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO CURRENT SCHOOLS (IMPACT 13-4).

The student generation rate for RJUHSD is 0.138 per housing unit. Based on the student generation rate, the proposed project could generate 13 (0.138 x 89 = 12.28) additional students for the RJUHSD (grades 9-12). Because the RJUHSD is already over capacity, additional students to the district may result in further overcrowding and compromising programs. Therefore, the project would have a ***potentially significant*** impact to schools.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to a less-than-significant level the project's impacts to current schools.

13-4 *Prior to construction, the project applicant shall participate in the Mutual Benefit Agreement and pay minimum statutory developer fees of $1.15 per square foot to provide revenue for overcrowding and funding shortfalls.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 13-4 (Impacts to current schools) to a less-than-significant level because the Mutual Benefit Agreement payment would occur prior to construction of the project.

4.10 INITIAL STUDY

CONVERT PRIME FARMLAND, UNIQUE FARMLAND, OR FARMLAND OF STATEWIDE OR LOCAL IMPORTANCE (FARMLAND), AS SHOWN ON THE MAPS PREPARED PURSUANT TO THE FARMLAND MAPPING AND MONITORING PROGRAM OF THE CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY, TO NON-AGRICULTURAL USE? (INITIAL STUDY IMPACT II-2)

As the project site is located in an area where larger rural residential agriculture parcels are also located, the potential exists for existing, as well as future, agricultural operations to adversely impact residences within this project site. As the County has adopted a "Right to Farm" ordinance, which allows these existing and future agricultural operations to continue, in am manner consistent with the underlying zoning, a condition of approval shall be included with this proposed project informing future residents that agricultural/farming operations may take place on nearby/surrounding parcels, and the approval of this project shall not impact the ability of existing/future agricultural and/or farming operations to continue in a manner consistent with the underlying zoning regulations. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

MM II.1 *The developer will be required to notify future owners of the County's Right to Farm Ordinance, which discloses the potential effects of residing near ongoing agricultural operations. This statement shall inform lot owners that farm operators have a "right to farm" their lands despite potential nuisance to neighboring residences, including noise, odors, and use of toxic and hazardous materials.*

SUBSTANTIALLY CAUSE ADVERSE CHANGE IN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF A UNIQUE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE PURSUANT TO CEQA GUIDELINES, SECTION 15064.5; DISTURB ANY HUMAN REMAINS, INCLUDING THESE INTERRED OUTSIDE OF FORMAL CEMETERIES? (INITIAL STUDY IMPACTS V-2 AND V-6)

While historical resources were identified on the project site, the Archaeological Inventory Survey prepared for this project did not identify any archaeological resources. However, since the majority of the 119-acre parcel will be disturbed by construction activities, including grading, there is a potential for unique archaeological resources to be uncovered. To address this concern, a standard condition of approval will be required as part of any project approval to monitor the site during construction activities. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce any potential archaeological impact to a less than significant level.

Although there is no evidence of any kind of burial ground within the project boundary, the proposed project has the potential, due to site disturbance and grading required for the project, to disturb any human remains, including these interred outside of formal cemeteries that may exist on the site. To address this potential impact, Mitigation Measures V-1, as articulated below, will need to be included as a condition of approval. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce any potential burial ground impacts to a less than significant level.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

MM V.1 *If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s). If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect shall be provided on the Improvement Plans for the project. Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide protection of the site*

and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.

CREATE ANY HEALTH HAZARD OR POTENTIAL HEALTH HAZARD? (INITIAL STUDY IMPACT VII-8)

Mosquito breeding is expected to significantly impact this project as there is a small pond on the property which has the potential of breeding mosquitoes. Additionally, overwatering of landscaping and residential irrigation has the potential to breed mosquitoes.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

MM VII.1 *The project proponent agrees to abide by a mosquito abatement program with the Mosquito Abatement District. The project will be conditioned to allow the Mosquito Abatement District to review the Improvement Plans. As a condition of this project, drip irrigation will be used for landscaping areas.*

RESULT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF INCOMPATIBLE USES AND/OR THE CREATION OF LAND USE CONFLICTS; AFFECT AGRICULTURAL AND TIMBER RESOURCES OR OPERATIONS (I.E. IMPACTS TO SOILS OR FARMLANDS AND TIMBER HARVEST PLANS, OR IMPACTS FROM INCOMPATIBLE LAND USES)? (INITIAL STUDY IMPACTS IX-4 AND IX-5)

The project site is located in an area where larger rural residential agriculture parcels are also located, the potential exists for existing, as well as future, agricultural operations to adversely impact residences within this project site. As the County has adopted a "Right to Farm" ordinance, which allows these existing and future agricultural operations to continue, in a manner consistent with the underlying zoning, a condition of approval shall be included with this proposed project informing future residents that agricultural/farming operations may take place on nearby/surrounding parcels, and the approval of this project shall not impact the ability of existing/future agricultural and/or farming operations to continue in a manner consistent with the underlying zoning regulations. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

MM-IX.1 *To mitigate potential impacts to any agricultural uses in the project area, a condition of approval will be included notifying and residents of this*

development of the County's "Right to Farm" ordinance which allows existing and future agricultural operations to continue where allowed by zoning. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

POTENTIALLY-SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL THROUGH MITIGATION MEASURES

5.1 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: CUMULATIVE IMPACTS TO STUDY AREA INTERSECTIONS AND ROADWAY SEGMENTS RESULTING FROM PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION (IMPACT 16-5).

The following two intersections would operate at an unacceptable LOS under Cumulative Plus Project conditions:

- Intersection # 6: Douglas Boulevard / Cavitt-Stallman Road; and
- Intersection # 9: Douglas Boulevard / Barton Road.

All study area roadway segments anticipated to operate at an acceptable LOS under the Cumulative (2025) No Project scenario, are also projected to operate at an acceptable LOS under the Cumulative (2025) Plus Project scenario. The proposed project creates site-specific impacts on local transportation systems that are considered less-than-significant when analyzed against the existing baseline traffic conditions and roadway segment/intersection existing LOS; however, the cumulative effect of an increase in traffic has the potential to create significant impacts to the area's transportation system. Article 15.28.010 of the Placer County Code establishes a road network Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The proposed project is subject to this code and, therefore, is required to pay traffic impact fees to fund the CIP for area roadway improvements.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project's incremental contribution to the cumulative traffic impact to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's cumulative impacts to study area intersections and roadway segments resulting from project implementation.

16-5(a) *The project applicant shall be responsible for contributing a fair share of the cost for the necessary improvements to the Douglas Boulevard / Cavitt-Stallman Road intersection (Intersection #6). Necessary improvements shall include the westbound (Douglas Boulevard) approach being re-striped to include an additional through lane. With this mitigation measure, the westbound approach of Douglas Boulevard would include one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one shared through-right lane. The project applicant shall be responsible for payment of the proposed project's equitable share of improvement costs, in the amount of three percent (3%) of the total costs for the abovementioned improvement to the Douglas Boulevard / Cavitt-Stallman Road intersection.*

16-5(b) *The project shall be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Granite Bay Benefit District), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The project applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fees will be required and shall be paid to the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building permits for the project:*

- *County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code;*
- *South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA); and*
- *Placer County / City of Roseville JPA (PC/CR).*

The current total combined estimated fee is $7,734 per single family residence. The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If either the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 16-5 (Cumulative impacts to study area intersections and roadway segments resulting from project implementation) to a less-than-significant level because the project applicant would be required to contribute a "fair share" of the improvement-related costs, based upon the proposed project's PM peak-hour traffic impacts.

5.2 AIR QUALITY

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: CUMULATIVE IMPACTS TO REGIONAL AIR QUALITY (IMPACT 16-6).

The PCAPCD cumulative significance thresholds for emissions are applied to project-level emissions. An increase of more than ten pounds per day of ROG and/or NOX (ozone precursors) would be above the PCAPCD cumulative threshold of significance. The PCAPCD does not have cumulative thresholds of significance for PM10 emissions, as Placer County is in attainment for PM10. Project operational emissions for ROG would slightly exceed the PCAPCD cumulative thresholds of significance; therefore, the cumulative impact associated with the project would be ***potentially significant.***

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's cumulative impacts to regional air quality.

16-6 *In order to mitigate the project's contribution to long-term emission of pollutants, the applicant shall participate in the Placer County Air Pollution District Offsite Mitigation Program by paying the equivalent amount of money, which is equal to the projects contribution of pollutants (ROG) that exceed the cumulative threshold of 10 pounds per day. The estimated total amount of excessive ROG for this project is approximately 0.26 tons per year. Therefore, the estimated payment for the proposed project is $1,859 based on $14,300 per ton. The actual amount to be paid shall be determined, per current California Air*

Resource Board guidelines, at the time of recordation of the Final Map. This condition shall be satisfied prior to recordation of a Final Map.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 16-6 (Cumulative impacts to regional air quality) to a less-than-significant level because the payment of the fee would reduce region-wide emissions through funding of grants and incentive programs offered by the PCAPCD, which support fleet modernizations, repowers, retrofits, and fleet expansions of heavy duty on- and off-road mobile vehicles/equipment; alternative fuels infrastructure or low emission fuel purchases; new or expanding alternative transit service programs; light-duty low emission vehicle (LEV) programs; public education; repower of agricultural pump engines; and other beneficial air quality projects. Thus, on a cumulative level, emission sources throughout the area would reduce the above impact, over time, resulting in a cumulative lowering of emissions.

5.3 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: LONG-TERM INCREASES IN PEAK STORMWATER RUNOFF FLOW AND FLOODING RELATED TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND IN COMBINATION WITH EXISTING AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS IN PLACER COUNTY (IMPACT 16-10).

The property proposed for development is within the Dry Greek Watershed Flood Control Plan area (this property is on the Miners Ravine portion of the Dry Creek watershed). Flooding along Dry Creek and its tributaries is well documented. Cumulative downstream impacts were studied in the Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan in order to plan for flood control projects and set flood control policies. Mitigation measures for development in this area include flood control development fees to fund regional detention basins to reduce flooding on major streams in the Dry Creek watershed. If fees are not collected on a project by project basis to fund regional detention facilities, these types of capital improvements may not be realized and flooding impacts to properties within the Dry Creek Watershed area will persist. These cumulative flooding impacts are considered ***potentially significant.***

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's long-term increases in peak stormwater runoff flow and flooding related to the proposed project and in combination with existing and future developments in Placer County.

16-10(a) *The project shall be subject to the one-time payment of drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the "Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance" (Ref. Chapter 15, Article 15.32, Placer County Code). The current estimated development fee is $224 per single family residence, payable to the Engineering and Surveying Department prior to each building permit issuance. The actual fee shall be that in effect at the time payment occurs.*

16-10(b) *The project shall be subject to payment of annual drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the "Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance" (Ref. Chapter 15, Article 15.32, Placer County Code). Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall cause the subject property to become a participant in the existing Dry Creek Watershed County Service*

Area for purposes of collecting these annual assessments. The current estimated annual fee is $35 per single family residence.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 16-10 (Long-term increases in peak stormwater runoff flow and flooding related to the proposed project and in combination with existing and future developments in Placer County) to a less-than-significant level because the payment of the fee would fund necessary regional detention facilities.

5.4 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: INCREASE IN DEMAND FOR ADDITIONAL PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES AS A RESULT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND OTHER PROJECTS PROPOSED IN THE GRANITE BAY AREA (IMPACT 16-11).

The proposed project would increase the demand for public services and utilities. Placer County has adopted development fees consistent with State law in order to facilitate the provision of public services for projects consistent with the buildout of the PCGP. The costs of capital improvement projects are to be borne by the upstream users. The proposed Rancho Del Oro Estates project is an upstream user to pipe reaches in the trunk sewer that experience surcharging in build out conditions. These cumulative impacts to the wastewater conveyance are considered ***potentially significant.***

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts associated with an increase in demand for additional public services and utilities as a result of the proposed project and other projects proposed in the Granite Bay area.

16-11 *The applicant shall pay their fair share fee per EDU, prior to Improvement Plan approval, toward the cost of the future improvement projects (including design and construction management along with actual construction costs) as identified in the RMC Technical Memorandum Trunk Sewer Hydraulic Analysis (TM 3b) dated October 31, 2006 of the June 2007 South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation (Systems Evaluation). The Environmental Engineering Division will use this money to reduce surcharging within the trunk sewer by replacement, and/or rehabilitation of existing sewer infrastructure. The applicant is notified that the fair share fee per EDU to be approved by the Environmental Engineering Division will be contributed to the cost to construct the recommended improvement projects and such fee will be required prior to Improvement Plan approval.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 16-11 (Increase in demand for additional public services and utilities as a result of the proposed project and other projects proposed in the Granite Bay area) to a less-than-significant level because the payment of the fee would fund necessary trunk sewer replacement and/or rehabilitation of existing sewer infrastructure.

SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACT WHICH REMAINS SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE

5.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: CUMULATIVE LOSS OF BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES IN PLACER COUNTY AND THE EFFECTS OF ONGOING URBANIZATION IN THE REGION (IMPACT 16-2).

Approximately 3.21 acres of jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the United States, and a total of 16.93 acres of oak woodland would be impacted by implementation of the proposed project. These impacts would contribute to cumulative impacts to wetlands, oak woodlands and other significant oak trees, and special-status plant and wildlife species, including direct removal of suitable breeding and/or foraging habitat and habitat fragmentation. While mitigation would be required for other reasonably foreseeable projects, and while the proposed mitigation would reduce project-specific impacts to less-than-significant levels, the removal of trees, wetlands, and uplands would contribute to the significant cumulative loss of vegetation and wildlife habitat throughout the GBCP area. Considering the cumulative impact scenario of which the proposed project is a part, cumulative impacts to biological resources would be ***significant and unavoidable.***

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that partially mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. However, this mitigation would not reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce the project's impacts regarding cumulative loss of biological resources, but not to a less-than-significant level.

16-2 *Implement Mitigation Measures 5-1, 5-3(a), 5-3(b), 5-4, 5-5(a), 5-5(b), 5-6(a), 5-6(b), 5-6(c), 5-9(a), 5-9(b), 5-10(a), 5-10(b), and 5-10(c).*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would not reduce Impact 16-2 (Cumulative loss of biological resources in Placer County and the effects of ongoing urbanization in the region) to a less-than-significant level.

6 ALTERNATIVES

The CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR describe a reasonable range of alternatives that would feasibly obtain most of the basis project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. (Guidelines Section 15126(a)). Case law has indicated that the lead agency has the discretion to determine how many alternatives constitute a reasonable range. (Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990), 52 C.3d 553, 566). CEQA Guidelines note that alternatives evaluated in the EIR should be able to obtain most of the basic objectives of the project (Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)). An EIR need not present alternatives that are incompatible with fundamental project objectives (Save San Francisco Bay Association vs. San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission (1992), 10 Cal.App.4th 908); and the Guidelines provide that an EIR need not consider alternatives that are infeasible. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)). The Guidelines provide that among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are "site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site." (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1)). The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)).

Public Resources Code Section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines Section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations. (See also *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* ("*Goleta II*") (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565 [276 Cal. Rptr. 410].)

The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417 [183 Cal.Rptr. 898].) "'[F]easibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (*Id.*; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715 [29 Cal.Rptr.2d 182].)

The review of project alternatives is guided primarily by the need to substantially reduce potential impacts associated with the project, while still achieving the basic objectives of the project. The following objectives for the project were provided by the applicant:

1. Complete the land use planning of the western end of Olive Ranch Road in a manner consistent with the GBCP and compatible with adjacent development.

2. Create a very high-end subdivision of at least 89 residential lots consistent with, or surpassing, the quality and ambiance of Granite Bay's most prestigious neighborhoods.

3. Create an infill project composed of lots nearly one acre in size that minimizes grading activity to preserve natural resources on-site, to the extent feasible, while at the same time avoiding a sharp deviation from projected residential units in the Granite GBCP, with the resultant drop in school fees, traffic fees, and park fees that a sharp reduction in units would entail, compared to what is currently allowed under the GBCP.

The detailed discussion in Sections 4 and 5 demonstrate that many of the significant environmental effects of the project have been either substantially lessened or avoided through the imposition of existing policies or regulations or by the adoption of additional, formal mitigation measures recommended in the EIR.

For the sake of full disclosure, moreover, it is noted that, even with mitigation in the form of the application of existing policies and, where feasible, the addition of formal mitigation measures, the following significant effect remains significant and unavoidable, though it has been substantially lessened:

- Cumulative loss of biological resources in Placer County and the effects of ongoing urbanization in the region (Impact 16-2). Increased development and population would occur due to the proposed project. The resulting increase in the human population and associated development would convert wildlife habitat and reduce the quality of the remaining habitat. Development of the proposed project would result in a substantial change in habitat types on-site. Despite implementation of mitigation for impacts to special-status plant species, special-status wildlife species, and oak woodlands, the project would still create a net decrease in open space, grasslands, and oak woodlands, and an increase in developed area. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the project on biological resources is considered significant and unavoidable.

The project applicant can fully satisfy its CEQA obligations by determining whether any alternatives identified in the Draft EIR are both feasible and environmentally superior with respect to this impact. (See *Laurel Hills, supra*, 83 Cal.App.3d at pp. 520-521 and pp. 526-527; *Kings County Farm Bureau, supra*, 221 Cal.App.3d at pp. 730-731; and *Laurel Heights I, supra*, 47 Cal.3d at pp. 400-403; see also Pub. Resources Code Sec. 21002.) These Findings will assess whether each alternative is feasible in light of the project applicant's objectives for the

project. As the following discussion will show, no identified alternative qualifies as both feasible and environmentally superior with respect to the significant and unavoidable impact.

In accordance with Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that could feasibly attain the basic project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project was addressed in the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR considered the following three alternatives to the proposed project: No Project Alternative, Base Zoning Alternative, and Planned Development Alternative.

6.1 NO PROJECT – NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE

Section 15126.6(e)(1) of the Government Code provides the following direction relative to the No Project Alternative:

> The specific alternative of "no project" shall also be evaluated along with its impact. The purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. The no project alterative analysis is not the baseline for determining where the proposed project's environmental impacts may be significant, unless it is identical to the existing environmental setting analysis which does establish that baseline.

The No Project – No Build Alternative assumes the continuation of the existing condition of the project site, which, for the Ranch Del Oro Estates project, is an undeveloped oak woodland with annual grasses. The No Project – No Build Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives. Under the No Project – No Build Alternative, construction and operational vehicle trips, along with associated emissions and noise related to vehicles trips would not be generated. As construction would not occur, impacts to biological and cultural resources would not occur. In addition, the project site would not be graded and the existing drainage pattern would remain. Lastly, an increase for the demand for water, wastewater, and other public services would not occur. However, it should be noted that the project site is identified for development in the Placer County General Plan (PCGP) and the Granite Bay Community Plan (GBCP).

Finding: Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives. The County has determined that specific economic, social, and environmental considerations render the No Project Alternative infeasible. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15091, subd. (a)(3).). Under CEQA, "feasible" means "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner in a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15364.) As noted above, the concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar*, *supra*, 133 Cal.App.3d at 417.) The No Project Alternative would not promote the objectives of the Project.

To the extent that the Project has greater environmental impacts than the No Project Alternative, the County believes they are acceptable, given the great lengths taken to mitigate all environmental impacts to the extent feasible. In sum, the County believes that the benefits of the Project as proposed outweigh its environmental costs. (See Laurel Hills, supra, 83 Cal.App.3d at p. 521 (a "public agency may approve [ ] a project once its significant adverse effects have been reduced to an acceptable level - - that is, all avoidable damage has been eliminated and that which remains is otherwise acceptable.").)

6.2 BASE ZONING ALTERNATIVE

Section 15126.6(e)(1)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines states, "[...] where failure to proceed with the project will not result in preservation of existing environmental conditions, the analysis should identify the practical result of the project's non-approval and not create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to

preserve the existing physical environment." The Base Zoning Alternative would include development of the project site under the existing RS-AG-B-100 PD 0.83 (Residential Single-family, Combining Agricultural, Combining Minimum Building Site of 100,000 square feet, Combining Planned Development 0.83 dwelling units per acre) zoning designation. The Base Zoning Alternative would include 40 residential single-family lots, two open space lots, and a common area parcel, approximately 2.0 acres, containing a sewer pump station and bio swale stormwater treatment basin. The two open space parcels would provide 6.27 acres of year round drainage and wetland setback location in the southeastern portion of the property, and 9.9 acres of floodplain and open space south of Miners Ravine.

The Base Zoning Alternative would require the same off-site sewer infrastructure and water quality treatment as the Proposed Project. Buildout of the Base Zoning Alternative would include the development of 40 single family residential units, which would be less than the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would not satisfy Project Objectives 2 and 3. This alternative would result in less environmental impact to Land Use, Transportation and Circulation, Air Quality, Noise, and Public Services and Utilities. Regarding biological resources, although the Base Zoning Alternative includes fewer units, the 40 residential lots would be a minimum of 2.3 acres, and would cover a similar amount of land as the 89 lots for the Proposed Project. Similar to the proposed project, the Base Zoning Alternative would include two open space parcels along Miners Ravine and the southwestern potion of the site. Both the Base Zoning Alternative and the proposed project would include similar lot-specific grading as the units are developed. Though somewhat speculative, the possibility exists that some homeowners would preserve a greater number of trees under the Base Zoning Alternative simply because their lots will be 1.3 acres larger than those proposed for the project, thereby allowing more trees to be retained. However, the extent to which each property owner would preserve trees on their property is speculative and for purposes of this analysis it is assumed that the level of biological impacts would be roughly equal for the proposed project and the Base Zoning Alternative. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, development of the Base Zoning Alternative would still result in a *significant and unavoidable* cumulative impact to biological resources.

Finding: Implementation of the Base Zoning Alternative would not meet two of the three project objectives. In particular, the Base Zoning Alternative would include the development of 40 single family residential units, which would be less than the proposed project.

The County has determined that specific economic, social, and environmental considerations render the Base Zoning Alternative infeasible. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15091, subd. (a)(3).). Under CEQA, "feasible" means "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner in a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15364.) As explained above, the concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar*, *supra*, 133 Cal.App.3d at 417.) The Base Zoning Alternative would not promote the basic objectives of the project.

To the extent that the project has greater environmental impacts than the Base Zoning Alternative, the County believes they are acceptable, given the great lengths taken to mitigate all environmental impacts to the extent feasible. In sum, the County believes that the benefits of the project as proposed outweigh its environmental costs. (See *Laurel Hills, supra*, 83 Cal.App.3d at p. 521 (a "public agency may approve [ ] a project once its significant adverse effects have been reduced to an acceptable level - - that is, all avoidable damage has been eliminated and that which remains is otherwise acceptable.").)

6.3 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

The Planned Development Alternative would result in the development of the project site as a Planned Residential Development (PD) consistent with Article 17.54.080 of the Placer County Code. The Planned Development Alternative would allow for the development of up to 62 residential lots, ranging in size from 17,000 square feet (0.4 acres) to 39,000 square feet (0.9 acres), with an average size of 23,800 square feet. The internal circulation

system would include a single gated access road off Olive Ranch Road across from Ramsgate Drive. The Planned Development Alternative would include a 53.9-acre open space parcel in the western portion of the site, including preservation of 38 blue oak woodland trees on the project site; a 7.4-acre open space parcel along the southern portion of Miners Ravine; and a 2.0-acre common area parcel with a sewer pump facility and bioswale stormwater treatment basin. In addition, a 3.3-acre on-site private park/wetland preserve would be included in the eastern portion of the site.

Buildout of the Planned Development Alternative would include the development of 62 single family residential units, which would be less than the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would not satisfy Project Objectives 2 and 3. This alternative would result in less environmental impact to Land Use; Cultural Resources; Transportation and Circulation; Air Quality; Noise; Geology and Soils; Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage; and Public Services and Utilities. Further, regarding biological resources, the Planned Development Alternative includes a 53.9-acre open space parcel in the western portion of the site, which would reduce the intensity of impacts to oak woodland, as approximately 48 acres of oak woodland would be developed, as compared to 79 acres in the Proposed Project. In addition, construction of infrastructure for the Planned Development Alternative would impact 11 significant oak trees versus the 69 that would be impacted by the subdivision improvements for the proposed project. However, it should be noted that with the development of smaller lots in the Planned Development Alternative, a majority of significant oak trees within building setback lines would be removed. In addition, the Planned Development Alternative would include a 9.8-acre open space parcel that crosses the site in a southeast direction from Miners Ravine and an 8.3-acre wetlands preserve on the eastern edge of the site. A large portion of the project site would not be developed under the Planned Development Alternative and the impacts to jurisdictional wetland areas, special-status species habitat, and trees would be greatly reduced. Therefore, the Planned Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts related to biological resources, as compared to the Proposed Project. However, it should be noted that similar to the proposed project, development of the Base Zoning Alternative would result in a *significant and unavoidable* cumulative impact to biological resources.

Finding: Implementation of the Planned Development Alternative would not meet two of the three project objectives. In particular, the Planned Development Alternative would include the development of 62 single family residential units, which would be less than the proposed project.

The County has determined that specific economic, social, and environmental considerations render the Planned Development Alternative infeasible. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15091, subd. (a)(3).). Under CEQA, "feasible" means "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner in a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15364.) As explained above, the concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar, supra*, 133 Cal.App.3d at 417.) The Planned Development Alternative would not promote the basic objectives of the project.

To the extent that the project has greater environmental impacts than the Planned Development Alternative, the County believes they are acceptable, given the great lengths taken to mitigate all environmental impacts to the extent feasible. In sum, the County believes that the benefits of the project as proposed outweigh its environmental costs. (See *Laurel Hills, supra*, 83 Cal.App.3d at p. 521 (a "public agency may approve [ ] a project once its significant adverse effects have been reduced to an acceptable level - - that is, all avoidable damage has been eliminated and that which remains is otherwise acceptable.").)

7 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

As discussed in Section 5 of these CEQA Findings, the Final EIR concludes that the proposed project, even with the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures and consideration of alternatives, will nonetheless cause a significant direct unavoidable impact on the following resource:

- Cumulative loss of biological resources in Placer County and the effects of ongoing urbanization in the region.

Placer County has also adopted all feasible mitigation measures with respect to this impact, which further lessens the impact but would not reduce it below a level of significance.

Under CEQA, before a project which is determined to have a significant, unmitigated environmental effect can be approved, the public agency must consider and adopt a "statement of overriding considerations" pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15043 and 15093. As the primary purpose of CEQA is to fully inform the decision makers and the public as to the environmental effects of a proposed project and to include feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce any such adverse effects below a level of significance, CEQA nonetheless recognizes and authorizes the approval of projects where not all adverse impacts can be fully lessened or avoided. However, that agency must explain and justify its conclusion to approve such project through the statement of overriding considerations, setting forth the proposed project's general social, economic, policy, or other public benefits that support the agency's informed conclusion to approve the proposed project.

Placer County finds that the proposed project meets the following stated project objectives – which have substantial social, economic, policy and other public benefits – justifying its approval and implementation, notwithstanding the fact that one environmental impact was not fully reduced below a level of significance:

The proposed project will provide for the following:

- Complete the land use planning of the western end of Olive Ranch Road in a manner consistent with the GBCP and compatible with adjacent development.

- Create a very high-end subdivision of at least 89 residential lots consistent with, or surpassing, the quality and ambiance of Granite Bay's most prestigious neighborhoods.

- Create a project composed of lots nearly one acre in size that minimizes grading activity to preserve natural resources on-site, to the extent feasible, while at the same time avoiding a sharp deviation from projected residential units in the Granite GBCP, with the resultant drop in school fees, traffic fees, and park fees that a sharp reduction in units would entail, compared to what is currently allowed under the GBCP.

In addition, the following benefits are noted:

- The project will provide land uses that are economically beneficial to the County through property tax revenue and development impact fee revenue for public facilities, including for the County, SMD #2, and the Eureka Union School District, generally consistent with the anticipated number of dwelling units for the project site anticipated in the Granite Bay Community Plan.

- The project will provide all necessary on-site infrastructures and contribute fair share funding to upgrade the County's infrastructure.

- The project will provide an off-site emergency vehicle access route that will improve emergency vehicle response time to existing Granite Bay neighborhoods around Shadow Oaks Lane and Cavitt-Stallman Road.

- The project's detention basin to be located in Open Space Lots E and F will collect and store drainage from 325 off-site acres, as well as on-site drainage, before being channeled to Miners Ravine.

- The proposed Sewer Line "C" to be constructed by the project will enable the sewer flows from six (6) homes in Lawrence Estates to flow by gravity to the project's sewer lift station in place of the existing sewer pump facility located between Lots 25 and 26 of Lawrence Estates.

Any one of these reasons is sufficient to justify approval of the project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the Board of Supervisors would stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this section, and in the documents found in the Record of Proceedings, as defined in section 4 above.

8 CONCLUSION

The mitigation measures listed in conjunction with each of the findings set forth above, as implemented through the MMRP, have eliminated or reduced, or will eliminate or reduce to a level of insignificance, all adverse environmental impacts, except for that described above in Section 6.

Taken together, the Final EIR, the mitigation measures, and the MMRP provide an adequate basis for approval of the Rancho Del Oro Estates Project.