

# ATTACHMENT E

## CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT FOR THE THE PARK AT GRANITE BAY

---

SCH#2015022026

*PREPARED FOR*  
PLACER COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT RESOURCE AGENCY  
AND  
MAVERICK PARTNERS WEST

*PREPARED BY*



**AUGUST 2016**



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Introduction.....1

Statutory Requirements for CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations .....2

Legal Effect of Findings .....2

Definitions.....6

Project Description.....8

Project Objectives .....8

Procedural History .....9

Record of Proceedings .....10

Document Organization .....12

1. Less Than Significant Impacts (or No Impacts) Identified in the Final EIR.....13

2. Findings for Significant, Potentially Significant, and Cumulatively Significant Impacts  
Reduced to Less Than Significant Through Mitigation Measures. ....49

3. Findings for Significant and Unavoidable Impacts .....111

4. Findings Associated with Project Alternatives.....111

5. Other Impacts and Considerations .....123

7. Incorporation By Reference .....126

8. Recirculation Not Required .....126

9. Summary .....126

10. Approvals.....127



**INTRODUCTION**

These CEQA Findings of Fact are made with respect to approval of a general plan amendment, rezone, variance, and tentative subdivision map for the construction of the proposed Park at Granite Bay project (“proposed project”) and state findings of the Placer County Board of Supervisors relating to the potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed project.

The following actions are proposed and referred to collectively as the project approvals. The project approvals constitute the project for purposes of CEQA and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15378 and these determinations of the Board of Supervisors.

- The project requires certification of the EIR by the Placer County Board of Supervisors.
- The project requires adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) by Placer County.
- The project requires the County to adopt a CEQA Findings of Fact, and if any impacts are determined to be significant and unavoidable, a Statement of Overriding Considerations.
- Approval of General Plan Amendment (Granite Bay Community Plan) to allow for a change in the land use on site from Rural Low Density (RLDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR).
- Approval of a Rezone to change the zoning of the project site from Residential-Single-Family within an Agriculture combining district and Building Site combining district with a minimum lot size of 40,000 square feet (RS-AG-B-40), to Residential-Single-Family, with a B-X combining zone with a minimum lot size of 7,000 square feet (RS-B-X 7,000) and a maximum density of 3.4 residential units per gross acre.
- Approval of a Variance to increase the maximum building coverage allowed per single-story residential lot (only on those lots that are 8,000 square feet or less) from 40 percent lot coverage to 50 percent lot coverage.
- Approval of a Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map.

The project would also require the following actions by entities other than the County:

- Granting of a Section 404 Permit by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for the filling of waters of the U.S. The USACE issued the Section 404 Permit on November 4, 2014; a copy is provided in Appendix K of the Draft EIR;
- Granting of a Section 401 Permit by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) for certification that pollutant discharges into waters of the U.S. comply with applicable effluent limitations and water quality standards;

- Granting of a permit to connect to the San Juan Water District’s water infrastructure and provision of water supply;
- Granting of a permit from Placer County Sewer Maintenance District 2 to connect to the City of Roseville’s wastewater infrastructure;
- Granting of a permit to alter City of Roseville roadway (Sierra College Boulevard);
- Granting of a construction activity stormwater permit from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB); and
- Approval of a Dust Control Plan from the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD).

The findings and determinations contained herein are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the project and the EIR. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations by the Placer County Board of Supervisors (Board of Supervisors) in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

Although the findings below identify specific pages within the Draft EIR and Final EIR in support of various conclusions reached below, the Board of Supervisors incorporates by reference and adopts as its own, the reasoning set forth in both environmental documents, and thus relies on that reasoning, even where not specifically mentioned or cited below, in reaching the conclusions set forth below, except where additional evidence is specifically mentioned. This is especially true with respect to the County’s approval of the mitigation measures recommended in the Final EIR, and the reasoning set forth in responses to comments in the Final EIR. The County further intends that if these findings fail to cross-reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these findings, any finding required or permitted to be made by the County with respect to any particular subject matter of the Project must be deemed made if it appears in any portion of these findings or findings elsewhere in the record.

**STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS FOR CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

The California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq. and the regulations implementing that statute, Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, §§ 15000 et seq. (the “CEQA Guidelines”) (collectively, the act and the CEQA Guidelines are referred to as “CEQA”) require public agencies to consider the potential effects of their discretionary activities on the environment and, when feasible, to adopt and implement mitigation measures that avoid or substantially lessen the effects of those activities on the environment. Specifically, Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]” The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA “are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible

alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects.” Section 21002 goes on to state that “in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof.”

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code Section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).) For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The three possible findings are:

- (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, 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.

(Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd (a); see also CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).)

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.)

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 401, 417 (*City of Del Mar*).) “[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.” (Ibid.; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715 (*Sequoyah Hills*); see also *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 [after weighing “economic, environmental, social, and technological factors’ ... ‘an agency may conclude that a mitigation measure or alternative is impracticable or undesirable from a policy standpoint and reject it as infeasible on that ground’].)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's “benefits” rendered “acceptable” its “unavoidable

adverse environmental effects.” (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).) The California Supreme Court has stated, “[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced.” (*Goleta II, supra*, 52 Cal.3d at p. 576.) Here, because all of the potentially significant impacts of the project will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by the implementation of mitigation, the County is not required to adopt a statement of overriding considerations.

In making these Findings and the determination regarding the project approvals, the Board of Supervisors recognizes that the project implicates a number of controversial environmental issues and that a range of technical and scientific opinion exists with respect to those issues. The Board of Supervisors has acquired an understanding of the range of this technical and scientific opinion by its review of the EIR, the comments received on the Draft EIR and the responses to those comments in the Final EIR, as well as testimony, letters and reports regarding the Final EIR and the merits of the project. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered, as a whole, the evidence and analysis presented in the Draft EIR, the evidence and analysis presented in the comments on the Draft EIR, the evidence and analysis presented in the Final EIR, the information submitted on the Final EIR, and the reports prepared by the experts who prepared the EIR and the consultants the EIR preparers relied upon, the County’s planning consultants, and by staff, addressing these comments. In particular, the Board of Supervisors has considered the Alternatives presented in the EIR, as well as the proposed comments submitted by various commenters and the responses of the EIR preparers and staff to those comments. The Board of Supervisors has gained a comprehensive and well-rounded understanding of the environmental issues presented by the project. In turn, the understanding has enabled the Board of Supervisors to make its decisions after weighing and considering the various viewpoints on these important issues. Accordingly, the Board of Supervisors certifies that its findings are based on a full appraisal of all of the evidence contained in the Final EIR, as well as the evidence and other information in the record addressing the Final EIR.

These findings constitute the Board of Supervisors’ best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. These findings are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that come into effect with the County’s approval of the project. In particular, in adopting these findings, the County commits itself to ensure the implementation of the mitigation measures approved in these findings.

The Board of Supervisors is adopting these findings for the entirety of the actions described in these findings and in the Final EIR. Although the findings below identify specific pages within the Draft and Final EIR in support of various conclusions reached below, the Board of Supervisors incorporates by reference and adopts as its own, the reasoning set forth in both environmental documents, and thus relies on that reasoning, even where not specifically mentioned or cited below, in reaching the conclusions set forth below, except where additional evidence is specifically mentioned. This is especially true with respect to the Board of Supervisors’ approval of all mitigation measures, policies and implementation programs

recommended in the Final EIR, and the reasoning set forth in responses to comments in the Final EIR.

As noted, the Final EIR is incorporated into these Findings in its entirety. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of mitigation measures, the basis for determining the significance of impacts, the comparative analysis of alternatives, and the reasons for approving the project in spite of the potential for associated significant and unavoidable adverse impacts. In the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted below, such a mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure does not accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the policies and implementation measures as set forth in the Final EIR shall control, unless the language of the policies and implementation measures has been specifically and expressly modified by these findings. Where the language of such measures differs between the Final EIR and these findings, the more stringent language shall control. The Board of Supervisors provides this direction in order to ensure that any such discrepancy shall be regarded as inadvertent, and shall not be regarded as an effort by the Board of Supervisors to undermine its commitment to adopt mitigation measures as necessary to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects of the Project.

These findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the Board of Supervisors regarding the environmental impacts of the Project and the mitigation measures included as part of the Final EIR and adopted by the Board of Supervisors as part of the project. To avoid duplication and redundancy, and because the Board of Supervisors agrees with, and hereby adopts, the conclusions in the Final EIR, these findings will not always repeat the analysis and conclusions in the Final EIR, but instead incorporates them by reference herein and relied upon them as substantial evidence supporting these findings.

In making these findings, the Board of Supervisors has considered the opinions of other agencies and members of the public. The Board of Supervisors finds that the determination of significance thresholds is a judgment decision within the discretion of the Board of Supervisors; the significance thresholds used in the EIR are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the expert opinion of the EIR preparers and County staff; and the significance thresholds used in the EIR provide reasonable and appropriate means of assessing the significance of the adverse environmental effects of the Project. Thus, although, as a legal matter, the Board of Supervisors is not bound by the significance determinations in the EIR (see Pub. Resources Code, § 21082.2, subd. (e)), except as expressly set forth in these findings, the Board of Supervisors finds these significance thresholds persuasive and hereby adopts them as its own.

These findings summarize the environmental determinations of the Final EIR and project's potentially significant impacts before and after mitigation. The findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, the findings provide a summary description of each impact, set forth the mitigation measures identified to reduce or avoid the impact, and state the Board of Supervisors' findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted project's provisions and the

recommended mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final EIR and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR supporting the Final EIR's determination regarding the project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Board of Supervisors ratifies, adopts and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

**LEGAL EFFECT OF FINDINGS**

These Findings constitute the County's evidentiary and policy basis for its decision to approve the project in a manner consistent with CEQA. To the extent that these Findings conclude that various proposed mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded, or withdrawn, Placer County binds the project applicant to implement these measures. These Findings are not merely informational, but constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when Placer County approves the Park at Granite Bay project (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(b)). The mitigation measures identified as feasible and within the County's authority to require implementation for the approved project are incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project and must be satisfied/implemented by the project applicant. Placer County, upon review of the Final EIR (which includes the Draft EIR) and based on all the information and evidence in the administrative record, hereby makes the Findings set forth herein.

**DEFINITIONS**

The following definitions apply where the subject words or abbreviations are used in these Findings:

“CEQA” means the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.).

“CDRA” means the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency.

“Condition” means a Condition of Approval adopted by the County in connection with approval of the project.

“Corps” means the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

“County” means Placer County.

“Draft EIR” means the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Park at Granite Bay project.

“DPW” means the Placer County Department of Public Works.

“DRC” means the Placer County Development Review Committee.

“ECS” means the Placer County Environmental Coordination Services Division.

“EIR” means environmental impact report.

“Environmental Health” means the Placer County Department of Health and Human Services, Environmental Health Division.

“Environmental Review Ordinance” means the Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance, as codified in Chapter 18 of the Placer County Code.

“ERC” means the Placer County Environmental Review Committee.

“ESD” means the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department.

“Final EIR” means the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Park at Granite Bay project.

“General Plan” means the Placer County General Plan, as adopted in 1994 with subsequent amendments.

“Granite Bay Community Plan” or “Community Plan” means the Granite Bay Community Plan, as updated by Board of Supervisors in 2012, and subsequent amendments.

“MMRP” means the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the proposed project.

“NOP” means Notice of Preparation of an EIR.

“Placer County APCD or PCAPCD” means the Placer County Air Pollution Control District.

“Planning Commission” means the Placer County Planning Commission.

“Planning Division” means the Placer County Planning Division.

“Proposed project” means the currently proposed Park at Granite Bay.

“RWQCB” means the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

“SMD 2” means Placer County Sewer Maintenance District No. 2.

“Zoning Ordinance” means the Placer County Code, Chapter 17, including all amendments thereto.

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project proposes a residential subdivision of 56 single-family residential units on a 16.3-acre project site in the community of Granite Bay in Placer County, California. Ingress/egress to the project site would be provided by a single gated access at the project’s midpoint along Sierra College Boulevard. The gate would remain open from dawn to dusk in order to allow public access to the 0.81-acre neighborhood park proposed as part of the project. There would also be a gated secondary access point to Eckerman Road that that would be available for use only by emergency vehicles or by area residents during an emergency. The 56 residential units would be a mix of one- and two-story homes on lot sizes ranging from 7,150 square feet to 17,196 square feet.

Residential units along Sierra College Boulevard would be buffered by landscape setbacks and sound walls. The project would include a 15-foot wide landscape buffer easement on the north, south and west sides of the development to provide a visual buffer for the existing neighboring properties. Project construction would require cut/fill grading to prepare the site for construction activities and would include installation of a water quality detention basin on the northwest side of the project to regulate peak stormwater flows from the project site.

## **PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

The following are the project applicant’s stated objectives for the proposed project:

- Provide the Granite Bay community with a project sized in the 56-unit range, with lot sizes comparable to those in the nearby Annabelle Avenue neighborhood, which will provide new sustainably designed housing opportunities for young and empty nest families alike.
- Provide considerable opportunity for new students to be generated for local schools with significant declining enrollments, along with significant school mitigation fees for school facilities.
- Provide a park open to the public that is of a sufficient size to accommodate youth sports practices.
- Provide sufficient housing opportunities on lots that can accommodate a variety of activities for young families, consistent with the requirements of State Housing law, assisting the County to achieve its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).
- Provide a project satisfying the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint principles in terms of proximity to a major transportation corridor, with quality design including energy efficiency, and on-site recreational amenities.

- Create a distinct sense of arrival and attractive gateway to Granite Bay from the Sierra College Boulevard corridor.
- Replace a long-standing undeveloped property with market ready, economically productive uses that strengthen the tax base.
- Create a sustainable development that maximizes opportunities for energy efficiency, water conservation, recycling, and use of renewable energy systems.
- Establish a walkable residential development.
- Improve an existing, localized flooding problem in the Eckerman Road area with infrastructure improvements/storm drainage improvements.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

- A Notice of Preparation and Initial Study (NOP/IS) for the EIR was filed with the State Clearinghouse on February 6, 2015. The 30-day public review comment period for the NOP/IS ended on March 9, 2015. The purpose of the NOP/IS was to provide responsible agencies and interested persons with sufficient information describing the project and its potential environmental effects to enable them to make a meaningful response as to the scope and content of the information to be included in the EIR. The project described in the February 2015 NOP/IS provided for 84 medium-density residential units on approximately 16.3 acres, including a publicly accessible 1.4-acre park, and approximately 2.5 acres of other green space consisting of a tot lot, a community paseo trail leading to a rose garden, and perimeter landscaped buffer lots. The NOP/IS was distributed in particular to governmental agencies, organizations, and persons interested in the proposed project. The County sent the NOP/IS to agencies with statutory responsibilities in connection with the project with the request for their input on the scope and content of the environmental information that should be addressed in the EIR. The NOP/IS was also published on the County's website and filed at the County Clerk's Office.
- A public scoping meeting for the EIR was held on February 25, 2015 in order to determine the scope and content of the environmental information that the responsible or trustee agencies may require, and also to accept public comment. Comments received during the scoping meeting, as well as those received during the public comment period for the NOP/IS, were considered during the preparation of the Draft EIR.
- A Notice of Completion (NOC) and copies of the Draft EIR were filed with the State Clearinghouse on December 30, 2015. An official 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR was established by the State Clearinghouse, ending on February 16, 2016. A Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR was published in the Sacramento Bee on December 31, 2015 and agencies, all property owners within the project area, and property owners within 300 feet of the property area were mailed notice of the

document's availability. The DEIR was also published on the County's website and filed at the County Clerk's office.

- Copies of the Draft EIR were available for review at the following locations:

Placer County  
Environmental Coordination Services Department  
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190  
Auburn, CA

Granite Bay Public Library  
6475 Douglas Blvd  
Granite Bay, CA

Loomis Public Library  
6050 Library Drive  
Loomis, CA

Rocklin Public Library  
4890 Granite Drive  
Rocklin, CA

Roseville Public Library  
225 Taylor Street  
Roseville, CA

- A public hearing to receive testimony on the Draft EIR was held before the County's Planning Commission on January 28, 2016. The public comment period for the Draft EIR closed on February 16, 2016. The transcript from the Planning Commission hearing is included in the Final EIR as Comment Letter T1.
- In addition to the public noticing required under CEQA, the project was also discussed at the Granite Bay Municipal Advisory Council (MAC).

## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

In accordance with CEQA Section 21167.6(e), the record of proceedings for the County's decision on the Park at Granite Bay project includes, without limitation, the following documents:

- The Initial Study prepared for the project;
- The Notice of Preparation (NOP) and all other public notices issued by the County in conjunction with the proposed project;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the NOP (provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR);

- The Draft EIR (December 2015) for the proposed project;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the Draft EIR;
- All comments and correspondence submitted to the County with respect to the proposed project, in addition to timely comments on the Draft EIR;
- The Final EIR (May 2016) for the proposed project, including comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments;
- Documents cited or referenced in the Draft and Final EIRs;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed project;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the County in connection with the project and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the project prepared by the County, consultants to the County, the applicant, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the County's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the County's action on the proposed project;
- All documents submitted to the County (including the Planning Commission) by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the project up through the close of the final public hearing on the proposed project;
- Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts, as available, of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the County in connection with the proposed project;
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the County at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings;
- Relevant portions of the Placer County Zoning Ordinance and Environmental Review Ordinance (Placer County Code, Chapters 17 and 18), and all other County Code provisions cited in materials prepared by or submitted to the County;
- Relevant portions of the Granite Bay Community Plan prepared in connection with the adoption of that plan;
- Any other materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e).

The County 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 County. Without exception,

any documents set forth above not so presented fall into one of two categories. Many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions with which the County was aware in approving the Project. Other documents influenced the expert advice provided to Planning Department 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 County's decisions relating to the adoption of the Project.

The record of proceedings does not include documents or other materials subject to the attorney/client privilege, the common-interest doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, or other privileges recognized by statute or common law. Administrative draft documents that were prepared at the County's direction, but were not provided to the public or other agencies, and intra-County communications with respect to such administrative draft documents, are not part of the record of proceedings; rather, such documents reflect the County's deliberative process, and reflect initial drafts of documents that later appeared in final form in the record of proceedings. Because these initial working drafts do not reflect the final evidence and analysis relied upon by the County, they are not part of the record of proceedings. In adopting these findings, the County does not waive its right to assert applicable privileges.

The public hearing transcript, a copy of all letters regarding the Draft EIR received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the Final EIR, as well as additional materials concerning approval of the Project and adoption of these findings are contained in County files, and are available for review by responsible agencies and interested members of the public during normal business hours at the Placer County. The official custodian of the documents comprising the record of proceedings is the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency Director, whose office is located at 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 140, Auburn, CA 95603.

## **DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15092(b) requires the findings associated with the significant impacts of the project that are either: (1) mitigated to a less than significant level pursuant to the mitigation measures identified in the EIR; or (2) mitigation measures notwithstanding, have a residual significant impact that requires a Statement of Overriding Consideration be supported by substantial evidence in the Administrative Record, which includes the documents, materials, and other evidence listed in the preceding section. The following sections provide an overview of the conclusions reached via analysis of the substantial evidence. The evidence in support of the findings is organized into the following sections. As identified in the Final EIR, there are no significant and unavoidable impacts that would require the preparation of a Statement of Overriding Considerations under CEQA Guidelines Section 15093.

- 1) Findings for Less Than Significant Impacts (or No Impacts)
- 2) Findings for Significant, Potentially Significant, and Cumulatively Significant Impacts Reduced to Less Than Significant Through Mitigation Measures
- 3) Findings for Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

- 4) Findings Associated with Project Alternatives
- 5) Other Impacts and Considerations
- 6) Findings and State of Facts Supporting The Findings
- 7) Incorporation by Reference
- 8) Recirculation Not Required
- 9) Summary
- 10) Approvals

**1. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS (OR NO IMPACTS) IDENTIFIED IN THE FINAL EIR**

The Board of Supervisors agrees with the characterization in the Initial Study, Draft EIR, and Final EIR with respect to all impacts identified as “no impact” or “less than significant” and finds that those impacts have been described accurately and are less than significant as so described in the Final EIR.

This finding applies to the following impacts evaluated in the Initial Study, Draft EIR, and Final EIR and determined to be “less than significant.”

**AESTHETICS**

**Initial Study**

- **I-1: Substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.** The project will be located along one major roadway corridor: Sierra College Boulevard to the east. While the corridor features scenic vistas in various locations, the portion of the corridor in the vicinity of the project site does not appear visually distinct or sensitive and is not designated a scenic corridor. Therefore the project would no impact on a scenic vista.

Finding

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

- **I-2: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway.** The Arborist’s Report (TRC, July, 2014) prepared for the project indicated a total of 45 trees which would be removed from the project site. The trees to be removed are typical for the surrounding area and are not particularly scenic. The project site does not contain any significant rock outcroppings. Additionally, the project site does not contain any historic resources. There are no other potentially scenic resources on the project site. Furthermore, while there are four eligible state scenic highways within Placer County,

there are no officially-designated state scenic highways near the project site or within Placer County. Because there are no scenic resources without or in close proximity to the project site, the project would have no impact on scenic resources.

Finding

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

**Draft and Final EIRs**

- **Impact 3.2-1: Implementation of the proposed project could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.** During construction, some activities would be visible from the public right of way along Sierra College Boulevard and from private residences to the north, south, and west of the project site. Construction of the perimeter fencing would reduce the visual effects of construction on the project site. The project would result in a substantial alteration to the visual character of the project site. However, consistent with the Granite Bay Community Plan Community Design Guidelines, the project would incorporate design features, including the use of natural building materials (e.g., masonry, stucco, concrete, wood and stone) and a perimeter landscaped buffer easement, perimeter fencing, and soundwalls. These design features would be encapsulated in recommended conditions of approval for the hearing body to review. In addition, the project design elements would be subject to Design/Site Review prior to approval of submitted improvement plans. Design/Site Review includes onsite landscaping, soundwall, perimeter fencing, as well as the exterior lighting, circulation and signage. The Design/Site Review process, as well as the incorporation of project design features into conditions of approval, would ensure that the proposed development of the project site would result in a less-than-significant impact to the visual character of the site and its surroundings.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.2-3: Construction of the proposed project could contribute to a cumulative impact related to a substantial degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.** During construction activities, the project sites may not be screened, and neighboring uses as well as passersby would potentially see construction equipment and activities. However, due to the distance between project sites analyzed for the cumulative condition, the presence of intervening structures between the project sites, and the temporary nature of construction activities, construction activities would not cause an adverse change in visual character. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.2-4: Operation of the proposed project could contribute to a cumulative impact related to a substantial degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.** While development of the cumulative projects in the Granite Bay community would result in conversion of vacant land to developed land, the projects, including the proposed project, would develop new residential development types that would be well designed and consistent with other residential developments in the larger project vicinity. Development patterns would include landscaping and setbacks that would both screen the proposed development from the adjacent neighbors and provide a transition space from existing surrounding rural residential lots. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.2-5: Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to a cumulative impact related to the creation of a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.** Like the proposed project, all new development would be required to conform to the guidelines and policies contained in the Placer County Code, the Granite Bay Community Plan design guidelines, as well as the Placer County Design Guidelines, which would result in implementation of lighting design and use of non-reflective building surfaces so as to avoid any adverse light and glare impacts on sensitive receptors. Therefore, as the geographic area is located within a rural context, projects would conform to the design guidelines contained in the applicable planning documents, there would not be a significant adverse cumulative effect with regard to light from development of cumulative projects, and the cumulative impact related to lighting would be less than significant. In addition, impacts on glare resulting from the project and other cumulative development would be localized and would not combine with existing neighboring residential developments to result in a significant cumulative impact related to glare. Therefore, the cumulative impact with regards to glare would be less than significant.

Finding

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

---

 AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES
**Initial Study**

- **II-1: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.** According to the California Department of Conservation (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), the project site is not located on land considered prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide or local importance (DOC, 2013a). Thus, the project would not convert important farmland and there would be no impact.

Finding

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

- **II-4: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).** Neither the project site nor adjacent areas are zoned for timberland, forest land, or timberland production zones. Therefore, development of the project site would not create a conflict for any timberland or forest land. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

## AIR QUALITY

**Initial Study**

- **III-5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.** The project would not result in the development of land uses associated with the creation of substantial odors (such as a wastewater treatment plant, rendering plant, composting facility, asphalt batch plant, etc.), nor would the project locate odor-sensitive receptors in the proximity of substantially odiferous land uses. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Finding

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

## Draft and Final EIRs

- **Impact 3.4-1: The proposed project could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.** General conformity requirements of the Plan include whether the project would contribute to new violations of NAAQS, increase the frequency or severity of an existing violation of any NAAQS, or delay timely attainment of any NAAQS. The proposed project’s short-term construction emissions and long-term operational emissions would not exceed the PCAPCD’s project-level thresholds of significance, even considering that the project would develop more residential units than allowed under the site’s current zoning. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, and the impact would be less than significant.

### Finding

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

- **Impact 3.4-3: Operational activities associated with the proposed project could generate emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> that would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.** Over the long-term, the project would result in an increase in emissions of ozone precursors, ROG, and NO<sub>x</sub>, primarily due to project related motor vehicle trips and onsite area and energy sources. The project is required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations, and incorporates design features to address operational air quality (see Draft EIR, Appendix F). As discussed in Draft EIR, Chapter 3.4, the proposed project’s long-term, operational-related criteria pollutant emissions would be below the PCAPCD thresholds of significance during both the summer and winter conditions (under both the adjusted and unadjusted scenarios) for ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>. Therefore, operational activities associated with the project would not substantially contribute to the PCAPCD’s nonattainment status for ozone or PM. This impact would be less-than-significant.

### Finding

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

- **Impact 3.4-4: Traffic associated with proposed project operations could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.** CO is a localized pollutant of concern. According to the PCAPCD, CO concentrations should be analyzed at intersections in the vicinity of a project if the LOS would be degraded from acceptable (i.e., A, B, C, or D) to unacceptable (i.e., E or F), or if a project would result in the addition of traffic that would substantially worsen (delay of 10 seconds or more) already unacceptable intersections. The greatest average intersection delay with the addition of project traffic would be up to five-seconds during the “Cumulative plus Project” AM and PM peak hours at the Sierra College Boulevard and Old Auburn Road intersection, which

already operates at unacceptable LOS. Therefore, because the delay is less than 10 seconds, the project would not substantially worsen already unacceptable intersections. No sources of substantial TACs would be associated with operation of the proposed project. However, because the project would introduce sensitive receptors, an assessment of compatibility with surrounding land uses with respect to TAC emissions is provided. There are no nearby industrial areas in the vicinity of the proposed project. The primary source of TACs that could affect the project would be on-road mobile sources on nearby surface streets. CARB recommends avoiding siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of urban roads with more than 100,000 vehicles per day without a health risk screening analysis. According to the traffic report for the proposed project, Sierra College Blvd is estimated to carry approximately 54,000 ADT under cumulative conditions. These traffic volumes would be less than screening recommendations for land use compatibility, and this impact would be less-than-significant.

#### Finding

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

- **Impact 3.4-6: The proposed project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).** As indicated in Table 3.4-9 in Chapter 3-4 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project's operational related emissions impacts would be at or below cumulative thresholds of significance set by PCAPCD (10 lbs. per day) for ROG and NOx during both the summer and winter in the adjusted scenario. Therefore, operational activities associated with the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. The cumulative impact would be less than significant.

#### Finding

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

## BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

### Initial Study

- **IV-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands.** A formal arborist survey was conducted for the project site in December 2013 and July 2014 (TRC, 2014c). Approximately 20 native oak trees were identified interspersed with a few native and many non-native trees. When viewed from the landscape perspective, oak trees within the project site do not exhibit an oak woodland character in terms of the structure and composition that is typical of Blue Oak Woodland,

Valley Oak Woodland, or Blue Oak-Foothill Pine habitat as described by the California Wildlife Habitat Relationship (CWHR) habitat classification scheme (Mayer and Laudenslayer, 1988). Thus, there would be no adverse impact to oak woodlands through habitat conversion and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- IV-8: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.** The proposed Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP) is a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and a Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) under the California Natural Community Conservation Planning Act. To date, a final draft has not been published or adopted. Placer County is a PCCP participating entity, but the project site is within the non-participating city influence area (“CIA”) (Placer County, 2011). Nonetheless, the project would meet the overarching goals of the PCCP by concentrating development in a “transitional” area of the County instead of in more pristine areas that may have higher ecological value and higher occurrences of protected species and habitats. Thus, the project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Finding

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

## CULTURAL RESOURCES

### Initial Study

- V-5: Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area.** There is no known evidence of existing religious or sacred uses on the project site or the surrounding areas. Therefore, the project would not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

## GEOLOGY AND SOILS

**Initial Study**

- **VI-3: Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features.** The project site features a gently rolling topography. The project site would generally be leveled to promote site drainage, though there would be grade differentials between lots. The preliminary grading plan for the project indicates that earthwork quantities (cut and fill) would balance, which indicates that topography would not be substantially changed by the proposed project. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **VI-4: Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features.** The geotechnical report prepared for the project (MPE, July 24, 2014) described the project site and its geology. Nothing in the report indicates the existence of any unique geologic or physical features. Therefore, there would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **VI-6: Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake.** The project site does not contain and is not adjacent to any rivers, streams, or lakes. Therefore, there would be no changes to the channels of a river, stream, or lake and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

## GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

**Draft and Final EIRs**

- **Impact 3.5-1: Construction and operation of the proposed project could generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant, cumulative impact on the environment or that would conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation of an appropriate regulatory agency adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.** Based on the methodology described

Draft EIR, Chapter 3.5, annual construction emissions during the years 2016, 2017, and 2018 were estimated to be approximately 410 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>, 447 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>, and 291 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>, respectively. Annual construction emissions for the project would not exceed the PCAPCD significance threshold of 1,100 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year. In addition, the project includes design features that address operational greenhouse gas emissions including consistency with State of California and Granite Bay Community Plan energy and water efficiency requirements. Thus both construction and operational emissions would be below significance threshold of 1,100 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year. Therefore these impacts would be less-than-significant.

Finding

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

## HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

### Initial Study

- **VIII-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials.** Construction of the project could involve the limited use of hazardous chemicals, including fuel for construction equipment, oil, and lubricants. Operation of the project could include the use of common household chemicals, including paint, solvents, oil, and fuel. The transportation, use, and disposal of these materials would be subject to local, state, and federal laws, as well as Placer County General Plan Safety Element policies intended to minimize the risk of exposure to hazardous materials. Consistency with these laws and policies would limit hazards to the public from the transportation, use, and disposal of these materials. Because the use of hazardous materials would be incidental to the operation of the proposed 56 homes that would be located in the project, the amount of hazardous materials that would be used would be small. While the project would involve the transportation, use, and disposal of limited small amounts of hazardous materials, compliance with local, state, and federal regulations and County policies would ensure that the project would result in less than significant impacts and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **VIII-2: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.** Construction of the project could involve the limited use of hazardous chemicals, including fuel for construction equipment, oil, and lubricants. Operation of the project could include the use of common household

chemicals, including paint, solvents, oil, and fuel. The transportation, use, and disposal of these materials would be subject to local, state, and federal laws, as well as Placer County General Plan Safety Element policies intended to minimize the risk of exposure to hazardous materials. Consistency with these laws and policies would limit hazards to the public from the transportation, use, and disposal of these materials. Because the use of hazardous materials would be incidental to the operation of the proposed 56 homes that would be located in the project, the amount of hazardous materials that would be used would be small. While the project would involve the transportation, use, and disposal of limited small amounts of hazardous materials, compliance with local, state, and federal regulations and County policies would ensure that the project would result in less than significant impacts and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **VIII-3: Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.** Construction and operation of the project could emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school (Granite Bay Montessori School). However, the use of any potentially hazardous materials would be subject to local, state, and federal laws, as well as Placer County General Plan Safety Element policies intended to minimize the risk of exposure to hazardous materials. Because the use of hazardous materials would be incidental to the residential uses in the proposed project, the amount of hazardous materials that would be used would be very small. While the project would involve the transportation, use, and disposal of very small amounts of hazardous materials, compliance with local, state, and federal regulations and County policies would ensure that the project would result in less-than-significant impacts and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **VIII-4: Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.** The project site is not on any list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (DTSC, 2014). The nearest listed site is the Roseville Railyards site located approximately 3.5 miles northwest of the project site. Additionally, a comprehensive review of aerial imagery dating from 1938 determined the site was not used for crop production. Because the project site is not listed on any list of hazardous material sites and there is no evidence of previous uses that would have contaminated the project site, the project would have no impact related to hazardous materials sites.

Finding

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

- **VIII-5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.** The closest public airport or private airstrip is Pruett private airfield located approximately 5.6 miles west of the project site. McClellan Airfield is located approximately 9.7 miles southwest of the project site, on the site of the former McClellan Air Force Base, and is currently owned and operated by Sacramento County Economic Development (Sacramento County, 2014). Because the project is not within an airport land use area or within two miles of any airstrip, the project would have no impact related to safety risks associated with public airports or private airstrips and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **VIII-6: For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area.** The closest public airport or private airstrip is Pruett private airfield located approximately 5.6 miles west of the project site. McClellan Airfield is located approximately 9.7 miles southwest of the project site, on the site of the former McClellan Air Force Base, and is currently owned and operated by Sacramento County Economic Development (Sacramento County, 2014). Because the project is not within an airport land use area or within two miles of any airstrip, the project would have no impact related to safety risks associated with public airports or private airstrips and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **VIII-7: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.** The project site is within an area characterized by low-density residential development. Furthermore, the project site is not in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone as determined by California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's Fire and Resource Assessment Program (CalFire, 2008). Because the project site is in a developed area and not within a high fire hazard zone, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death

due to wildland fire. Therefore, there would be no impact related to wildland fire and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

## HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

### Initial Study

- **IX-1: Violate any federal, state or county potable water quality standards.** The project would involve the construction of 56 new homes, with associated landscaping and a small park, which would be served potable water by the San Juan Water District. This development would not damage any existing water facilities or infrastructure. Further, there is no water infrastructure located on site that would be affected by the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not interfere with potable water delivery, and additionally, would not result in substantial degradation of groundwater quality or surface water quality, such that potable water quality standards would be violated. This impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **IX-7: Otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality.** The project could result in the release of pollutants into natural waters, during construction and operation. However, these potential pollutant releases would be minimized via implementation of BMPs and other measures that would be required under the General Construction Permit and the MS4 Permit. Pollutant control measures are anticipated to be sufficient to protect both surface water and groundwater from significant degradation. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **IX-8: Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.** The project site is not located within or adjacent to a floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Furthermore, as explained in the Final EIR, the project is not subject to SB 5's requirement to make a finding regarding the project's Urban Level of Flood Protection because it is not located

within a flood hazard zone that is mapped as either a special hazard area or an area of moderate hazard on FEMA's FIRM for the National Flood Insurance Program, nor is the project located in an area with a potential flood depth of three feet. Therefore, the project would not result in the placement of housing or other structures within a floodplain, and would not redirect or impede flood flows. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **IX-9: Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows.** The project site is not located within or adjacent to a floodplain as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Therefore, the project would not result in the placement of housing or other structures within a floodplain, and would not redirect or impede flood flows. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **IX-10: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.** No levees or dams are located within or in close proximity to the project site. Additionally, the project would not cause or result disturbance or interference with a levee or dam. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to potential loss, injury, or death involving the failure of a levee or dam, because the project would not directly or indirectly affect any such structure. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **IX-12: Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake.** Stormwater would be discharged from the project site. However, stormwater discharge would not flow into Folsom Lake or into any of the other water bodies listed above. Additionally, as discussed for Items IX-5, 6, potential water quality impacts would be minimized via adherence to permit conditions. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

**Draft and Final EIRs**

- Impact 3.7-1: Implementation of the proposed project could degrade surface water quality or contribute runoff water which could include substantial additional sources of polluted water.** The delivery, handling, and storage of construction materials and wastes, as well as the use of construction equipment, could result in stormwater contamination that could degrade water quality and result in the violation of a water quality standard. However, the implementation of the potential BMPs included in the SWPPP and the construction site inspection and monitoring, as required by the Construction General Permit (as discussed in Draft EIR, Chapter 3.7), would protect water quality to the maximum extent practicable throughout the entirety of the construction activities. As such, compliance with this existing regulatory requirement would ensure that construction impacts on water quality are less than significant. In addition, surface water runoff from the residential, park, and open space uses could result in pollutants conveyed in surface water flows. The proposed LID BMPs as well as the water quality treatment vault would reduce surface water pollution exiting the project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant long-term water quality impacts.

Mitigation Measures

Although water quality impacts during long-term operational activities would be less than significant with the implementation of the project including the water quality BMPs, further mitigation measures have been included to further reduce the less than significant water quality impacts during operational activities.

*3.7-1(a): The Improvement Plans shall show that drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting runoff on individual lots, are designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Stormwater Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and shall comply with applicable stormwater quality standards, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD). These facilities shall be constructed with subdivision improvements. Prior to Final Subdivision Map(s) approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication as required by the ESD. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the homeowners' association and annual notification to the county that annual maintenance of the Stormwater Quality BMPs has occurred is required.*

*3.7-1(b): This project is located within the permit area covered by Placer County's Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit No. CAS000004, Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ), pursuant to the NPDES Phase II program. Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said*

*permit. The project shall implement permanent and operational source control measures. These source control measures could include the proposed grass lined swales, vegetated detention basin, and disconnected roof drains as well as the water quality treatment vault. The water quality BMPs shall be designed for pollutant generating activities or sources consistent with recommendations from the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook for New Development and Redevelopment, or equivalent manual, and shall be shown on the Improvement Plans. The project is required to implement Low Impact Development (LID) standards designed to reduce runoff, treat stormwater, and provide baseline hydromodification management to the extent feasible. Except for the proposed vault, the source control measures identified above (i.e., grass lined swales, vegetated detention basin, and disconnected roof drains) are LID measures.*

*3.7-1(c): The Improvement Plan submittal for the project shall include a final drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual as well as the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the Engineering and Surveying Division for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used during long-term operational water quality protection. Long-term BMPs such as grass lined swales, vegetated detention basin, disconnected roof drains, and a water quality treatment vault for the entrapment of sediment, debris, and oils/greases or other identified pollutants shall be implemented.*

*3.7-1(d): The Improvement Plans shall show that the water quality treatment facilities/Best Management Practices (BMPs) are designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for New Development and Redevelopment (or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD)). Storm drainage from on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through BMPs such as grass lined swales, vegetated detention basin, and disconnected roof drains as well as a water quality treatment vault for the entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD). BMPs shall be designed 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, or other County approved methodology. No water quality facility construction shall 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 insure effectiveness. BMPs shall be designed in accordance with the West Placer Stormwater Quality Design Manual or other County approved methodology. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to the Placer County Engineering and Survey*

*Division upon request. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees.*

Finding

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.) Even after implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.7-1(a) through 3.7-1(d) listed above, construction and long-term operational water quality impacts would remain less than significant.

- **Impact 3.7-2: The proposed project could substantially deplete groundwater supplies, interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, or alter the direction or rate of groundwater flow.** Overall, infiltration is limited due to the Hydrologic Group D soils and the underlying major geologic formations onsite, percolation of water into the soil does occur. Temporary construction activities, which would not include construction-related groundwater extraction, would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The introduction of impervious surfaces to the project site would reduce the total area where percolation can occur; however, given that onsite soil infiltration is low, little recharge occurs within Placer County, and the project includes open space areas where percolation would still occur, project operation would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. In addition, project operation would not involve groundwater well drilling or extraction, and thus the project would not alter the direction or rate of groundwater flow. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.7-5: Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to cumulative degradation of water quality or contribute runoff water which could include substantial additional sources of polluted water.** Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with future development within the Dry Creek Watershed could contribute to a cumulative degradation of water quality due to the generation of pollutants from construction and operational activities and as a result of increased urban runoff. The project as well as future development within the Dry Creek Watershed are subject to the General Construction Permit, which require the implementation of a SWPPP and BMPs to reduce water pollution to the maximum extent practicable during construction activities. In addition, future development within the Dry Creek Watershed are subject to the NPDES municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) permit and associated BMPs to reduce storm water pollutants during operational activities. These measures are effective at reducing the pollutant load from new developments, though they do not eliminate water pollution entirely. Given the existing regulatory requirements for development projects within the watershed and the efficacy of standard BMPs, the cumulative water quality impact is considered less than significant.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.7-6: Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to a substantial cumulative depletion of groundwater supplies, cumulatively interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, or cumulatively alter the direction or rate of groundwater flow.** Development in the North American Groundwater sub-basin area would result in the creation of new impervious surfaces by converting undeveloped land to developed uses. Under natural conditions, less than five percent of total recharge to the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin is attributable to Placer County. Much of western Placer County, including the proposed project, consists of Hydrologic Group D soils, which are characterized by high runoff and low infiltration potential. The major geologic formations that underlie western Placer County also impede infiltration of rainwater and irrigation water. Areas outside of Placer County and in the Dry Creek Watershed and underlain by the North American Groundwater sub-basin have similar conditions. As such, cumulative effects to groundwater such as the alteration of the direction or rate of groundwater flow would be less than significant.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.7-7: Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to a cumulative substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area.** Construction activities associated with the project and cumulative projects that involve grading, excavation, building construction, and other activities could alter existing drainage patterns. As described on page 3.1-21 of the Draft EIR, the general slope and landform of the site would be similar to that under existing conditions and the project would retain the existing drainage patterns so that runoff would enter and exit the site at the same location and the project would not increase off-site runoff peak flows. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-3, the localized flooding that currently occurs on the project site as well as the offsite parcels along Eckerman Road would be reduced. As a result, the project's contribution to the cumulative alteration of an existing drainage pattern during construction would be less than cumulatively considerable and thus less than significant. Operational activities associated with the project would not contribute to a potential, substantial, cumulative, drainage pattern alterations because the project would retain storm water flows onsite prior to release to offsite in the same general area as existing flows. Therefore, the project's contribution to the potential cumulative alteration of existing drainage patterns would be less than cumulatively considerable during operational activities, and thus less than significant.

Finding

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

- Impact 3.7-8: Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff.** Construction activities associated with the project and cumulative projects that involve grading, excavation, building construction, and other activities could alter the rate and amount of runoff from a project site. This alteration could occur from redirecting surface flows while constructing. As described on page 3.1-21 of the Draft EIR, the general slope and landform of the site would be similar to that under existing conditions and the project would retain the existing drainage patterns so that runoff would enter and exit the site at the same location and the project would not increase off-site runoff peak flows. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-3, the surface water flow from the project site to offsite would be retained by a temporary detention basin, and reduce the rate and volume of stormwater exiting the project site. As a result, the project's contribution to the cumulative increase in the rate and amount of surface runoff would be less than cumulatively considerable and thus less than significant. Operational activities associated with the project would not contribute to a cumulative increase in the rate and volume of runoff during storm events because the project would retain peak concentration storm water flows onsite prior to releasing the flows offsite. The peak stormwater flows would be released offsite at a rate and volume less than the existing flows. Therefore, the project's contribution to the potential cumulative increase in the rate and volume of runoff would be less than cumulatively considerable during operational activities, and thus less than significant.

#### Finding

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

## LAND USE AND PLANNING

### Initial Study

- X-1: Physically divide an established community.** The project site is located in an island area of unincorporated Placer County which represents a "transitional area" between lower density residential uses further east in the Granite Bay community and suburban density residential and other urbanized uses in the surrounding portions of the City of Roseville. The immediate project vicinity is developed primarily with low-density, single-family residential uses, many of which are rural in character. The site is located within the City of Roseville sphere of influence (SOI). Development of the project site would not divide an established community or disrupt an established community by limiting or eliminating public access to or across the project site. The site is currently fenced and is private property, and does not currently allow for public access to or across the project site. Development of the project would provide public access to

the project site by providing a public roadway connection along Sierra College Boulevard, providing new pedestrian access through the project site by constructing sidewalks and paseos, and providing a publicly accessible park and tot lot. Although the project would develop residential uses that are denser than similar uses in the surrounding area, the project would not divide or disrupt the physical arrangement of an established community. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **X-6: Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community).** The project site is located in an area of unincorporated Placer County which represents a “transitional area” between lower density residential uses further east in the Granite Bay community and suburban density residential and other urbanized uses in the surrounding portions of the City of Roseville. The immediate project vicinity is developed primarily with low-density, single-family residential uses, many of which are rural in character. The site is located within the City of Roseville sphere of influence (SOI). Development of the project site would not divide an established community or disrupt an established community by limiting or eliminating public access to or across the project site. The site is currently fenced and is private property, and does not currently allow for public access to or across the project site. Development of the project would provide public access to the project site by providing a public roadway connection along Sierra College Boulevard, providing new pedestrian access through the project site by constructing sidewalks and paseos, and providing a publicly accessible park and tot lot. Although the project would develop residential uses that are denser than similar uses in the surrounding area, the project would not divide or disrupt the physical arrangement of an established community. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **X-8: Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration.** The project would add residential uses in an area planned for residential development and surrounded by areas of varying densities of residential development. The project would be constructed in a transitional area of the County that is characterized by a range of residential densities, including a number of large lot residences. There is no evidence to suggest that development of the project site could develop residential uses to such a degree that it would draw residents away from other residential areas resulting in the abandonment and subsequent urban decay of existing residential areas. In addition, the

project would not develop retail commercial space, and therefore, would not result in the development of retail uses that would result in increased vacancy rates or abandonment of commercial spaces in the project vicinity, resulting in urban decay. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

**Draft and Final EIRs**

- **Impact 3.1-1: Implementation of the proposed project could conflict with policies of the Placer County General Plan.** Although the project is inconsistent with the current zoning and land use designation, the project proposes a general plan amendment and rezoning which could render the project as proposed consistent with the applicable goals and policies of the General Plan s. The project is not isolated or remote as it is surrounded by rural residential and suburban development uses, and is located in close proximity to major transportation corridors, such as Douglas Boulevard and Sierra College Boulevard. These corridors support higher density residential development. In addition, the project has been designed to be similar in architectural character to the surrounding residences and compatible with the existing rural character of the area. Furthermore, the project would implement the goals in the General Plan to diversify the housing stock in the County. Because the project is consistent with the land use goals and policies in the Placer County General Plan, this impact would be less than significant.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.1-2: Implementation of the proposed project would conflict with policies of the Granite Bay Community Plan and could result in an alteration of the present or planned land use of an area.** The project would develop homes that would be of a similar size and scale to those located along Annabelle Avenue, and the homes located across Sierra College Boulevard to the east. The project includes plans for a 0.81 acre private park that would be accessible to the public during daylight hours. The project would be compatible with the area's natural features by incorporating the general slope and similar landform, as well as retaining existing drainage patterns. The project would be connected to existing utility infrastructure in Sierra College Boulevard, would be served by existing services, and would not result in a significant increase in demand for services or infrastructure. The project would require a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and a Variance. The Variance would be limited to only those single-story lots of less than 8,000 square feet. Subdivision Policy 5 states that "lots shall be adequate size and shape to accommodate those...uses which are in keeping with the particular residential characteristics of the specific location without...creating the need for variances."

However, the impetus for requesting the Variance is to help alleviate the perceived massing of the project from the perspective of the immediate neighbors, while allowing for larger single-story homes. Thus even though a variance is requested, the project would be consistent with the Granite Bay Community Plan for the reasons discussed above and for the reasons set forth in Tables 3.1-1 and 3.1-4 in the EIR. Although the project would be inconsistent with Policy 5 of the Granite Bay Community Plan, that inconsistency in and of itself does not result in an environmental impact. The project is consistent with all other applicable Community Plan policies and as a result, potential environmental impacts would be less than significant.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.1-3: Implementation of the proposed project could result in land uses that are incompatible with surrounding uses.** Implementation of the project would increase the density of residential development within a portion of the County island area of rural low density residential development. Medium-density residential uses are compatible with low-density residential uses. Furthermore, the project is designed so as to not be perceived from the public roadways as a medium-density development, with varying setbacks and perimeter landscaped buffers to screen the project from surrounding residences and reduce the potential for impacts to the rural residential character of the existing community. All landscaped areas would be required to comply with Placer County's Landscape Design Guidelines. These design features would be encapsulated into conditions of approval which would be available for review by the public and the hearing body prior to any approval of the project. Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the project applicant would be required to provide a final landscape plan for review and approval by the Placer County Planning Services Division. With inclusion of the above design features, which would become conditions of approval, this impact would be less than significant.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.1-4: Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to cumulatively considerable land use compatibility impacts in the surrounding project area.** Like the proposed project, all new development would be required to conform to the guidelines and policies contained in the Placer County Code, the Granite Bay Community Plan design guidelines, as well as the Placer County Design Guidelines, which would reduce or avoid land use compatibility conflicts. Therefore, because there are no projects in the vicinity of the site that could contribute to localized land use compatibility conflicts there would not be a significant adverse cumulative effect with regard to land use compatibility. The proposed project's incremental effect would not be

cumulatively considerable, as the project would be designed to reduce impacts on neighboring residential units to a less than significant level. The proposed project's contribution to the cumulative impact with regard to land use compatibility would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Finding

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

MINERAL RESOURCES

**Initial Study**

- **XI-1: The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.** The Placer County General Plan Granite Bay Community Plan does not feature any mapping of mineral resources but discusses that mineral deposits are widespread throughout Placer County. However, no known mineral resources that would be of value are known to occur on the project site or in its vicinity. The Granite Bay Community Plan mentions that no quarries or mining sites currently remain active in the Granite Bay Community Plan area. According to California Department of Conservation (DOC) maps, much of western Placer County, including the project site, is within a mineral resource zone (MRZ-4) of no known mineral resources (DOC, 1995). As a result, the project would not result in the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

Finding

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

- **XI-2: The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.** The Placer County General Plan Granite Bay Community Plan does not feature any mapping of mineral resources but discusses that mineral deposits are widespread throughout Placer County. However, no known mineral resources that would be of value are known to occur on the project site or in its vicinity. The Granite Bay Community Plan mentions that no quarries or mining sites currently remain active in the Granite Bay Community Plan area. According to California Department of Conservation (DOC) maps, much of western Placer County, including the project site, is within a mineral resource zone (MRZ-4) of no known mineral resources (DOC, 1995). As a result, the project would not result in the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

Finding

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

## NOISE

### Initial Study

- **XII-4: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.** The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip. Therefore, no impact would result.

#### Finding

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

- **XII-5: For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.** The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip. Therefore, no impact would result.

#### Finding

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

### Draft and Final EIRs

- **Impact 3.6-2: Implementation of the proposed project could result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.** Construction activities would occur only during allowable construction hours set by the County, and no nighttime construction activities would occur. Onsite construction activities could result in some perceptible groundborne vibration outside or inside residences adjacent to the project site. However, due to the type of construction equipment anticipated to be used on the project site and the distance between construction activities and adjacent offsite buildings, building damage is not likely to occur as a result of construction-related vibration. Although construction-related groundborne vibration may be perceptible to people adjacent to the project site, this effect would be temporary in nature and is expected to diminish as construction activities move from site grading and site preparation to building framing and finishing. No operational vibration is anticipated. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

#### Finding

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

- Impact 3.6-3: Implementation of the proposed project could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise at existing noise-sensitive land uses.** Development of the project would introduce additional traffic volumes to local roadways, particularly along Sierra College Boulevard. This would result in increased traffic noise levels that could potentially adversely affect adjacent noise-sensitive rural residential land uses. The traffic noise increases associated with the full build-out of the project would range between +0.03 and +0.04 dBA relative to existing conditions. This potential increase in noise along Sierra College Boulevard would be negligible and would not exceed the applied significance threshold. Consequently, existing noise-sensitive land uses located adjacent to Sierra College Boulevard would not be exposed to noise increases exceeding the significance thresholds and roadway traffic noise would be considered a less-than-significant impact. The project also includes the development of a community park, which is anticipated to include a bocce ball court and host regular soccer practices for mixed age groups. The nearest off-site existing residence is located approximately 180 feet to the south of the proposed park and would be exposed to a noise level of approximately 44 dBA Leq and 64 dBA Lmax, which would not exceed the Placer County Code non-transportation noise level criteria. Residential buildings to be developed as part of the project would also provide shielding which would further reduce off-site noise from the community park. Noise impacts associated with on-site recreational activities at the community park would be considered a less-than-significant impact.

#### Finding

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

## POPULATION AND HOUSING

### Initial Study

- XIII-1: Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure).** Under the existing land use designation, the project site would be expected to accommodate 16 residential units, resulting in approximately 46 residents. The project would consist of the development of 56 new single-family homes and a population of approximately 162 residents. The population of Granite Bay is approximately 20,825 people (Placer County, 2012). Therefore, the anticipated increase in population to the Granite Bay community as a result of the project would be approximately 1.1%, compared to an increase of 0.2% under the existing land use designation. Infrastructure that would be constructed as part of the project would be sized to accommodate only the project and would not support additional development on

surrounding properties or otherwise remove an obstacle to growth. Although the density of development in the project would be greater than in surrounding development, the incremental increase in the number of residential units and population in the project compared to the units and population that could be accommodated under the existing land use designation would not be substantial in light of the overall population of the project area, including the Granite Bay community and the nearby City of Roseville. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth for the area, directly or indirectly, and the impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **XIII-2: Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.** The project site currently consists of seven parcels. One of the parcels contains a house, barn, and septic system and the remaining parcels are vacant and undeveloped. The existing house, barn, and septic system would be removed during project construction. The property is owned by the project applicant, and the existing residents have agreed to relocate prior to the start of project construction. With only one house to be demolished, there would not be a substantial number of residents that face displacement as a consequence of the proposed project. As a result, the project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing to cause a need for replacement housing to be constructed elsewhere. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

PUBLIC SERVICES

**Initial Study**

- **XIV-1: Fire protection.** The project site is serviced by South Placer Fire District for its fire protection services, with the nearest station, Station 15, located at 4650 East Roseville Parkway. This station is located approximately one traveled mile northeast of the project site. The project would also include a secondary emergency access point from Eckerman Road at the western edge of the project site. This secondary emergency access point would be gated and for the exclusive use of emergency vehicles. The South Placer Fire District has confirmed that Eckerman Road is adequate as a secondary emergency vehicle access outlet and no improvements to Eckerman Road are necessary. The project would result in additional demand for fire protection services but does not propose any new fire facilities beyond required fire hydrants. The project site is surrounded by a largely urbanized area, and much of the land in the vicinity of the project site has been

developed and currently features substantial residential populations. While the project would result in additional demand for fire protection services, the project site would cause a small incremental increase in demand in relation to the larger, surrounding, and predominantly developed area. Thus, the project would create a less-than-significant impact and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **XIV-2: Sheriff protection.** The sheriff protection needs for the project site are provided by Placer County Sheriff's Office. The closest sheriff station, South Placer Station, is located at 6140 Horseshoe Bar Road, in the City of Loomis and approximately 6.5 miles to the northeast. Although the Granite Bay Community Plan anticipates a target ratio of one deputy per one thousand residents in unincorporated areas, the ratio at the time of the plan's adoption was one deputy per 1,142 people (Placer County, 2012). Based on a population factor of 2.7 persons per household (Placer County, 2012), the project would result in a population increase of approximately 227 people, an increase of 1.1% over the existing Granite Bay population. Similar to Item XIV-1, while the project would result in additional demand for sheriff protection services, the project site would cause a small incremental increase in demand in relation to the larger, surrounding, and predominantly developed area. Thus, the project would create a less-than-significant impact and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **XIV-3: Schools.** The project site is served by Eureka Union School District (grades K-8) and Roseville Joint Union High School District (grades 9-12). Students generated by the project could attend Maidu Elementary School (K-3), Excelsior School (4-6), and Olympus Jr. High School (7-8) in the Eureka Union School District. Students could also attend Granite Bay High School in the Roseville Joint Union High School District. The project would increase future enrollments due to the residential population of the proposed project's 56 new homes. This increase would be incremental in relation to the largely developed and populated surrounding communities. In addition, development of residential units and resulting increased student enrollment in the Eureka Union School District and Roseville Joint Union High School District could help boost declining enrollment numbers and result in increased State funding for the districts. As such, no additional facilities would be required and no additional physical environmental impacts would be created. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **XIV-4: Maintenance of public facilities, including roads.** The project would result in the creation of 56 new homes with associated infrastructure, which includes a private road network that would connect to Sierra College Boulevard. Access to Eckerman Road would only be as secondary access in the case of an emergency. The project would include frontage along Sierra College Boulevard, a City of Roseville roadway. The impact from these new homes, while increasing a need for maintenance, would be incremental and less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **XIV-5: Other governmental services.** The project would not create a significant demand for governmental services beyond those already considered in the Granite Bay Community Plan. The project would not require the provision of new, or physically alter existing governmental services and facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. The impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

**Initial Study**

- **XVI-4: Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses.** The project would be accessed from one entrance/exit along Sierra College Boulevard. The project would also include an additional access point for use by emergency vehicles only. The emergency vehicle access point would be located in the northwest corner of the project site, and would connect the project site to Eckerman Road. The emergency vehicle access on Eckerman Road would be gated which would prohibit non-emergency vehicles from using this access point. The South Placer Fire District has confirmed that the Eckerman Road access complies with the requirements of the California Fire Code and the District approves it as the secondary emergency vehicle access for the project. Both the emergency access point from Eckerman Road and the main access point from Sierra College Boulevard would be equipped with a Knox key switch and would be controlled using an Opticom system compatible with emergency response vehicles. The South Placer Fire District has confirmed that the current roadway width of Eckerman Road is

adequate for emergency vehicle access purposes. Within the project site, the proposed loop road would also provide adequate accessibility for emergency response. Because the project would provide adequate roadway widths and multiple access points for emergency vehicles, the impact would be considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- XVI-5: Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site.** The project would construct 56 single-family dwelling units. As proposed, each dwelling unit would include two parking spaces within the garage, and two additional parking spaces within the driveway, meeting the requirements of Placer County Zoning Code Section 17.54.060 (B)(5). On-street parking would be permitted on at least one side of the main circular roadway loop. The southern cul-de-sac denoted as Court A would have parking on both sides of the street. On-street parking would only be allowed on one side of the street on the northern cul-de-sac due to width constraints. Because the park would be open to the public during daylight hours, parking accessible to park users would be needed within close proximity to the park. The Placer County Zoning Code Section 17.54.060 (B)(3) requires parks and playgrounds to provide 1 space for every 10,000 square feet of use area. The proposed 0.81-acre park would require 4 parking spaces (0.81 ac. x 43,560 sf/ac. ÷ 10,000 sf = 4 spaces). Due to the proposed use of the park for soccer practice, additional parking would be necessary, and the project would provide at least 24 parking spaces at curbside. Because the project would include sufficient parking for residents and visitors, including park patrons, the project would not have a significant impact related to parking capacity on or off the project site and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- XVI-6: Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists.** The project would include one ingress/egress point along Sierra College Boulevard, as well as an emergency vehicle access point from Eckerman Road. Along the project site, Sierra College Boulevard currently includes a bike lane, curb, and gutter. The project would maintain the existing sidewalk along Sierra College Boulevard along the project site's frontage. The provision of curb cuts along Sierra College Boulevard to provide access to the project site would not remove or otherwise prohibit pedestrian and bicycle movement along Sierra College Boulevard. Further, the project would include sidewalks along the interior of the proposed loop road, and along one side of both proposed cul-de-sacs (Court A and Court C). Marked sidewalks would ensure pedestrian connections are maintained within the project site. Because the project would not interfere with pedestrian or bicycle movement, the impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **XVI-7: Conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (i.e., bus turnouts, bicycle lanes, bicycle racks, public transit, pedestrian facilities, etc.) or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.** The project would not interfere with bicycle or pedestrian facilities. There are no bus stops along Sierra College Boulevard near the project site and neither Roseville Transit nor Placer County Transit provide bus service on Sierra College Boulevard adjacent to the project site. The Granite Bay Community Plan states a goal of providing safe and comfortable routes for walking, cycling, and public transportation to encourage use of these modes of transportation, enable convenient and active travel as part of daily activities, reduce pollution, and meet the needs of all users of the streets. The project would not conflict with any existing policies or preclude anticipated future policies, plans, or other programs supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

- **XVI-8: Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.** The closest public airport or private airstrip is Pruet private airfield located approximately 5.6 miles west of the project site. Because the project site is located so far from the nearest airport, the proposed would not be expected to have any impact on air traffic patterns. Furthermore, the project would not include any excessively tall buildings that could potentially impact air traffic patterns. Therefore, the project would have no impact on air traffic patterns and no mitigation is required.

Finding

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

**Draft and Final EIRs**

- **Impact 3.3-2: Implementation of the proposed project could worsen conditions at intersections along Sierra College Boulevard near the project site below minimum LOS standards.** The City of Roseville's LOS policy is limited to performance standards for signalized intersections. The Impact 3.3-1 discussion addresses signal warrant analysis for the unsignalized intersections of Sierra College Boulevard/Annabelle Avenue and Sierra College Boulevard/Project Access Driveway. Further, the Sierra College

Boulevard/Old Auburn Road signalized intersection operates at LOS “C/C” during the AM/PM peak hours under “Existing” and “Existing plus Project” conditions. The proposed project is estimated to increase average intersection delay by up to 1.0 seconds during the AM and 0.5 seconds during the PM peak hours. The LOS designation for the Sierra College Boulevard/Old Auburn Road signalized intersection would not be changed by the addition of the project and would continue to operate at acceptable levels under “Existing plus Project” conditions, therefore project impacts to LOS for intersections near the project site are considered less than significant.

#### Finding

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

- **Impact 3.3-3: The proposed project could cause a cumulative increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections).**
- The “Cumulative Base” conditions for the Sierra College Boulevard / Annabelle Avenue intersection show projected delays over 80 seconds (LOS “F”) for AM and PM peak hours for the Sierra College Boulevard/Annabelle Avenue intersection. “Cumulative plus Project” conditions would add additional delay at the intersection that would remain greater than 80 seconds per vehicle (LOS “F”, worst case movement) for AM and PM peak hours. As discussed in Impact 3.3-2, City of Roseville’s methodology for determining LOS is not applicable to this intersection, so CA-MUTCD 2012 based peak hour signal warrant-3 analysis has been applied. Under “Cumulative Plus Project” conditions, Annabelle Avenue at Sierra College Boulevard is projected to generate 29 eastbound vph and 22 westbound vph under AM peak hour conditions and 35 eastbound vph and 55 westbound vph under PM peak hour conditions. The highest approach vph (55 westbound vph during PM peak hour) does not exceed the 75 approach vph minimum for satisfaction of the signal warrant-3 criteria and the project impact is considered less than cumulatively considerable.
- The Sierra College Boulevard/Project Access Driveway unsignalized intersection is not present in “Cumulative Base” projections and would be projected to operate with an AM peak hour delay of 49.2 seconds (LOS “E”) and a PM peak hour delay exceeding 80 seconds (LOS “F”). As discussed for Impact 3.3-2, the maximum approach vph generated by the project would be 39 westbound vph under PM peak hour conditions, which would fail to exceed the 75 approach vph threshold to satisfy the signal warrant. Therefore, the project impacts to cumulative base conditions at this intersection are less than cumulatively considerable.
- The Sierra College Boulevard/Old Auburn Road intersection would operate at LOS “E/D” under AM/PM peak hour “Cumulative plus Project” conditions, which falls below

the goal of LOS “C” for signalized intersections within the City of Roseville. The City of Roseville requires that at least 70 percent of signalized intersections within its jurisdiction operate at LOS “C” or better. The City of Roseville 2025 General Plan projects that more than 80 percent of signalized intersections within the City of Roseville will operate at LOS “C” or better through the 2025 planning horizon however the cumulative scenario for this section evaluates a 2035 planning horizon, therefore the City of Roseville’s 2025 General Plan cannot be used. The Sierra College Boulevard/Old Auburn Road intersection would operate at LOS “E/D” under “Existing plus Project” conditions, with delay conditions expected to be 65.8 Seconds during AM peak hour and 49.4 seconds during PM peak hour. The intersection is also projected to operate at LOS “E/D” for AM/PM peak hour “Cumulative Base Conditions”, with AM peak hour delay of 60.5 seconds and PM peak hour delay of 44.2 seconds. The LOS designation would not be changed by the project relative to “Cumulative Base” conditions. Therefore, addition of the project to cumulative base conditions would not alter the LOS designation for the signalized intersection and the project is anticipated to have a less than cumulatively considerable impact at this intersection.

- Weaving patterns from vehicles exiting the project site and moving across lanes to the left-turn/U-turn lane at Old Auburn Road were assessed for “Cumulative Base Plus Project” conditions and found not to substantially impact LOS for that segment of Sierra College Boulevard. The distance between the project driveway and Old Auburn Road would be sufficient to allow safe weaving movements. Therefore, addition of the project to cumulative base conditions would not alter the LOS designation for this roadway segment and the project is anticipated to have a less than cumulatively considerable impact on this segment of Sierra College Boulevard.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.3-4: Implementation of the proposed project could worsen cumulative conditions at intersections along Sierra College Boulevard near the project site below minimum LOS standards for signalized intersections or meet signal warrant requirements for unsignalized intersections.** As discussed above, the LOS designations would not be changed by addition of the project to “Cumulative Base” conditions for the intersection of Sierra College Boulevard and Old Auburn Road, therefore, the project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact on this intersection.

Finding

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

---

 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS
**Initial Study**

- **XVII-3: Require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage systems.** The project would not include the installation or use of an on-site sewage or septic system. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Finding

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

**Draft and Final EIRs**

- **Impact 3.8-1: The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.** Project construction is not anticipated to result in the treatment of wastewater on site. On site portable toilets for construction workers would be used during construction. Water used for dust control and other construction-related uses (e.g., onsite cement mixing, wheel washing, etc.) would be procured by the construction contractors on an as-needed, and could be up to approximately 0.5 AF/acre over the course of the construction grading period. Water would be used in accordance with CVRWQCB requirements to prevent runoff. This impact would be less than significant for project construction. The project would introduce additional residential development into the area, which would increase the amount of wastewater produced within the area. Wastewater generated by the project would be treated at the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (DCWWTP), operated by the City of Roseville. The City of Roseville has been issued its own National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit (Order No. R5-2008-0077-01) by the CVRWQCB. Wastewater treatment requirements for the project would be based on all applicable state and federal regulations and policies including the NPDES Permit, and include limitations on effluent discharge and receiving water. The residential and recreational land uses proposed by the project would not discharge wastewater that contains harmful levels of toxins that are regulated by the CVRWQCB and all effluent would comply with the wastewater treatment standards of the CVRWQCB. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts related to the wastewater treatment requirements of the CVRWQCB.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.8-2: The project could exceed the capacity of the wastewater conveyance and treatment system which could cause significant environmental effects.** The project would result in the development of 56 residential units on the project site and

would, therefore, result in an increased generation of wastewater flows from the project site. Modeling (see Draft EIR, Chapter 3.8) indicates that the capacity of the City of Roseville 8-inch sewer pipelines that the project would connect to in Sierra College Boulevard would have ample capacity downstream, even during wet weather flows, to accommodate projected wastewater flows generated by the project at buildout of the areas served by the Old Auburn Road Trunk Sewer. All wastewater produced by the project would be treated by the DCWWTP. The DCWWTP currently has an 18 MGD treatment capacity, with a current demand of 10.5 mgd, and a future demand of 16.34 mgd on buildout within the DCWWTP sewer service area, including the project site. The additional demand from the project of 10,640 gpd ADWF would not exceed existing or future planned capacity of the DCWWTP and would not require expansion of the treatment facilities. Furthermore, the project would pay its fair share of fees for the conveyance and treatment of wastewater, as calculated by the County. Therefore, the project would result in less-than-significant impacts on wastewater conveyance and treatment system capacities.

#### Finding

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

- **Impact 3.8-3: Sufficient water supplies may not be available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and new or expanded entitlements may be needed.** Project construction would require water for dust suppression, grading, and general demolition and construction activities. Water would be supplied by the construction contractor and delivered to the project site in construction watering trucks. Water could be supplied from existing water mains in the vicinity of the project site, from raw water supplied by SJWD, or from other sources. Based on the proposed construction schedule for the 16.3-acre project site, it is estimated that project construction could require up to approximately 0.5 AF/acre over the course of the construction grading period. The will-serve letter from SJWD provides adequate assurance that there would be water available to support project construction. This impact is less than significant. A water supply assessment is not required under SB 610 due to the proposed project's size. However, water demand for the project was provided by the 2015 County Applicant Environmental Questionnaire, and estimated to be approximately 115 AFY for the entire project. As a condition of the Will Serve application approval from SJWD, the project would be required to provide a landscape irrigation plan to meet any mandated drought emergency measures in effect at that time. Because sufficient water supplies are available to serve the proposed project, it would result in a less-than-significant impact on water supply.

#### Finding

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

- **Impact 3.8-4: The project could require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.** The project includes a storm drainage system to collect and convey storm water entering the project site from offsite areas as well as storm water originating on the project site to the northwestern portion of the project site. The preliminary drainage report prepared for the project demonstrates that the on-site detention system would reduce post-construction peak flows below existing conditions. As part of the improvement plan submittal process, the preliminary drainage report shall be submitted in final form. Because the storm water flows exiting the project site would be detained on the project site and reduce peak concentrations exiting the project site, the project would not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expand existing facilities in addition to the storm drain system that is proposed as part of the project. Therefore, the project would result in environmental impacts that are less than significant associated with the existing storm drainage system.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.8-5: The project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.** Construction of the project has the potential to generate solid waste, including cardboard, metals, plastics, concrete and other building materials. Solid waste generated during construction activities would be disposed of at the Western Regional Landfill located at 3195 Athens Avenue in Lincoln. Recyclable construction debris would be disposed of at an appropriate construction and debris processing facility. Solid waste disposed of during construction activities for the new residential development would represent a small fraction of the remaining capacity. The increased intensity of the project site and introduction of residential development to the site would result in increased generation of solid waste. The project would be expected to generate approximately 124 tons of solid waste per year upon full buildout. The existing capacity of the Western Regional Landfill would be sufficient to accommodate solid waste generation from project implementation. Considering that the landfill has enough remaining capacity to stay open until 2058, the existing landfill would have adequate capacity to accept all project construction and operation waste. Impacts relating to solid waste as a result of project construction and operation would be less than significant.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.8-6: The proposed project would comply with all requirements related to disposal of solid waste.** The project would comply with all federal, state, and local requirements that relate to the disposal and recycling of solid waste. For example, the

project contractor would meet with the County's designated environmental utilities inspector prior to beginning work to ensure that an approved plan is in place to store, recycle, and dispose of all construction debris. The project would be served by local waste and recycling collection services to ensure that all waste would be picked up and delivered to the MRF prior to final disposal of solid waste at the Western Regional Landfill. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.8-7: Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to cumulative demands on wastewater treatment facilities, resulting in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the cumulative demand.** The demands for wastewater treatment have been factored into the DCWWTP long-range plans to provide these services. This includes growth not only within the 2005 service area boundary (SAB), but planned future Urban Growth Areas (e.g., Placer Vineyards). Potential expansion of the DCWWTP was identified in the Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan Final EIR completed in May 1996. Expansion of the plant to serve flows could result in impacts on the environment associated with construction to increase the capacity of the plant, loss of natural and other resources to expand the footprint of the facility, and degradation of water quality as a result of increased discharges to Deer Creek. The NPDES discharge permit for the plant would need to be amended to reflect higher flows. Growth assumptions factored into the expansion plans for the DCWWTP included approved development projects within the plant's service area, including buildout of the proposed project. Expansion of the DCWWTP is planned, but an EIR has not yet been prepared. The project's demand for wastewater treatment would be comparatively small within the context of the entire SAB and the project's would have a less-than-considerable contribution and the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

Finding

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

- **Impact 3.8-9: Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to cumulative demand for water supply.** As described previously, detailed information on the SJWD's water supply and water demands are documented in the SJWD's 2010 UWMP. As documented in the 2010 UWMP, SJWD projections on water demands were calculated to reach 15,105 AFY by 2030 for its retail service area. Buildout demands in the SJWD retail service area were based on land use constraints in future growth rates reported in the Placer County Granite Bay Community Plan. There are no other projects currently planned in Placer County within the SJWD retail service area. The 2010

UWMP determined that SJWD will have sufficient water to meet projected water demands in addition to meeting the existing retail service area's planned future demands. SJWD would not need to obtain new water sources to serve the retail service area at build-out even during multiple dry years. As shown in 2010 UWMP, SJWD has reliable water supplies available to meet the demands of its retail service area in single and multiple (up to three) dry years through 2030, with no reductions to supply or demand. The cumulative growth, including the proposed project, can be served with existing supplies within the water demands projected by SJWD. This would be less-than-significant cumulative impact on water supply.

Finding

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

- Impact 3.8-10: Implementation of the proposed project could require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause cumulative significant environmental effects.** Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with future development within the Dry Creek Watershed could increase impervious surfaces and alter drainage conditions and rates. This cumulative alteration could contribute to exceeding the capacity of existing storm water conveyance facilities, leading to potential flood conditions within the watershed. However, the project would not contribute to the cumulative increase in the rate and volume of runoff during storm events because the project would retain peak concentration storm water flows onsite prior to releasing the storm water offsite. The preliminary drainage report prepared for the project demonstrates that the on-site detention system would reduce post-construction peak flows below existing conditions. As part of the improvement plan submittal process, the preliminary drainage report shall be submitted in final form. The peak stormwater flows would be released offsite at a rate and volume less than existing flows. Therefore, the project would not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities after the implementation of the project including the proposed onsite storm drainage system. Thus, the project's contribution to the cumulative increase in the rate and volume of runoff would be less than cumulatively considerable, and thus less than significant.

Finding

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

- Impact 3.8-11: Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to cumulative demand on solid waste facilities.** Currently the materials recovery facility (MRF) has permitted processing capacity up to 1,750 tons per day and the WRSL is permitted to accept waste through 2058. However, the need for processing capacity at the MRF and for a final closure date at the landfill would be influenced by several factors,

including regional growth rates, economic conditions, and the efficiency of waste recovery. Depending on these factors, waste from the project in combination with buildout of the areas served by the landfill, including the two current projects under consideration by Placer County (Rockwood (Maher) and Greyhawk II projects) could eventually shorten the lifespan of the MRF and the landfill by decreasing the current permitted capacity. This is considered a significant cumulative impact. Since development within Placer County was assumed and factored into expansion plans of the MRF and landfill, the project's anticipated incremental contribution to cumulative solid waste demand is considered less than considerable. In addition, the project would be required to pay collection fees, a portion of which would be used to service bonds necessary to fund landfill expansions. This impact is less than significant.

#### Finding

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

## **2. FINDINGS FOR SIGNIFICANT, POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT, AND CUMULATIVELY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS REDUCED TO LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT THROUGH MITIGATION MEASURES.**

The Board of Supervisors agrees with the characterization in the Final EIR with respect to all impacts initially identified as “significant” or “potentially significant” that will be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), a specific finding is made for each impact and its associated mitigation measures in the discussions below.

### **AESTHETICS**

#### **Draft and Final EIRs**

- **Impact 3.2-2: Implementation of the proposed project could create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.** Consistent with the Granite Bay Community Plan Community Design Guidelines, the residential structures and fencing would utilize earth tones and be designed to blend with the natural landscape and reduce the potential for impacts with regards to glare. Impacts related to glare would therefore be considered less than significant. All outdoor lighting installed as part of the project would be limited to the minimum amount needed for public safety and would be designed to limit upward and sideways spillover. In single-family residences, all luminaries mounted to the exterior of a building (or to other buildings on the same lot) shall be high efficiency luminaries, or shall be controlled by a motion sensor and also by a photocontrol, astronomical time clock, or energy management control systems (EMCS). Lighting must be controlled by a manual on/off switch that does not override any automatic sensor to the “on” mode. Outdoor light fixtures for pedestrian areas and roadways would be shielded and directed downward to preserve the night sky and to direct light away from adjacent residential areas, which would minimize light effects on the adjacent neighboring properties. Consistent with the

Granite Bay Community Plan Community Design Guidelines, proposed lighting fixtures would not be mounted at a height that exceeds 14 feet and would be finished in a color that would blend into the landscape and prevent glare. The project could result in a new source of substantial light that would adversely affect nighttime views in the area, and this change would be considered potentially significant. However, due to the various design features included as part of the project which are encapsulated in the mitigation measure below, this impact would be considered less than significant.

#### Mitigation Measures

*3.2-2: All street lighting shall be required to be of the fully-cut off and fully-shielded style in order to direct light downward (and not up or out), and shall be a maximum height of 14 feet.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-2 would reduce light and glare impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

As discussed above, impacts related to glare are considered less than significant. However, the project could result in a new source of substantial light that would adversely affect nighttime views in the area, which would be considered a potentially significant impact. To address this potential impact, the project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure 3.2-2, which would ensure that street lighting would not adversely affect nighttime views in the area by requiring downward angling of light fixtures, full-shielding, and restricting height to a maximum of 14 feet.

## AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES

### Initial Study

- **II-2: Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations.** The Granite Bay Community Plan (Placer County, 2012;:p.26) and Placer County “Right to Farm” Ordinance include policies and regulations to maintain, encourage, and support farm operations. The project site is identified as non-enrolled land and is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. The project site and a portion of the immediately surrounding area is classified as “Other Land” on the California Department of Conservation Farmland Map, published in 2013. “Other Land” includes low density residential developments and vacant and nonagricultural land which is surrounded on all sides by urban development. The other portion of the surrounding area is designated as “Urban and Built-up Land”, which is land occupied by structures with a building density of at least one unit to 1.5 acres (DOC, 2013a; DOC, 2013b). The project site does not include any existing agricultural uses, other than occasional horse

and goat grazing. Placer County’s “Right to Farm” Ordinance allows existing agricultural operations to continue in a manner consistent with the underlying zoning. As a result of the “Right to Farm” Ordinance, implementation of the project would not preclude agricultural operations on nearby parcels. The project site is zoned by Placer County as residential single-family, with an agriculture combining district, and a minimum lot size of 40,000 square feet, (RS-AG-B-40). The project is requesting a rezone to residential single-family, with a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet, and a Planned Residential Development, with a maximum density of 6 residential units per acre (RS-B-6, PD=6). While the project would develop land that could otherwise be used for agricultural operations, there have been no known agricultural operations associated with the project site in recent history. Implementation of Mitigation Measure II-1 would require that the CC&Rs for the subdivision notify new owners of the “Right to Farm” Ordinance, and would result in a less-than- significant impact with regards to agricultural operations in the vicinity.

#### Mitigation Measures

***MM II-1:** The project applicant shall notify all future property owners within the project site of Placer County’s Right to Farm Ordinance (Placer County Code Section 5.24.040) by including this information in the CC&Rs for the subdivision.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM II-1 would reduce impacts related to nearby agricultural activities to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM II-1 would mitigate impacts on agriculture activities in the area by informing future project property owners of the County’s Right to Farm Ordinance and the possibility of agricultural activities in the project vicinity. Approval of the proposed project, and/or notification to new future property owners within the project site of existing adjacent agricultural operations, would not prevent or otherwise inhibit adjacent property owners from continuing or beginning new agricultural operations on their properties.

- **II-3: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, a Williamson Act contract or a Right-to-Farm Policy.** The Granite Bay Community Plan (Placer County, 2012:p.26) and Placer County “Right to Farm” Ordinance include policies and regulations to maintain, encourage, and support farm operations. The project site is identified as non-enrolled land and is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. The project site and a portion of the immediately surrounding area is classified as “Other Land” on the California Department of Conservation Farmland Map, published in 2013. “Other Land” includes low density residential developments and vacant and nonagricultural land which is surrounded on all sides by urban development. The other portion of the surrounding

area is designated as “Urban and Built-up Land”, which is land occupied by structures with a building density of at least one unit to 1.5 acres (DOC, 2013a; DOC, 2013b). The project site does not include any existing agricultural uses, other than occasional horse and goat grazing. Placer County’s “Right to Farm” Ordinance allows existing agricultural operations to continue in a manner consistent with the underlying zoning. As a result of the “Right to Farm” Ordinance, implementation of the project would not preclude agricultural operations on nearby parcels. The project site is zoned by Placer County as residential single-family, with an agriculture combining district, and a minimum lot size of 40,000 square feet, (RS-AG-B-40). The project is requesting a rezone to residential single-family, with a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet, and a Planned Residential Development, with a maximum density of 6 residential units per acre (RS-B-6, PD=6). While the project would develop land that could otherwise be used for agricultural operations, there have been no known agricultural operations associated with the project site in recent history. Implementation of Mitigation Measure II-1 would require that the CC&Rs for the subdivision notify new owners of the “Right to Farm” Ordinance, and would result in a less-than- significant impact with regards to agricultural operations in the vicinity.

#### Mitigation Measures

***MM II-1:** The project applicant shall notify all future property owners within the project site of Placer County’s Right to Farm Ordinance (Placer County Code Section 5.24.040) by including this information in the CC&Rs for the subdivision.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM II-1 would reduce impacts related to agricultural uses to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

Development of the project would not preclude existing or future agricultural operations on nearby parcels. However, the project would develop land that could otherwise be used for agricultural operations, though there have been no known agricultural uses associated with the project site in recent history. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM II-1 would mitigate impacts related to agricultural uses by informing future project property owners of the County’s Right to Farm Ordinance and the possibility of agricultural activities in the project vicinity. Approval of the proposed project, and/or notification to new future property owners within the project site of existing adjacent agricultural operations, would not prevent or otherwise inhibit adjacent property owners from continuing or beginning new agricultural operations on their properties.

- **II-5: Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the loss or conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest use.** While the project site is

in an agriculture combining zone, there are no active agricultural uses on the project site. The requested rezone for the project would remove the agriculture combining designation for the property, which would preclude the future agriculture use of the project site. However, other parcels in the area would still retain the agriculture combining designation. Additionally, Placer County has a Right to Farm Ordinance (Placer County Code Section 5.24.040). As discussed under Items II-2 and II-3 above, implementation of Mitigation Measure MM II-1 would mitigate impacts on agriculture activities in the area to a less-than-significant level by informing future project property owners of the County's Right to Farm Ordinance and the possibility of agricultural activities in the project vicinity. Finally, the project would not involve changes that could result in the conversion of Farmland or forest land to a non-agricultural use.

#### Mitigation Measures

*MM II-2: Implement MM II-1 – The project applicant shall notify all future property owners within the project site of Placer County's Right to Farm Ordinance (Placer County Code Section 5.24.040) by including this information in the CC&Rs for the subdivision.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM II-1 would reduce impacts related to loss of farmland to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

The project would develop land that could otherwise be used for agricultural operations. While the project site is in an agriculture combining zone, there are no active agricultural uses on the project site. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM II-1 would mitigate impacts related to loss of farmland by informing future project property owners of the County's Right to Farm Ordinance and the possibility of agricultural activities in the project vicinity. Approval of the project would not result in the direct conversion of nearby Farmland to non-agricultural use.

## AIR QUALITY

### Draft and Final EIRs

- **Impact 3.4-2: Construction of the proposed project could generate emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> that would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.** Construction-related emissions arise from a variety of activities. Construction-related fugitive dust emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the level and type of activity, silt content of the soil, and the weather. In the absence of mitigation, construction activities may result in significant quantities of dust, and as a result, local visibility and PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations

may be adversely affected on a temporary and intermittent basis. As discussed in Draft EIR, Chapter 3.4, the project is required to comply with all PCAPCD rules and regulations for construction, including the rules specifically applicable to construction-related air quality impacts. The proposed project's short-term, construction-related criteria pollutant emissions are below the PCAPCD thresholds of significance for ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>. Construction activities associated with the project would not substantially contribute to the PCAPCD's nonattainment status for ozone or PM. The construction emissions from the project during both the summer and winter conditions (whether twice daily watering occurs or not) would not exceed the thresholds of significance. The impact would be less than significant. The project is located in an area that does not contain asbestos-containing (serpentine) soils, therefore soil disturbance does not represent an asbestos-related inhalation risk. This is a less than significant impact. However, there is the potential for release of asbestos during building demolition. The existing house, built in 1974, could potentially contain asbestos. Asbestos may be present in textured paint and in patching compounds using on wall and ceiling joints built before 1977 because asbestos in these materials was not banned until 1977. This is a potentially significant impact.

#### Mitigation Measures

*3.4-2(a): Asbestos Inspection and Removal. Conduct an asbestos inspection of all structures slated for demolition and test materials to determine the presence of asbestos. Remove any identified asbestos-containing materials and properly dispose of those materials prior to initiation of building demolition. Both the asbestos inspection and, if necessary, the asbestos removal shall be conducted by a Cal/OSHA-certified asbestos consultant.*

*3.4-2(b): The project applicant shall include the following standard notes on all Building Plans approved in association with this project:*

- 1. Low VOC paint shall be utilized for both the interiors and exteriors of the building. To limit the quantity of VOCs in architectural coatings supplied, sold, offered for sale, applied, solicited for application, or manufactured for use within the District, all projects must comply with APCD Rule 218. (Based on APCD Rule 218)*
- 2. Wood burning or pellet appliances shall not be permitted. Only natural gas or propane fired fireplace appliances are permitted. These appliances shall be clearly delineated on the Floor Plans submitted in conjunction with the Building Permit application. (Based on APCD Rule 225, section 302.2).*
- 3. Where natural gas is available, the installation of a gas outlet for use with outdoor cooking appliances, such as a gas barbecue or outdoor recreational fire pits, shall be shown.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.4-2(a) and 3.4-2(b) would reduce air quality

impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

Development of the project would involve demolishing a pre-1974 house which could contain asbestos. The project also involves ground disturbing and other construction activities which may result in emissions that effect air quality. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-2(a) would ensure asbestos-laden materials would be properly handled and disposed of during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-2(b) would ensure air emissions are reduced below PCAPCD thresholds by requiring low VOC paint for building interiors and exteriors, that only natural gas or propane fireplaces appliances be permitted, and that natural gas outlets be provided for outdoor cooking appliances, where natural gas is available.

## BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

### Initial Study

- **IV-1: Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries.** Special-status species and their habitats that may be affected either directly or indirectly through implementation of the project include the loss of annual grassland habitat, fill of aquatic habitats (seasonal wetlands, seasonal swales, lacustrine), removal of protected trees, and potential impacts to raptors and migratory birds (Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, and western burrowing owl). The project site is bound by residential and vacant/undeveloped properties to the north, south and west and Sierra College Boulevard on the east. The site lacks woodland, riparian, or aquatic corridors that connect the site to other habitats. Because of the pattern of development on surrounding and nearby properties, implementation of the project would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native or resident migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nesting or breeding sites. Although the site contains tree canopies that would provide suitable nesting habitat for raptors and other bird species, there are no known nests or rookeries on-site.

The site is subject to regular grazing by horses and goats as well as regular mechanical mowing. These activities have generally had the effect of converting the bulk of the site to an annual grassland comprised of non-native grasses and herbaceous species. None of the habitats necessary to support potential special-status plant species is present on the site.

The Biological Resources Assessment shows that the nearest occurrences of vernal pool fairy shrimp are located more than two miles north of the project site, according to the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). Based on a survey of the project site's conditions, the Biological Resources Assessment determined there is no potential for fairy shrimp to occur on the project site. The wetlands on site do not include vernal pools, and the hydrology and vegetation of the depression seasonal wetlands, seasonal stock pond, and seasonal swale would not support the species. The dominant plants supported by the onsite wetlands indicate that the features do not provide an extended inundation period which is required for fairy shrimp and tadpole shrimp to complete their lifecycles. Additionally, the wetlands are very small and have no hydrologic connection to offsite habitats known to support fairy shrimp.

The potential for Swainson's hawk occurrence on the project site is discussed in the Initial Study and the Biological Resources Assessment. As discussed therein, habitat for Swainson's hawk on the site is of low quality and lies in close proximity to other developed parcels. As such, the assessment concluded that there is no potential for occurrence of Swainson's hawk at the project site because "the species is not known to nest in the Granite Bay area and the closest [CNDDDB] record is nearly five miles southeast of the site. There is high-quality foraging habitat closer to the known nest location, making it unreasonable to assume that Swainson's hawks would utilize the site for foraging habitat."

The project site is a relatively small parcel within a developed residential landscape, with existing homes surrounding the site within 15 to 44 feet of the common property line with the project site. Thus, this developed landscape would provide little value for foraging Swainson's hawks. Swainson's hawks require large unbroken landscapes and are much less likely to use fragmented landscapes or isolated parcels. Foraging habitat for the nest that is located approximately five miles southeast of the project site is much more abundant in the open grasslands south of U.S. Highway 50.

Furthermore, studied flight patterns for Swainson's hawk indicate that its average foraging range is about 2 miles. The closest CNDDDB occurrence to the project site was at the outermost range for the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) survey protocol recommendations, which recommend a 5-mile range.

Mitigation Measures IV-1 IV-2, and IV-3 would avoid any potential adverse effects on nesting birds. These mitigation measures have been modified in response to comments from CDFW. Thus, the impact to wildlife movement or wildlife migratory corridors would be less than significant.

#### Mitigation Measures

***MM IV-1:** A pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 3 days prior to demolition/construction activities during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31). If there is a break in construction activity of more than 2 weeks, subsequent surveys shall be completed. During this survey, the qualified wildlife biologist shall inspect all trees in and immediately adjacent to the impact area for the*

*white-tailed kite and other raptor and migratory bird nests. If the above survey does not identify any nesting raptor species on or near the construction site, further mitigation is not required. However, should any raptor species be found nesting on or near the construction site (within 500 feet of construction activities), the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:*

- a. Prior to the issuance of Improvement Plans, the project applicant, in consultation with the Placer County and CDFW, shall avoid all birds of prey or migratory bird nest sites located in the construction area during breeding season while the nest is occupied with adults and/or eggs or young. The occupied nest shall be monitored by a qualified wildlife biologist to determine when the nest is no longer used. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a no disturbance buffer zone around the nest site. The size of the buffer zone shall be determined in consultation with Placer County and CDFW. Highly visible temporary construction fencing shall delineate the buffer zone.*
- b. If a legally-protected species nest is located in a tree designated for removal, the removal shall be deferred until after August 31, or until the adults and young are no longer dependent on the nest site, as determined by a qualified biologist.*

**MM IV-2:** *Prior to construction activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct four burrowing owl surveys on the project site and within a 500-foot buffer of the project site, as feasible, in accordance with CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 1995) no more than 30 days prior to the onset of project-related disturbance activities.*

*The biologist shall conduct at least one site visit between February 15 and April 15, and a minimum of three survey visits, at least three weeks apart between April 15 and July 15, with a least one visit after June 15. Surveys shall not be conducted during inclement weather, when burrowing owls are typically less active and visible. If no burrowing owls or evidence of burrowing owls (e.g., whitewash or pellets) are observed during surveys, no additional mitigation is necessary.*

*If active owl burrows are located during the pre-activity survey, the following measures shall be implemented consistent with the CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation:*

- a. The project applicant shall not disturb occupied burrowing owl burrows during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31) unless it is verified by a qualified biologist that either the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation, or that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival. Eviction outside the nesting season may be permitted pending evaluation of eviction plans and receipt of formal written approval from the CDFW.*

- b. *Unless otherwise authorized by the CDFW, the project applicant shall establish a 250-foot buffer between the construction work area and nesting burrowing owls during the nesting season. If a 250-foot buffer is not feasible, a qualified biologist shall consult with the CDFW to determine an appropriate buffer distance. The project applicant shall maintain this buffer area until August 31 or at CDFW's discretion and based upon monitoring evidence, until the young owls are foraging independently.*
- c. *Unless otherwise authorized by the CDFW, the project applicant shall establish a 160-foot buffer between the construction work area and occupied burrows during the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31). If a 160-foot buffer is not feasible, a qualified biologist shall consult with the CDFW to determine an appropriate buffer distance. The proponent will maintain this buffer area until January 31 or at CDFW's discretion and based upon monitoring evidence, until the young owls are foraging independently.*
- d. *If burrowing owls must be moved away from the construction footprint, the project applicant shall undertake the passive relocation measures in accordance with CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. The project applicant shall submit a memorandum to Placer County documenting compliance with the CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation on a weekly basis. Placer County shall consult with the CDFW as appropriate to ensure compliance.*

**MM IV-3:** *If any vegetation removal occurs during the typical avian nesting season (February 1 through August 31), the project applicant shall conduct a pre-disturbance survey to determine if active nests are present on the project site. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than two weeks prior to the onset of vegetation removal. If active nests are found on the site, disturbance or removal of the nest should be avoided until the young have fledged and the nest is no longer active. Extensive buffers, such as those recommended for nesting raptors, are not necessary for nesting avian species protected solely by the MBTA. However, depending on the species, site conditions, and the proposed construction activities near the active nest, a small buffer may be prescribed, as determined by a qualified biologist. Alternatively, vegetation removal could be scheduled to avoid all potential impacts. Vegetation removal conducted between September 1 and January 31 would not require a pre-disturbance nesting bird survey.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM IV-1, MM IV-2, and MM IV-3 would reduce the potential impacts on special-status species and their habitat to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that these Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

Explanation

As discussed in the Initial Study and the Biological Resources Assessment, the only special status species with potential for occurrence on the project site are the Western burrowing owl, the white-tailed kite, and other raptors. As discussed in the Initial Study, Section IV, the project site contains low quality foraging habitat suitable for Swainson's hawk, White-tailed kite, and western burrowing owl. The site is considered low quality due to the tall grass height and proximity to other developed parcels. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM IV-1, MM IV-2, and MM IV-3 would reduce the potential impacts on special-status species and their habitat by requiring pre-construction surveys and, if evidence of special-status species or their habitat are found on the project site, requiring avoidance or relocation.

- **IV-2: Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species.** Special-status species and their habitats that may be affected either directly or indirectly through implementation of the project include the loss of annual grassland habitat, fill of aquatic habitats (seasonal wetlands, seasonal swales, lacustrine), removal of protected trees, and potential impacts to raptors and migratory birds (Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, and western burrowing owl). The project site is bound by residential and vacant/undeveloped properties to the north, south and west and Sierra College Boulevard on the east. The site lacks woodland, riparian, or aquatic corridors that connect the site to other habitats. Because of the pattern of development on surrounding and nearby properties, implementation of the project would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native or resident migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nesting or breeding sites. Although the site contains tree canopies that would provide suitable nesting habitat for raptors and other bird species, there are no known nests or rookeries on-site. Mitigation Measures IV-1 IV-2, and IV-3, as modified in response to comments from CDFW, would avoid any potential adverse effects on nesting birds. Thus, the impact to wildlife movement or wildlife migratory corridors would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

***MM IV-1:** A pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 3 days prior to demolition/construction activities during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31). If there is a break in construction activity of more than 2 weeks, subsequent surveys shall be completed. During this survey, the qualified wildlife biologist shall inspect all trees in and immediately adjacent to the impact area for the white-tailed kite and other raptor and migratory bird nests. If the above survey does not identify any nesting raptor species on or near the construction site, further mitigation is not required. However, should any raptor species be found nesting on or near the construction site (within 500 feet of construction activities), the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:*

- a. *Prior to the issuance of Improvement Plans, the project applicant, in consultation with the Placer County and CDFW, shall avoid all birds of prey or migratory bird nest sites located in the construction area during breeding season while the nest is occupied with adults and/or eggs or young. The occupied nest shall be monitored by a qualified wildlife biologist to determine when the nest is no longer used. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a no disturbance buffer zone around the nest site. The size of the buffer zone shall be determined in consultation with Placer County and CDFW. Highly visible temporary construction fencing shall delineate the buffer zone.*
- b. *If a legally-protected species nest is located in a tree designated for removal, the removal shall be deferred until after August 31, or until the adults and young are no longer dependent on the nest site, as determined by a qualified biologist.*

**MM IV-2:** *Prior to construction activities, applicant qualified biologist shall conduct four burrowing owl surveys on the project site and within a 500-foot buffer of the project site, as feasible, in accordance with CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 1995) no more than 30 days prior to the onset of project-related disturbance activities. The biologist shall conduct at least one site visit between February 15 and April 15, and a minimum of three survey visits, at least three weeks apart, between April 15 and July 15, with at least one visit after June 15. Surveys shall not be conducted during inclement weather, when burrowing owls are typically less active and visible. If no burrowing owls or evidence of burrowing owls (e.g. whitewash or pellets) are observed during surveys, no additional mitigation is necessary. If active owl burrows are located during the pre-activity survey, the following measures shall be implemented consistent with the CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation:*

- a. *The project applicant shall not disturb occupied burrowing owl burrows during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31) unless it is verified by a qualified biologist that either the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation, or that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival. Eviction outside the nesting season may be permitted pending evaluation of eviction plans and receipt of formal written approval from the CDFW.*
- b. *Unless otherwise authorized by the CDFW, the project applicant shall establish a 250-foot buffer between the construction work area and nesting burrowing owls during the nesting season. If a 250-foot buffer is not feasible, a qualified biologist shall consult with the CDFW to determine an appropriate buffer distance. The project applicant shall maintain this buffer area until August 31 or at CDFW's discretion and based upon monitoring evidence, until the young owls are foraging independently.*
- c. *Unless otherwise authorized by the CDFW, the project applicant shall establish a 160-foot buffer between the construction work area and occupied burrows during the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31). If a 160-foot buffer is*

*not feasible, a qualified biologist shall consult with the CDFW to determine an appropriate buffer distance. The proponent will maintain this buffer area until January 31 or at CDFW's discretion and based upon monitoring evidence, until the young owls are foraging independently.*

- d. If burrowing owls must be moved away from the construction footprint, the project applicant shall undertake the passive relocation measures in accordance with CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. The project applicant shall submit a memorandum to Placer County documenting compliance with the CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation on a weekly basis. Placer County shall consult with the CDFW as appropriate to ensure compliance.*

*MM IV-3: If any vegetation removal occurs during the typical avian nesting season (February 1 through August 31), the project applicant shall conduct a pre-disturbance survey to determine if active nests are present on the project site. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than two weeks prior to the onset of vegetation removal. If active nests are found on the site, disturbance or removal of the nest should be avoided until the young have fledged and the nest is no longer active. Extensive buffers, such as those recommended for nesting raptors, are not necessary for nesting avian species protected solely by the MBTA. However, depending on the species, site conditions, and the proposed construction activities near the active nest, a small buffer may be prescribed, as determined by a qualified biologist. Alternatively, vegetation removal could be scheduled to avoid all potential impacts. Vegetation removal conducted between September 1 and January 31 would not require a pre-disturbance nesting bird survey.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM IV-1, MM IV-2, and MM IV-3 would reduce the potential impacts on fish or wildlife species and their habitat to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that these Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

As discussed in the Initial Study, Section IV, the project site contains low quality foraging habitat suitable for Swainson's hawk, White-tailed kite, and western burrowing owl. The site is considered low quality due to the tall grass height and proximity to other developed parcels. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM IV-1, MM IV-2, and MM IV-3 would reduce the potential impacts on special-status species and their habitat by requiring pre-construction surveys and, if evidence of special-status species or their habitat are found on the project site, requiring avoidance or relocation.

- **IV-4: Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, including oak woodlands, identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish**

**& Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries.** The project site contains seasonal wetland habitat (low quality) which is considered a sensitive natural community by the CDFW. There are no riparian or oak woodland habitats identified within the project site. Other sensitive natural communities include seasonal wetlands and seasonal swales identified during the formal wetland delineation. The project would remove approximately 0.065 acres of depressional seasonal wetlands, 0.073 acres of seasonal swales, and 0.013 acres of lacustrine (stock pond) habitat. Although the jurisdictional status of these wetlands has not been verified by USACE, removal of these features may have a substantial adverse effect. This document assumes that some or all of the noted features will be determined to be jurisdictional; in the event that some or all of the features are determined to be non-jurisdictional, mitigation would not be required. Implementation of Mitigation Measure IV-4, below, would mitigate potential impacts to sensitive natural communities identified by CDFW. Therefore, the impact would be less-than-significant with incorporation of mitigation.

#### Mitigation Measures

*MM IV-4: Compensate for impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S. The project applicant shall obtain all required permit approvals from USACE under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), including a Water Quality Certification under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act and fulfill Waste Discharge Requirements under the State's Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.*

*Wetlands that cannot be avoided shall be compensated to result in "no net loss" of wetlands to ensure that the project would maintain the current functions and values of onsite wetland habitats. Loss of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. will be mitigated by purchasing mitigation credits from a USACE-approved local mitigation bank at a ratio of 1:1 to mitigate for 0.151 acres of Waters of the U.S.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM IV-4 would reduce the potential impacts on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

The project site contains approximately 0.151 acres of depressional seasonal wetlands, seasonal swales, and lacustrine habitat that could be identified as Waters of the U.S. Development on the project site may result in the loss of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM IV-4 would reduce the potential impacts on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities by requiring permit approvals and compensation to ensure "no net loss" of wetlands, including the purchasing

of mitigation credits from a USACE-approved local mitigation bank at ratio of 1:1, for jurisdictional waters.

- IV-5: Have a substantial adverse effect on federal or state protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or as defined by state statute, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.** The project site contains seasonal wetland habitat (low quality) which is considered a sensitive natural community by the CDFW. There are no riparian or oak woodland habitats identified within the project site. Other sensitive natural communities include seasonal wetlands and seasonal swales identified during the formal wetland delineation. The project would remove approximately 0.065 acres of depressional seasonal wetlands, 0.073 acres of seasonal swales, and 0.013 acres of lacustrine (stock pond) habitat. Although the jurisdictional status of these wetlands has not been verified by USACE, removal of these features may have a substantial adverse effect. This document assumes that some or all of the noted features will be determined to be jurisdictional; in the event that some or all of the features are determined to be non-jurisdictional, mitigation would not be required. Implementation of Mitigation Measure IV-4, below, would mitigate potential impacts to sensitive natural communities identified by CDFW. Therefore, the impact would be less-than-significant with incorporation of mitigation.

#### Mitigation Measures

***MM IV-4:** Compensate for impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S. The project applicant shall obtain all required permit approvals from USACE under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), including a Water Quality Certification under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act and fulfill Waste Discharge Requirements under the State's Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.*

*Wetlands that cannot be avoided shall be compensated to result in "no net loss" of wetlands to ensure that the project would maintain the current functions and values of onsite wetland habitats. Loss of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. will be mitigated by purchasing mitigation credits from a USACE-approved local mitigation bank at a ratio of 1:1 to mitigate for 0.151 acres of Waters of the U.S.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM IV-4 would reduce the potential impacts on protected wetlands to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

As discussed under Impact IV-4, the project site contains approximately 0.151 acres of depressional seasonal wetlands, seasonal swales, and lacustrine habitat that could be

identified as Waters of the U.S. Development on the project site may result in the loss of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM IV-4 would reduce the potential impacts on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities by requiring permit approvals and compensation to ensure “no net loss” of wetlands, including the purchasing of mitigation credits from a USACE-approved local mitigation bank at ratio of 1:1, for jurisdictional waters.

- IV-6: Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nesting or breeding sites.** Special-status species and their habitats that may be affected either directly or indirectly through implementation of the project include the loss of annual grassland habitat, fill of aquatic habitats (seasonal wetlands, seasonal swales, lacustrine), removal of protected trees, and potential impacts to raptors and migratory birds (Swainson’s hawk, white-tailed kite, and western burrowing owl). The project site is bound by residential and vacant/undeveloped properties to the north, south and west and Sierra College Boulevard on the east. The site lacks woodland, riparian, or aquatic corridors that connect the site to other habitats. Because of the pattern of development on surrounding and nearby properties, implementation of the project would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native or resident migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nesting or breeding sites. Although the site contains tree canopies that would provide suitable nesting habitat for raptors and other bird species, there are no known nests or rookeries on-site. Mitigation Measures IV-1 IV-2, and IV-3, as modified in response to CDFW comments, would avoid any potential adverse effects on nesting birds. Thus, the impact to wildlife movement or wildlife migratory corridors would be less than significant.

#### Mitigation Measures

*MM IV-1: A pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 3 days prior to demolition/construction activities during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31). If there is a break in construction activity of more than 2 weeks, subsequent surveys shall be completed. During this survey, the qualified wildlife biologist shall inspect all trees in and immediately adjacent to the impact area for the white-tailed kite and other raptor and migratory bird nests. If the above survey does not identify any nesting raptor species on or near the construction site, further mitigation is not required. However, should any raptor species be found nesting on or near the construction site (within 500 feet of construction activities), the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:*

- Prior to the issuance of Improvement Plans, the project applicant, in consultation with the Placer County and CDFW, shall avoid all birds of prey or migratory bird nest sites located in the construction area during breeding season while the nest is occupied with adults and/or eggs or young. The occupied nest shall be monitored by a qualified wildlife biologist to determine when the nest is no longer used. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a no disturbance buffer zone*

around the nest site. The size of the buffer zone shall be determined in consultation with Placer County and CDFW. Highly visible temporary construction fencing shall delineate the buffer zone.

- b. If a legally-protected species nest is located in a tree designated for removal, the removal shall be deferred until after August 31, or until the adults and young are no longer dependent on the nest site, as determined by a qualified biologist.

**MM IV-2:** Prior to construction activities, applicant qualified biologist shall conduct four burrowing owl surveys on the project site and within a 500-foot buffer of the project site, as feasible, in accordance with CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 1995) no more than 30 days prior to the onset of project-related disturbance activities. The biologist shall conduct at least one site visit between February 15 and April 15, and a minimum of three survey visits, at least three weeks apart, between April 15 and July 15, with at least one visit after June 15. Surveys shall not be conducted during inclement weather, when burrowing owls are typically less active and visible. If no burrowing owls or evidence of burrowing owls (e.g., whitewash or pellets) are observed during surveys, no additional mitigation is necessary. If active owl burrows are located during the pre-activity survey, the following measures shall be implemented consistent with the CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation:

- a. The project applicant shall not disturb occupied burrowing owl burrows during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31) unless it is verified by a qualified biologist that either the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation, or that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival. Eviction outside the nesting season may be permitted pending evaluation of eviction plans and receipt of formal written approval from the CDFW.
- b. Unless otherwise authorized by the CDFW, the project applicant shall establish a 250-foot buffer between the construction work area and nesting burrowing owls during the nesting season. If a 250-foot buffer is not feasible, a qualified biologist shall consult with the CDFW to determine an appropriate buffer distance. The project applicant shall maintain this buffer area until August 31 or at CDFW's discretion and based upon monitoring evidence, until the young owls are foraging independently.
- c. Unless otherwise authorized by the CDFW, the project applicant shall establish a 160-foot buffer between the construction work area and occupied burrows during the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31). If a 160-foot buffer is not feasible, a qualified biologist shall consult with the CDFW to determine an appropriate buffer distance. The proponent will maintain this buffer area until January 31 or at CDFW's discretion and based upon monitoring evidence, until the young owls are foraging independently.

- d. *If burrowing owls must be moved away from the construction footprint, the project applicant shall undertake the passive relocation measures in accordance with CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. The project applicant shall submit a memorandum to Placer County documenting compliance with the CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation on a weekly basis. Placer County shall consult with the CDFW as appropriate to ensure compliance.*

*MM IV-3: If any vegetation removal occurs during the typical avian nesting season (February 1 through August 31), the project applicant shall conduct a pre-disturbance survey to determine if active nests are present on the project site. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than two weeks prior to the onset of vegetation removal. If active nests are found on the site, disturbance or removal of the nest should be avoided until the young have fledged and the nest is no longer active. Extensive buffers, such as those recommended for nesting raptors, are not necessary for nesting avian species protected solely by the MBTA. However, depending on the species, site conditions, and the proposed construction activities near the active nest, a small buffer may be prescribed, as determined by a qualified biologist. Alternatively, vegetation removal could be scheduled to avoid all potential impacts. Vegetation removal conducted between September 1 and January 31 would not require a pre-disturbance nesting bird survey.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM IV-1, MM IV-2, and MM IV-3 would reduce the potential impacts on native resident or migratory wildlife species and their habitat to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

As discussed in the Initial Study, Section IV, the project site contains low quality foraging habitat suitable for Swainson's hawk, White-tailed kite, and western burrowing owl. The site is considered low quality due to the tall grass height and proximity to other developed parcels. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM IV-1, MM IV-2, and MM IV-3 would reduce the potential impacts on native resident or migratory wildlife species and their habitat by requiring pre-construction surveys and, if evidence of special-status species or their habitat are found on the project site, requiring avoidance or relocation.

- **IV-7: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, including oak woodland resources.** The Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance regulates both the removal of protected trees and the encroachment of construction activities within their driplines. Protected trees include any native tree, excluding foothill pine (*Pinus sabiniana*), with a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 5 inches or greater, or a multiple-trunk tree with an aggregate DBH of 10 inches or greater. The project would remove a total of 45 trees from the project site, including 28 protected trees (20 native

oak trees, 3 native willow trees, and 5 native ash trees). To accommodate the proposed right-in turn movement, 8 trees would be removed from the existing median on Sierra College Boulevard. None of the median trees are native species or of sufficient size to trigger protective measures. For the 28 protected trees on the project site, compliance with the requirements of the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance to mitigate for impacts due to tree removal and implementation of Mitigation Measure IV-5 to protect retained trees would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level with incorporation of mitigation.

#### Mitigation Measures

**MM IV-5:** *Compensate for Impacts to Protected Trees and Protect Retained Trees. The applicant shall obtain a Tree Permit and shall provide mitigation for the loss of the on-site, native oak trees protected under the Placer County Tree Ordinance which are five inches or greater diameter at breast height as single stemmed trees, or 10 inches DBH or larger in aggregate for multiple stemmed trees.*

*The project applicant shall compensate for the loss of such trees either through onsite planting of native trees or payment of fees, as determined by the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance. If the applicant chooses to mitigate onsite, mitigation shall include planting of replacement native trees of the same species as were removed at a 1:1 ratio for the total inches (DBH) of native trees removed (i.e., the total DBH of replacement trees will be equal to the total DBH of removed trees at an "inch-for-an-inch" replacement). Trees will be specimens in at least 1-gallon sized pots selected from a local nursery and planted in accordance to industry standards. A 3-year maintenance schedule shall be implemented to ensure planted saplings are established. If any five gallon size tree or greater that was replanted or relocated that is dead after three years, the tree must be replaced in kind with equal sized healthy replacements. Revegetated areas or areas where trees smaller than five gallon size were replanted must have at least seventy-five (75) percent of the trees still alive after three years. Alternatively, the applicant may choose to mitigate for removal of native trees by paying into the Placer County Tree Preservation Fund prior to approval of the Grading Plans. The amount shall equal 100 dollars for each inch of protected trees removed, or the current market value as established by an Arborist.*

*The following protection measures shall be implemented to protect retained trees on-site:*

- *A Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) shall be established around any tree or group of trees to be retained. The TPZ shall be defined as 1.5 times the radius of the dripline or 5 feet from the edge of any grading, whichever is greater, unless otherwise adjusted on a case-by-case basis after consultation with a certified arborist.*
- *All TPZs shall be marked with post and wire or equivalent fencing, which shall remain in place for the duration of construction activities in the area. "Keep out" signs shall be posted on TPZ fencing facing out in all directions.*

- *Construction-related activities, including grading, trenching, construction, demolition, or other work shall be prohibited within the TPZ. No heavy equipment or machinery shall be operated within the TPZ. No construction materials, equipment, machinery, or other supplies shall be stored within a TPZ. No wires or signs shall be attached to any tree. In the event that the contractor identifies a need to conduct activities within a TPZ, such activities must be approved and monitored by a certified arborist.*
- *Selected trees shall be pruned, as necessary, to provide clearance during construction and/or to remove any defective limbs or other parts that may pose a failure risk. All pruning shall be completed by a certified arborist or tree worker and shall adhere to the Tree Pruning Guidelines of the International Society of Arboriculture.*
- *Each week during construction, a certified arborist shall monitor the health and condition of the protected trees and, if necessary, recommend additional mitigations and appropriate actions. This shall include the monitoring of trees adjacent to project facilities in order to determine if construction activities (including the removal of nearby trees) would affect protected trees in the future.*
- *Provide supplemental irrigation and other care, such as mulch and fertilizer, as deemed necessary by a certified arborist. Any injuries shall be treated by a certified arborist.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM IV-5 would reduce the potential impacts related to conflicts with local policies or ordinances that aim to protect biological resources to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

The project would remove a total of 45 trees from the project site, including 28 protected trees. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM IV-5 would reduce the potential impacts related to conflicts with local policies or ordinances that aim to protect biological resources by requiring compensation for impacts to protected trees by adhering to the Placer County Tree Ordinance either through onsite mitigation at a 1:1 ratio for the total inches removed or through the payment of fees at \$100 per inch of protected trees removed, or current market value as established by an arborist.

## CULTURAL RESOURCES

## Initial Study

- V-1: Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5.** A cultural resources investigation was prepared by TRC Solutions, Inc. and is documented in a report dated July 2014 (TRC, 2014). The TRC report was reviewed by ESA cultural resources experts and Placer County staff, and was determined to be adequate for purposes of evaluating the cultural resources of the proposed project. This investigation included a records search at the North Central Information Center (March 11, 2014, NCIC# PLA-14- 25), NAHC contact (April 2014), and field survey (March 25, 2014 and July 9, 2014). The investigation concluded that there was no evidence of prehistoric or historic sites on the project site and that no historical resources are present on the project site. The archival and field studies did not indicate any evidence of human burials or burial grounds within the project site. As such, it is highly unlikely that the project would disturb any known human remains. Nevertheless, the potential exists that despite the lack of current evidence, there could be a discovery of unknown remains that could be buried on the project site, thus this impact would be considered potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure V-1 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. While the report indicated that there is no evidence of cultural resources on the project site, construction activities could uncover previously unknown resources. Mitigation Measures V-1 through V-2 are standard measures applied by Placer County for the purpose of reducing potential impacts from previously unknown archaeological resources and human remains.

Mitigation Measures

***MM V-1:** The improvement plans shall include a statement that 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 shall be stopped immediately within a 100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Services Division and Department of Museums shall 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 Services Division. 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 that provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.*

***MM V-2:** Prior to the start of ground disturbance, construction personnel to be involved with earth-moving activities should be informed that artifacts could be discovered during excavating, that these items are protected by laws, on the appearance of common*

*artifacts, and on proper notification procedures should artifacts be discovered. This worker training should be prepared and presented by a qualified professional.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM V-1 and MM V-2 would reduce impacts from changes in the significance of a historical resource to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

While the cultural report indicated that there is no evidence of cultural resources or human remains on the project site, construction activities could uncover previously unknown resources. Mitigation Measures V-1 and V-2 are standard measures applied by Placer County for the purpose of reducing potential impacts from previously unknown historical resources and human remains. Should these resources be uncovered during project construction, appropriate steps would be taken to properly handle them.

- V-2: Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5.** A cultural resources investigation was prepared by TRC Solutions, Inc. and is documented in a report dated July 2014 (TRC, 2014). The TRC report was reviewed by ESA cultural resources experts and Placer County staff, and was determined to be adequate for purposes of evaluating the cultural resources of the proposed project. This investigation included a records search at the North Central Information Center (March 11, 2014, NCIC# PLA-14- 25), NAHC contact (April 2014), and field survey (March 25, 2014 and July 9, 2014). The investigation concluded that there was no evidence of prehistoric or historic sites on the project site and that no historical resources are present on the project site. The archival and field studies did not indicate any evidence of human burials or burial grounds within the project site. As such, it is highly unlikely that the project would disturb any known human remains. Nevertheless, the potential exists that despite the lack of current evidence, there could be a discovery of unknown remains that could be buried on the project site, thus this impact would be considered potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure V-1 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. While the report indicated that there is no evidence of cultural resources on the project site, construction activities could uncover previously unknown resources. Mitigation Measures V-1 through V-2 are standard measures applied by Placer County for the purpose of reducing potential impacts from previously unknown archaeological resources and human remains.

#### Mitigation Measures

**MM V-1:** *The improvement plans shall include a statement that 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 shall be stopped immediately within a*

*100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Services Division and Department of Museums shall 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 Services Division. 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 that provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.*

*MM V-2: Prior to the start of ground disturbance, construction personnel to be involved with earth-moving activities should be informed that artifacts could be discovered during excavating, that these items are protected by laws, on the appearance of common artifacts, and on proper notification procedures should artifacts be discovered. This worker training should be prepared and presented by a qualified professional.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM V-1 and MM V-2 would reduce impacts from adverse changes in the significance of a unique archaeological to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

While the cultural report indicated that there is no evidence of cultural resources or human remains on the project site, construction activities could uncover previously unknown archaeological resources. Mitigation Measures V-1 and V-2 are standard measures applied by Placer County for the purpose of reducing potential impacts from previously unknown archaeological resources and human remains.

- **V-3: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.** Paleontological resources are fossilized remains of plants and animals that can be present in certain fossiliferous geologic formations. PaleoResource Consultants, in a report dated July 2014 (PaleoResource Consultants, 2014), evaluated the potential for the geologic formations underlying the project site and that could be disturbed during earth moving activities, and concluded that the project site is underlain by formation that could contain significant paleontological resources, specifically Pleistocene vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant macrofossils; microfossils, and ichnofossils in the Turlock Lake and Riverbank Formations. The paleontological resources report revealed that fossil remains were found at two previously unrecorded fossil localities and concluded that the project has a high potential to produce fossil resources (PaleoResource Consultants, 2014:20). ESA Site clearing, grading, and deeper excavation at the site that disturbs these formations could result in significant adverse impacts to paleontological

resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measures V-3 through V-8 would reduce the potentially significant adverse environmental impact of project-related ground disturbance and earth-moving on paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level by allowing for the salvage of fossil remains and associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data that otherwise might be lost to earth-moving and to unauthorized fossil collecting.

### Mitigation Measures

***MM V-3:** Prior to improvement plan submittal, the applicant shall provide written evidence to the Planning Services Division that a qualified paleontologist has been retained by the applicant to observe grading activities and salvage fossils as necessary. The paleontologist shall establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance and shall establish, in cooperation with the project developer, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit sampling, identification, and evaluation of fossils. If major paleontological resources are discovered, which require temporary halting or redirecting of grading, the paleontologist shall report such findings to the project developer, and to the Placer County Department of Museums and Planning Services Division.*

*The paleontologist shall determine appropriate protocols which ensure proper exploration and/or salvage of all fossils. Excavated finds shall be offered to a State-designated repository such as Museum of Paleontology, U.C. Berkeley, the California Academy of Sciences, or any other State-designated repository. Otherwise, the finds shall be offered to the Placer County Department of Museums for purposes of public education and interpretive displays.*

*These actions, as well as final mitigation and disposition of the resources shall be subject to approval by the Department of Museums. The paleontologist shall submit a follow-up report to the Department of Museums and Planning Services Division, which shall include the period of inspections, an analysis of the fossils found, and present repository of fossils.*

***MM V-4:** Retain a Project Paleontologist. Prior to the start of ground disturbance, a qualified professional paleontologist (as defined by SVP 2010) shall be retained to both design a monitoring and mitigation program and implement the program during project-related excavation and earth disturbance activities. The paleontological resource monitoring and mitigation program shall include preconstruction coordination; construction monitoring; emergency salvage procedures; sampling and data recovery; preparation, identification, and analysis of the significance of fossil specimens salvaged; museum storage of any specimens and data recovered; and reporting. Prior to the start of construction, the paleontologist shall conduct a field survey of exposures of sensitive stratigraphic units within the construction footprint that will be disturbed and salvage any fossils discovered.*

**MM V-5: Worker Training.** *Prior to the start of ground disturbance, construction personnel to be involved with earth-moving activities shall be informed that fossils will likely be discovered during excavating, that these fossils are protected by laws, and shall be trained on the appearance of common fossils, and on proper notification procedures should fossils be discovered. This worker training shall be prepared and presented by a qualified professional paleontologist.*

**MM V-6: Monitoring.** *Earth-moving activities shall be monitored and inspected for the presence of potentially fossiliferous sediments by a qualified field paleontologist as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists (SVP). Monitoring shall not be conducted in soils that have been previously disturbed or in areas where exposed soils will be buried, but not otherwise disturbed. A monitor shall be present during actual earth-moving during the first few days of initial project grading to observe the stratigraphy and any fossils exposed by excavations. If no significant fossils are discovered during this time, monitoring should be reduced to only periodic spot checking of the deepest excavations or those judged most likely to disturb fossils. Should fossils be discovered, increased monitoring shall occur.*

**MM V-7: Salvage and Treatment of Fossils Discovered.** *Any paleontological materials exposed during project excavations shall be salvaged and treated as described by SVP (2010). This treatment shall include preparation, identification, determination of significance, and curation into a public museum.*

**MM V-8: Preparation of Final Report.** *Within ninety (90) days following the end of project excavations, the project paleontologist shall prepare a final report, summarizing the complete mitigation program, describing and illustrating any fossils recovered, along with their significance, and certifying that the paleontological resource impact mitigation program resulted in insignificant impacts on paleontological resources as required by CEQA. The acceptance of the final report by the County shall complete the mitigation program.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM V-3, V-4, V-5, V-6, V-7, and V-8 would reduce impacts on unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

The project site is underlain by formation that could contain significant paleontological resources, which could be disturbed during earth moving activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM V-3, V-4, V-5, V-6, V-7, and V-8 would mitigate impacts on unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature by allowing for the salvage of fossil remains and associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and

geographic site data that otherwise might be lost to earth-moving and to unauthorized fossil collecting.

- V-4: Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values.** A cultural resources investigation was prepared by TRC Solutions, Inc. and is documented in a report dated July 2014 (TRC, 2014). The TRC report was reviewed by ESA cultural resources experts and Placer County staff, and was determined to be adequate for purposes of evaluating the cultural resources of the proposed project. This investigation included a records search at the North Central Information Center (March 11, 2014, NCIC# PLA-14- 25), NAHC contact (April 2014), and field survey (March 25, 2014 and July 9, 2014). The investigation concluded that there was no evidence of prehistoric or historic sites on the project site and that no historical resources are present on the project site. The archival and field studies did not indicate any evidence of human burials or burial grounds within the project site. As such, it is highly unlikely that the project would disturb any known human remains. Nevertheless, the potential exists that despite the lack of current evidence, there could be a discovery of unknown remains that could be buried on the project site, thus this impact would be considered potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure V-1 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. While the report indicated that there is no evidence of cultural resources on the project site, construction activities could uncover previously unknown resources. Mitigation Measures V-1 through V-2 are standard measures applied by Placer County for the purpose of reducing potential impacts from previously unknown archaeological resources and human remains.

#### Mitigation Measures

***MM V-1:** The improvement plans shall include a statement that 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 shall be stopped immediately within a 100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Services Division and Department of Museums shall 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 Services Division. 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 that provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.*

***MM V-2:** Prior to the start of ground disturbance, construction personnel to be involved with earth-moving activities should be informed that artifacts could be discovered during excavating, that these items are protected by laws, on the appearance of common artifacts, and on proper notification procedures should artifacts be discovered. This worker training should be prepared and presented by a qualified professional.*

Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM V-1 and MM V-2 would reduce impacts to unique ethnic cultural values to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

Explanation

While the cultural report indicated that there is no evidence of cultural resources on the project site, construction activities could uncover previously unknown unique ethnic cultural resources. Mitigation Measures V-1 and V-2 are standard measures applied by Placer County for the purpose of reducing potential impacts from previously unknown archaeological resources and human remains, and would reduce the impact to previously unknown unique ethnic cultural resources by ensuring they are protected if uncovered.

- **V-6: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.** A cultural resources investigation was prepared by TRC Solutions, Inc. and is documented in a report dated July 2014 (TRC, 2014). The TRC report was reviewed by ESA cultural resources experts and Placer County staff, and was determined to be adequate for purposes of evaluating the cultural resources of the proposed project. This investigation included a records search at the North Central Information Center (March 11, 2014, NCIC# PLA-14- 25), NAHC contact (April 2014), and field survey (March 25, 2014 and July 9, 2014). The investigation concluded that there was no evidence of prehistoric or historic sites on the project site and that no historical resources are present on the project site. The archival and field studies did not indicate any evidence of human burials or burial grounds within the project site. As such, it is highly unlikely that the project would disturb any known human remains. Nevertheless, the potential exists that despite the lack of current evidence, there could be a discovery of unknown remains that could be buried on the project site, thus this impact would be considered potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure V-1 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. While the report indicated that there is no evidence of cultural resources on the project site, construction activities could uncover previously unknown resources. Mitigation Measures V-1 through V-2 are standard measures applied by Placer County for the purpose of reducing potential impacts from previously unknown archaeological resources and human remains.

Mitigation Measures

***MM V-1:** The improvement plans shall include a statement that 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 shall be stopped immediately within a 100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Services Division and Department of Museums shall 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 Services Division. 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 that provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.*

*MM V-2: Prior to the start of ground disturbance, construction personnel to be involved with earth-moving activities should be informed that artifacts could be discovered during excavating, that these items are protected by laws, on the appearance of common artifacts, and on proper notification procedures should artifacts be discovered. This worker training should be prepared and presented by a qualified professional.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM V-1 and MM V-2 would reduce impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

While the cultural report indicated that there is no evidence of human remains or other cultural resources on the project site, construction activities could uncover previously unknown resources. Mitigation Measures V-1 and V-2 are standard measures applied by Placer County for the purpose of reducing potential impacts from previously unknown human remains.

## GEOLOGY AND SOILS

### Initial Study

- **VI-1: Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures.** While the project site could be subject to seismic activity, it is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (AP Fault Zone). Because the project site is not within an AP Fault Zone, it is unlikely that the project would subject people or structures to strong groundshaking surface rupture, or seismically-induced liquefaction. In addition, the proposed grades anticipated with the project would not create extreme slopes that would be vulnerable to landslides or mudslides. A geotechnical report dated March 14, 2014/Revised July 24, 2014 by Mid Pacific Engineering analyzed the geological conditions and hazards of the project and project site (MPE, 2014). ESA and Placer County staff reviewed the report and determined it to be adequate for inclusion in the Initial Study. The report concluded that groundwater depth was sufficient, and that groundwater levels would not be a factor in structure design. The geotechnical report provided site-specific recommendations for site preparation, excavation, foundation design, and other project construction activities. Because these recommendations are

based on generally accepted construction practices and have been formulated to specifically to address the proposed project, implementation of Mitigation Measures VI-1a-d would ensure that this impact would be less than significant.

### Mitigation Measures

**MM VI-1a:** *The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) for review and approval of each project phase. The plans shall show all physical improvements as required by the 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 and Placer County Fire Department improvement plan review and inspection fees with the 1st Improvement Plan submittal. 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 Development Review Committee (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 in both hard copy and electronic versions in a format to be approved by the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.*

*Conceptual landscape plans submitted prior to project approval may require modification during the Improvement Plan process to resolve issues of drainage and traffic safety.*

**MM VI-1b:** *The Improvement Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, 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 Development Review Committee (DRC). All cut/fill slopes shall be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal: vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) concurs with said recommendation. Fill slopes shall not exceed 1.5:1 (horizontal: vertical).*

*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 ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas, shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD).*

*The applicant shall submit to the ESD 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 DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.*

**MM VI-1c:** *The Improvement Plan submittal shall include a final geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer for Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) review and approval. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:*

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

*Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the ESD and one copy to the Building Services Division for its use. 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.*

*MM VI-1d: Staging Areas: The Improvement Plans shall identify the stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas with locations as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VI-1a through MM VI-1d would reduce impacts related to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

The project site is not within an AP Fault Zone, and it is unlikely that the project would subject people or structures to strong groundshaking surface rupture, or seismically-induced liquefaction. In addition, the proposed grades anticipated with the project would not create extreme slopes that would be vulnerable to landslides or mudslides. Nevertheless, a geotechnical report was prepared to address the reduction of potential exposure of people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VI-1a through MM VI-1b would mitigate impacts related to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures by implementing site-specific recommendations for site preparation, excavation, foundation design, and other project construction activities as recommended in the geotechnical report prepared for the proposed project.

- VI-2: Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil.** The geotechnical report (MPE, July 24, 2014) determined that the project site is underlain by Fiddymont loam, 1 to 8 percent slopes. The Fiddymont Series consists of moderately deep, well drained soils formed in material weathered from consolidated sediments of mixed rock sources. Fiddymont soils are on nearly level to rolling low terraces and hills and have slopes of 0 to 15 percent, possess slow to medium runoff and very slow permeability. Water perches above the claypan for short periods after episodes of heavy rainfall. The geotechnical report also stated that laboratory test results indicate that the onsite, near-surface clayey soils possess “very low” to “medium” expansion potential. Based on this information, the geotechnical report includes project-specific recommendations based on generally accepted construction methods. The project earthwork is proposed to balance on site, with approximately 61,700 cubic yards of cut and 61,700 cubic yards of fill. The maximum depth of cut is 12-14 feet and the maximum height of fill is 12-14 feet. All resulting finished grades are proposed to be no steeper than 2:1. The Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report concluded that the site soil should provide adequate pavement support and is suitable for the proposed residential development. The report concluded that the construction of the proposed improvements is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint given that the recommendations of a registered geotechnical engineer are incorporated into the design plans and implemented during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measures VI-1a-d would ensure that the

proposed project's impacts associated with soil disruptions, displacements, and compactions of the soil will be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

#### Mitigation Measures

*MM VI-2: Implement MM VI-1a-d.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM VI-2, which in turn requires implementation of MM VI-1a-d, would reduce impacts related to soils to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

According to the geotechnical report, the onsite, near-surface clayey soils possess "very low" to "medium" expansion potential, and should provide adequate pavement support and is suitable for the proposed residential development. The report also made recommendations to reduce the potential disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM VI-2 would mitigate impacts related to soils by implementing site-specific recommendations for site preparation, excavation, foundation design, and other project construction activities as recommended in the geotechnical report prepared for the proposed project.

- **VI-5: Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site.** Project construction would include site preparation activities, including grading and fill. These activities could increase the risk of erosion by exposing dirt to wind, rain, and runoff. The project would be required to adhere to the conditions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (General Construction Permit). Conditions of the permit would require the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that would document implementation of construction period best management practices (BMPs), monitoring, and other measures designed to minimize the release of construction related water pollutants and sediment from the project site. Adherence to these measures would minimize construction period effects on water quality. The geotechnical report prepared for the project further discussed the potential for erosion and included recommendations to minimize erosion. The project's site-specific impacts associated with erosion would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by implementing Mitigation Measure VI-3a-c.

#### Mitigation Measures

*MM VI-3a: The Improvement Plans shall show that water quality treatment facilities/ Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice*

*Handbooks for Construction, for New Development and Redevelopment, and for Industrial and Commercial (or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD)).*

*Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project shall include, but are not limited to: Fiber Rolls (SE-5), Hydroseeding (EC-4), Silt Fence, Stabilized Construction Entrance (LDM Plate C-4), Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance (NS-10), Wind Erosion Control (WE-1), Material Delivery and Storage (WM-1), sediment traps, revegetation techniques, dust control measures, concrete truck washout areas, and weekly street sweeping.*

**MM VI-3b:** *The applicant shall demonstrate that all excavations and fill slopes are protected from concentrated storm water run-off to minimize potential erosion. Control of water over the slopes may be accomplished by constructing V-ditches near the top of slopes, or by grading the area behind the top of slope to drain away from the slope. Ponding of surface water at the top of slope or allowing sheet flow of water over the top of a slope shall be avoided.*

**MM VI-3c:** *Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall obtain a State Regional Water Quality Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction stormwater quality permit and shall provide to the Engineering and Surveying Division evidence of a state-issued Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VI-3a, VI-3b, and VI-3c would reduce impacts related to erosion to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

Project site preparation activities could increase the risk of erosion by exposing dirt to wind, rain, and runoff. The project would be required to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan to comply with the NPDES General Construction Permit. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VI-3a, VI-3b, and VI-3c would mitigate impacts related to erosion by requiring implementation of best management practices that would provide protection from erosion and ensuring stormwater runoff is appropriately managed during construction activities.

- **VI-7: Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards.** While the project site could be subject to seismic activity, it is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (AP Fault Zone). Because the project site is not within an AP Fault Zone, it is unlikely that the project would subject people or structures to strong groundshaking surface rupture, or seismically-induced liquefaction. In addition, the proposed grades anticipated with the project would not create extreme

slopes that would be vulnerable to landslides or mudslides. A geotechnical report dated March 14, 2014/Revised July 24, 2014 by Mid Pacific Engineering analyzed the geological conditions and hazards of the project and project site (MPE, 2014). ESA and Placer County staff reviewed the report and determined it to be adequate for inclusion in this IS. The report concluded that groundwater depth was sufficient, and that groundwater levels would not be a factor in structure design. The geotechnical report provided site-specific recommendations for site preparation, excavation, foundation design, and other project construction activities. Because these recommendations are based on generally accepted construction practices and have been formulated to specifically to address the proposed project, implementation of Mitigation Measures VI-1a-d would ensure that this impact would be less than significant.

### Mitigation Measures

**MM VI-1a:** *The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) for review and approval of each project phase. The plans shall show all physical improvements as required by the 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 and Placer County Fire Department improvement plan review and inspection fees with the 1st Improvement Plan submittal. 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 Development Review Committee (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 in both hard copy and electronic versions in a format to be approved by the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.*

*Conceptual landscape plans submitted prior to project approval may require modification during the Improvement Plan process to resolve issues of drainage and traffic safety.*

**MM VI-1b:** *The Improvement Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, 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 Development Review Committee (DRC). All cut/fill slopes shall be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal: vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) concurs with said recommendation. Fill slopes shall not exceed 1.5:1 (horizontal: vertical).*

*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 ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas, shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD).*

*The applicant shall submit to the ESD 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 DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.*

**MM VI-1c:** *The Improvement Plan submittal shall include a final geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer for Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) review and approval. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:*

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

*Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the ESD and one copy to the Building Services Division for its use. 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.*

***MM VI-1d:** Staging Areas: The Improvement Plans shall identify the stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas with locations as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VI-1a through MM VI-1d would reduce impacts related to geologic and geomorphological hazards to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

The project site is not within an AP Fault Zone, and it is unlikely that the project would subject people or structures to strong groundshaking surface rupture, or seismically-induced liquefaction. In addition, the proposed grades anticipated with the project would not create extreme slopes that would be vulnerable to landslides or mudslides. Nevertheless, a geotechnical report was prepared to address the reduction of potential exposure of people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VI-1a through MM VI-1b would mitigate impacts related to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures by implementing site-specific recommendations for site preparation, excavation, foundation design, and other project construction activities as recommended in the geotechnical report prepared for the proposed project.

- **VI-8: Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.** While the project site could be subject to seismic activity, it is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (AP Fault Zone). Because the project site is not within an AP Fault Zone, it is unlikely that the project would subject people or structures to strong groundshaking surface rupture, or seismically-induced liquefaction. In addition, the proposed grades anticipated with the project would not create extreme slopes that would be vulnerable to landslides or mudslides. A geotechnical report dated March 14, 2014/Revised July 24, 2014 by Mid Pacific Engineering analyzed the geological conditions and hazards of the project and project site (MPE, 2014). ESA and Placer County staff reviewed the report and determined it to be adequate for inclusion in this IS. The report concluded that groundwater depth was sufficient, and that groundwater levels would not be a factor in structure design. The geotechnical report provided site-specific recommendations for site preparation, excavation, foundation design, and other project construction activities. Because these recommendations are based on generally accepted construction practices

and have been formulated to specifically to address the proposed project, implementation of Mitigation Measures VI-1a-d would ensure that this impact would be less than significant.

### Mitigation Measures

**MM VI-1a:** *The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) for review and approval of each project phase. The plans shall show all physical improvements as required by the 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 and Placer County Fire Department improvement plan review and inspection fees with the 1st Improvement Plan submittal. 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 Development Review Committee (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 in both hard copy and electronic versions in a format to be approved by the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.*

*Conceptual landscape plans submitted prior to project approval may require modification during the Improvement Plan process to resolve issues of drainage and traffic safety.*

**MM VI-1b:** *The Improvement Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, 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 Development Review Committee (DRC). All cut/fill slopes shall be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal: vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) concurs with said recommendation. Fill slopes shall not exceed 1.5:1 (horizontal: vertical).*

*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 ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas, shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD).*

*The applicant shall submit to the ESD 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 DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.*

**MM VI-1c:** *The Improvement Plan submittal shall include a final geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer for Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) review and approval. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:*

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

*Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the ESD and one copy to the Building Services Division for its use. 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.*

*MM VI-1d: Staging Areas: The Improvement Plans shall identify the stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas with locations as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VI-1a through MM VI-1d would reduce impacts related to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

The project site is not within an AP Fault Zone, and it is unlikely that the project would subject people or structures to strong groundshaking surface rupture, or seismically-induced liquefaction. In addition, the proposed grades anticipated with the project would not create extreme slopes that would be vulnerable to landslides or mudslides. Nevertheless, a geotechnical report was prepared to address the reduction of potential exposure of people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VI-1a through MM VI-1b would mitigate impacts related to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures by implementing site-specific recommendations for site preparation, excavation, foundation design, and other project construction activities as recommended in the geotechnical report prepared for the proposed project.

- **VI-9: Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Chapter 18 of the California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property.** While the project site could be subject to seismic activity, it is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (AP Fault Zone). Because the project site is not within an AP Fault Zone, it is unlikely that the project would subject people or structures to strong groundshaking surface rupture, or seismically-induced liquefaction. In addition, the proposed grades anticipated with the project would not create extreme slopes that would be vulnerable to landslides or mudslides. A geotechnical report dated March 14, 2014/Revised July 24, 2014 by Mid Pacific Engineering analyzed the geological conditions and hazards of the project and project site (MPE, 2014). ESA and Placer County staff reviewed the report and determined it to be adequate for inclusion in this IS. The report concluded that groundwater depth was sufficient, and that groundwater levels would not be a factor in structure design. The geotechnical report provided site-specific recommendations for site preparation, excavation, foundation design, and other project construction activities. Because these recommendations are based on generally accepted construction practices and have been formulated to specifically to address the proposed project, implementation of Mitigation Measures VI-1a-d would ensure that this impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

**MM VI-1a:** *The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) for review and approval of each project phase. The plans shall show all physical improvements as required by the 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 and Placer County Fire Department improvement plan review and inspection fees with the 1st Improvement Plan submittal. 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 Development Review Committee (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 in both hard copy and electronic versions in a format to be approved by the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.*

*Conceptual landscape plans submitted prior to project approval may require modification during the Improvement Plan process to resolve issues of drainage and traffic safety.*

**MM VI-1b:** *The Improvement Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, 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 Development Review Committee (DRC). All cut/fill slopes shall be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal: vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) concurs with said recommendation. Fill slopes shall not exceed 1.5:1 (horizontal: vertical).*

*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 ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas, shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified*

*in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD).*

*The applicant shall submit to the ESD 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 DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.*

**MM VI-1c:** *The Improvement Plan submittal shall include a final geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer for Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) review and approval. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:*

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

*Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the ESD and one copy to the Building Services Division for its use. 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.*

**MM VI-1d:** *Staging Areas: The Improvement Plans shall identify the stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas with locations as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.*

Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VI-1a through MM VI-1d would reduce impacts related to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

Explanation

The project site is not within an AP Fault Zone, and it is unlikely that the project would subject people or structures to strong groundshaking surface rupture, or seismically-induced liquefaction. In addition, the proposed grades anticipated with the project would not create extreme slopes that would be vulnerable to landslides or mudslides. Nevertheless, a geotechnical report was prepared to address the reduction of potential exposure of people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VI-1a through MM VI-1b would mitigate impacts related to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures by implementing site-specific recommendations for site preparation, excavation, foundation design, and other project construction activities as recommended in the geotechnical report prepared for the proposed project.

## GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

**Draft and Final EIRs**

None. See discussion in Less Than Significant Impacts, above, and Draft EIR, Chapter 3.5.

## HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

**Initial Study**

- **VIII-8: Create any health hazard or potential health hazard.** The project would include the removal of an existing septic system. The septic system would be removed during initial grading work. Removal and disposal of the septic system would be in compliance with all local, state, and federal requirements. Mitigation measures will require complete removal or destruction of the septic system. Compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal requirements and implementation of Mitigation Measures VIII-1 and VIII-2 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

*MM VIII-1: Prior to improvement plan approval, provide a plan note on the improvement plans indicating proper destruction, under permit and inspection, of the existing septic system located within the project site.*

*MM VIII-2: Prior to Final Subdivision Map approval, complete or provide for the proper destruction, under permit and inspection, of the existing septic system located within the project site.*

Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VIII-1 and MM VIII-2 would reduce impacts related to health hazards to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

Explanation

The project would include the removal of an existing septic system, which could represent a potential health hazard. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VIII-1 and MM VIII-2 would mitigate impacts related to health hazards by requiring complete removal or destruction of the existing onsite septic system in compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal requirements.

- **VIII-9: Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards.** The project would include the removal of an existing septic system. The septic system would be removed during initial grading work. Removal and disposal of the septic system would be in compliance with all local, state, and federal requirements. Mitigation measures will require complete removal or destruction of the septic system. Compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal requirements and implementation of Mitigation Measures VIII-1 and VIII-2 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

*MM VIII-1: Prior to improvement plan approval, provide a plan note on the improvement plans indicating proper destruction, under permit and inspection, of the existing septic system located within the project site.*

*MM VIII-2: Prior to Final Subdivision Map approval, complete or provide for the proper destruction, under permit and inspection, of the existing septic system located within the project site.*

Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VIII-1 and MM VIII-2 would reduce impacts related to health hazards to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

Explanation

The project would include the removal of an existing septic system, which could represent a potential health hazard. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM VIII-1

and MM VIII-2 would mitigate impacts related to health hazards by requiring complete removal or destruction of the existing onsite septic system in compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal requirements.

## HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

### Initial Study

- IX-5: Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water.** During project construction and operation, sediments, brake dust, oil, grease, and other pollutants from project roadways could become entrained in stormwater, and cause pollution of stormwater downstream. Additionally, residential use of herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers, and other common chemicals could result in these chemicals being captured by stormwater runoff, resulting in increased pollutant levels downstream. Potential project-related water quality impacts would be minimized by incorporating low impact development (LID) principles to mitigate on-site urban stormwater runoff and meet the water quality requirements. The LID principles include providing an all-inclusive treatment device and adequate detention to mitigate post-project peak flows and volumes. Stormwater from all proposed onsite development would be directed through vegetated areas before entering the drainage inlets and the storm drain conveyance system. Additionally, potential project-related water quality impacts would be minimized via adherence to the requirements of the Placer County's Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit No. CAS000004, Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ), Conditions of the MS4 permit require implementation of operation phase BMPs that would be used to reduce or prevent the release of pollutants from the project site. Implementation of Mitigation Measures IX-1, IX-2 and IX-3 would ensure compliance with the MS4 permit conditions, Placer County's Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Placer County Code, Article 8.28), and best management practices. Adherence to these conditions would ensure that potential project impacts on water quality would be less than significant.

### Mitigation Measures

*MM IX-1: This project is located within the permit area covered by Placer County's Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit No. CAS000004, Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ), pursuant to the NPDES Phase II program. Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said permit.*

*The project shall implement permanent and operational source control measures as applicable. Source control measures shall be designed for pollutant generating activities or sources consistent with recommendations from the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Stormwater BMP Handbook for New Development and Redevelopment, or equivalent manual, and shall be shown on the Improvement Plans.*

The project is also required to implement Low Impact Development (LID) standards designed to reduce runoff, treat stormwater, and provide baseline hydromodification management to the extent feasible.

**MM IX-2:** The Improvement Plan submittal for each project phase shall include a final drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the Engineering and Surveying Division for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. "Best Management Practice" measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.

**MM IX-3:** The Improvement Plans shall show that water quality treatment facilities/Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and for Industrial and Commercial (or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (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 Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD). BMPs shall be designed 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, or other County approved methodology. Post-development (permanent) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: vegetated swales and permanent underground water quality treatment vault. No water quality facility construction shall 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 insure effectiveness. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to ESD upon request. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees.

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM IX-1, IX-2, and IX-3 would reduce impacts related to water quality to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of

Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

The construction and operation of the project could result in the release of pollutants (oil, grease, sediments, common household chemicals, etc.) into stormwater runoff, which could be a substantial source of polluted water. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM IX-1, IX-2, and IX-3 would mitigate impacts related to water quality by ensuring compliance with the MS4 permit conditions, Placer County's Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Placer County Code, Article 8.28), and best management practices.

- IX-6: Otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality.** During project operation, sediments, brake dust, oil, grease, and other pollutants from project roadways could become entrained in stormwater, and cause pollution of stormwater downstream. Additionally, residential use of herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers, and other common chemicals could result in these chemicals being captured by stormwater runoff, resulting in increased pollutant levels downstream. Potential project-related water quality impacts would be minimized by incorporating low impact development (LID) principles to mitigate on-site urban stormwater runoff and meet the water quality requirements. The LID principles include providing an all-inclusive treatment device and adequate detention to mitigate post-project peak flows and volumes. Stormwater from all proposed onsite development would be directed through vegetated areas before entering the drainage inlets and the storm drain conveyance system. Additionally, potential project-related water quality impacts would be minimized via adherence to the requirements of the Placer County's Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit No. CAS000004, Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ), Conditions of the MS4 permit require implementation of operation phase BMPs that would be used to reduce or prevent the release of pollutants from the project site. Implementation of Mitigation Measures IX-1, IX-2 and IX-3 would ensure compliance with the MS4 permit conditions, Placer County's Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Placer County Code, Article 8.28), and best management practices. Adherence to these conditions would ensure that potential project impacts on water quality would be less than significant.

#### Mitigation Measures

**MM IX-1:** *This project is located within the permit area covered by Placer County's Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit No. CAS000004, Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ), pursuant to the NPDES Phase II program. Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said permit.*

*The project shall implement permanent and operational source control measures as applicable. Source control measures shall be designed for pollutant generating activities*

or sources consistent with recommendations from the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Stormwater BMP Handbook for New Development and Redevelopment, or equivalent manual, and shall be shown on the Improvement Plans.

The project is also required to implement Low Impact Development (LID) standards designed to reduce runoff, treat stormwater, and provide baseline hydromodification management to the extent feasible.

**MM IX-2:** The Improvement Plan submittal for each project phase shall include a final drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the Engineering and Surveying Division for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. "Best Management Practice" measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.

**MM IX-3:** The Improvement Plans shall show that water quality treatment facilities/Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development/Redevelopment, and for Industrial and Commercial (or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (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 Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD). BMPs shall be designed 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, or other County approved methodology. Post-development (permanent) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: vegetated swales and permanent underground water quality treatment vault. No water quality facility construction shall 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 insure effectiveness. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to ESD upon request. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees.

Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM IX-1, IX-2, and IX-3 would reduce impacts related to water quality to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

Explanation

The construction and operation of the project could result in the release of pollutants (oil, grease, sediments, common household chemicals, etc.) into stormwater runoff, which could substantially degrade surface water quality. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM IX-1, IX-2, and IX-3 would mitigate impacts related to water quality by ensuring compliance with the MS4 permit conditions, Placer County's Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Placer County Code, Article 8.28), and best management practices.

**Draft and Final EIRs**

- **Impact 3.7-3: Implementation of the proposed project could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area.** Project construction would involve grading, excavation, building construction, and other activities that would alter the existing natural flow of runoff in the area. This alteration could change where stormwater exits the project site as well as change the storm flow concentrations and volume exiting the project site during construction activities. This potential drainage pattern alteration could result in a significant impact. Mitigation Measure 3.7-3 has been included below to reduce the construction impacts on the existing drainage pattern of the area. The project would alter the drainage pattern of the project site through the introduction of single-family homes, roadways, parks, and green space. Onsite drainage facilities would include two above-ground open space/drainage swales and a landscaped detention basin in the northwest corner of the project site. The drainage swales would accommodate stormwater flows entering the project site at the northern and southern project boundaries. The swales would be vegetated and designed to provide pre-treatment before the water flows to the detention basin for detention and sediment settling. From the detention basin, stormwater would flow out to the existing drainage headwall site along the northern boundary of the project site. Stormwater would continue north within Eckerman Road to Annabelle Avenue where the stormwater would be conveyed to an existing swale near the northwest corner of Eckerman Road and Annabelle Avenue. The proposed development would not significantly change the location where stormwater flows enters or exits the project site. Therefore, the project's impact related to alteration of drainage patterns are less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

*3.7-3: The project applicant shall prepare and submit drainage plans for construction activities. Prior to alterations of on-site drainage patterns, a temporary detention basin shall be constructed at the northwest corner of the project site to retain peak discharges from the site during construction. Stormwater during construction activities shall be*

*allowed to continue to enter the project site at the same locations as existing stormwater flows and shall be directed to the northwest corner of the project site and into the temporary detention basin, thus regulating peak discharges from the site during construction.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-3 would reduce impacts related to existing drainage patterns to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

Project construction would involve grading, excavation, building construction, and other activities that would alter the existing natural flow of runoff in the area, including where stormwater exits the project site as well as change the storm flow concentrations and volume exiting the project site during construction activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-3 would mitigate impacts related to existing drainage patterns by requiring on-site drainage be temporarily stored within the project site to regulate peak discharges from the site during construction.

- **Impact 3.7-4: Implementation of the project could increase the rate or amount of surface runoff.** Project construction could increase the rate and potentially the amount of surface water conveyed on the project site and exiting the project site. This increase would be due to onsite grading, excavation, building construction, and other construction activities. The increase in stormwater rate (i.e., storm flow concentrations) or amount of surface runoff (i.e., runoff volume) could be substantial and result in a significant impact. Mitigation Measure 3.7-4 has been included below to reduce the construction impacts of surface runoff. The project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site through implementation of the proposed stormwater drainage system. The Preliminary Drainage Study prepared for the project (see Appendix H) determined that the proposed drainage system would be adequate, and no downstream flooding would occur as a result of project implementation. The existing localized flooding that occurs along Eckerman Road would not be exacerbated with the implementation of the proposed project. The project could reduce localized flooding. As the proposed drainage system would detain flows onsite and meter the release of water offsite, and peak discharge from the site would be less under proposed conditions, impacts would be less than significant.

#### Mitigation Measures

**3.7-4(a):** *Implement Mitigation Measure 3.7-3.*

**3.7-4(b):** *The project is 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 \$143 per residential unit, payable to the Engineering and Surveying*

*Division prior to Recordation of Final Subdivision Map(s). The fees to be paid shall be based on the fee program in effect at the time that the application is deemed complete.*

**3.7-4(c):** *The project is 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 Recordation of Final Subdivision Map(s), 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 annual fee is \$20 per residential unit.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.7-4(a), 3.7-4(b), and 3.7-4(c) would reduce impacts related to increased surface runoff to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

Project construction (including onsite grading, excavation, building construction, etc.) could increase the rate and potentially the amount of surface water conveyed on the project site and exiting the project site. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.7-4(a), 3.7-4(b), and 3.7-4(c) would mitigate increased surface runoff impacts by requiring on-site drainage be temporarily stored within the project site to regulate peak discharges from the site during construction.

## LAND USE AND PLANNING

### Initial Study

- **X-5: Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses).** There are currently no existing agricultural operations or timber resources onsite, but the project site is located in an area where residential agricultural parcels exist and could potentially conduct agricultural operations. The Granite Bay Community Plan (Placer County, 2012:p.26) and Placer County Right to Farm Ordinance include policies and regulations to maintain, encourage, and support farm operations. The Right to Farm Ordinance allows existing agricultural operations to continue in a manner consistent with the underlying zoning. The project would develop land that could otherwise be used for agricultural operations, but there are no active agricultural operations on the project site. Further, the development of the project would not preclude existing or future agricultural activities from occurring on surrounding parcels. Implementation of Mitigation Measure II-1 would require that the CC&Rs for the subdivision notify new owners of the “Right to Farm” Ordinance, and will result in a less-than-significant impact with regards to agricultural operations in the vicinity.

Mitigation Measures

*MM X-1: Implement MM II-1-The project applicant shall notify all future property owners within the project site of Placer County's Right to Farm Ordinance (Placer County Code Section 5.24.040) by including this information in the CC&Rs for the subdivision.*

Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure X-1 would reduce impacts related to agricultural and timber resources or operations to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

Explanation

The project would develop land that could otherwise be used for agricultural operations, but there are no active agricultural operations on the project site. Implementation of Mitigation Measure X-1 would mitigate impacts related to agricultural and timber resources or operations alerting home buyers to the protections applicable to agricultural operations in the vicinity. Approval of the proposed project, and/or notification to new future property owners within the project site of existing adjacent agricultural operations, would not prevent or otherwise inhibit adjacent property owners from continuing or beginning new agricultural operations on their properties.

## NOISE

**Initial Study**

- **XII-3: A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.** Construction activity noise levels at and near the project site would fluctuate depending on the particular type, number, and duration of uses of various pieces of construction equipment. Construction-related trips would raise ambient noise levels along haul routes, depending on the number of haul trips made and types of vehicles used. No pile driving would be needed for the project. The nearest residences to the proposed construction areas are located adjacent to the project site. At those locations, short-term increases in ambient noise levels due to construction noise could be substantial. Although construction activities associated with the project would be temporary in nature and the maximum noise levels listed above would be short-term, the project would result in a significant construction impact if construction activity would occur outside of the allowable daytime hours specified by the County Noise Code. Mitigation Measures XII-1a and XII-1b would ensure that construction would be in compliance with the County Code and that noise levels would be reduced to the extent feasible. As such, this impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

**MM XII-1a:** *Construction noise emanating from any construction activities for which a Grading or Building Permit is required is prohibited on Sundays and Federal holidays, and shall only occur:*

- a) *Monday through Friday, 6:00 am to 8:00 pm (during daylight savings)*
- b) *Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 8:00 pm (during standard time)*
- c) *Saturdays, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm*

*In addition, temporary signs 4 feet x 4 feet shall be located throughout the project, as determined by the Development Review Committee, at key intersections depicting the above construction hour limitations. Said signs shall include a toll free public information phone number where surrounding residents can report violations. This condition shall be included on the improvements plans and shown in the development notebook.*

*Quiet Activities, which do not involve heavy equipment or machinery, may occur at other times. Work occurring within an enclosed building, such as a house under construction with the roof and siding completed, may occur at other times as well.*

*The Planning Director is authorized to waive the time frames based on special circumstances, such as adverse weather conditions.*

**MM XII-1b:** *To reduce daytime noise impacts due to construction, the project applicant shall require construction contractors to implement the following measures:*

- *Equipment and trucks used for project construction will utilize the best available noise control techniques, such as improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible.*
- *Impact tools (i.e., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust will be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10-dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves will be used where feasible, and this could achieve a reduction of 5-dBA. Quieter procedures will be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever feasible.*
- *Stationary noise sources will be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and they will be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures to the extent feasible.*

Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures XII-1a and XII-1b would reduce impacts from construction noise to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

Explanation

Construction activities associated with the project would be temporary in nature and the maximum noise levels would be short-term. However, the project could result in a significant impact if construction activity occurs outside of the allowable daytime hours specified by the County Noise Code. Implementation of Mitigation Measures XII-1a and XII-1b would mitigate construction noise impacts by ensuring that construction would be in compliance with the County Code and that noise levels would be reduced to the extent feasible.

**Draft and Final EIRs**

- **Impact 3.6-1: Construction of the proposed project could result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.** There are some noise-sensitive residential land uses that could be exposed to noise levels greater than 89 dBA Leq during on-site excavation and finishing. The construction noise levels at these noise-sensitive land uses would exceed the Placer County maximum allowed daytime and nighttime noise standard. However, all construction activities would occur within the construction exempt hours provided in the Placer County Municipal code (Article 9.36.030). In addition, temporary signs 4 feet by 4 feet would be located throughout the project, as determined by the Development Review Committee, at key intersections depicting the above construction hour limitations. Said signs would include a toll free public information phone number where surrounding residents can report violations and the developer/builder would be required to respond and resolve noise violations. However, since construction noise levels at the nearest sensitive land use would exceed the qualitative day-time noise threshold, an increase in construction noise levels could result in annoyance for residents near the project site. Therefore, construction noise is considered to be a short-term potentially significant impact. The following mitigation measures are included to reduce the impacts of construction noise.

Mitigation Measures

**3.6-1(a):** *Project construction shall be prohibited on Sundays and Federal holidays, and shall only occur:*

- *Monday through Friday, 6:00 am to 8:00 pm (during daylight savings)*
- *Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 8:00 pm (during standard time)*

- *Saturdays, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm*

**3.6-1(b):** *Temporary signs 4 feet by 4 feet shall be located throughout the project, as determined by the Development Review Committee, at key intersections depicting the above construction hour limitations. Said signs shall include a toll free public information phone number where surrounding residents can report violations and the developer/builder will respond and resolve noise violations.*

**3.6-1(c):** *To reduce daytime construction noise levels due to construction at the nearby off-site sensitive receptors, the project applicant shall require construction contractors to implement the following measures:*

- *Equipment and trucks used for project construction shall utilize the best available noise control techniques, such as improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds.*
- *Impact tools (i.e., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10-dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used, to achieve a reduction of 5-dBA. Quieter procedures will be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment.*
- *Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and they will be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.6-1(a) through 3.6-1(c) would reduce impacts from construction noise to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

Some noise-sensitive residential land uses could be exposed to noise levels greater than 89 dBA Leq during on-site excavation and finishing. The construction noise levels at these noise-sensitive land uses would exceed the Placer County maximum allowed daytime and nighttime noise standard. Mitigation Measure 3.6-1(a) would limit construction to the County's construction daytime exempt hours to minimize potential for sleep disturbance and would reduce the potential for construction noise to result in a nuisance, since project construction-related noise would be less noticeable during the day due to greater ambient noise levels. Mitigation Measure 3.6-1(b) would provide a method

whereby nearby residents could inform the County of exceedances and violations. Mitigation Measure 3.6-1(c) would reduce construction noise to the extent feasible by requiring the use of mufflers on construction equipment which would decrease the overall noise generated by construction equipment. Since sound diminishes with distance, placing noise-generating equipment away from noise sensitive uses would protect nearby residences from excessive noise levels.

- **Impact 3.6-4: Implementation of the proposed project could expose new noise-sensitive land uses to noise levels in excess of the Placer County noise standards.** Traffic noise levels for the proposed lots closest to Sierra College Boulevard would exceed the County's standard. A barrier analysis was conducted by BAC, which can be found in the Environmental Noise Assessment – The Park at Granite Bay Residential Development<sup>17</sup> and Appendix G. The results of the barrier analysis indicate that the proposed 8-foot tall noise barrier, relative to the adjoining lot pad elevation, wrapped around Lots 1, 2, 55 and 56 would reduce future Sierra College traffic noise levels to 60 dBA L<sub>dn</sub> or less at the proposed residential backyard areas. However, future onsite noise-sensitive land uses at the second floor of residences located adjacent to Sierra College Boulevard would be exposed to future traffic noise levels exceeding the Placer County established noise standards and would be considered a potentially significant impact.

#### Mitigation Measures

**3.6-4:** *The project applicant shall implement the following measures in order to meet the 60 dBA L<sub>dn</sub> standard:*

- *An eight (8)-foot tall solid noise barrier, relative to the lot pad elevation, shall be constructed in the backyards of lots 1, 2, 55 and 56. Suitable materials for the traffic noise barriers include masonry and precast concrete panels. Other material may be acceptable but should be reviewed by an acoustical consultant prior to use.*
- *The following note shall be included on the Building Plans for Lots 1, 2, 55 and 56: All north, east, and south-facing second-floor windows of residences constructed on Lots 1, 2, 55 and 56 shall be upgraded to a minimum STC rating of 30.*
- *The following note shall be included on all Building Plans: Mechanical ventilation (air conditioning) shall be provided for all residences in this development to allow the occupants to close doors and windows as desired to achieve compliance with the applicable interior noise level criteria.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-4 would reduce impacts on noise sensitive land uses to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or

alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

Traffic noise levels for the proposed lots closest to Sierra College Boulevard would exceed the County's standard. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-4 would mitigate impacts on noise sensitive land uses by reducing future traffic noise levels through the construction of a solid noise barrier, upgrading the north, east, and south-facing second floor windows at the planned noise-sensitive land uses at Lots 1, 2, 55 and 56, located close to Sierra College Boulevard. In addition, all residences will be provided with mechanical ventilation.

- Impact 3.6-5: Increases in traffic from the proposed project, in combination with other development, could result in cumulatively considerable noise increases.** The development of the proposed project would add traffic volumes to local roadways, particularly along Sierra College Boulevard, which would result in increased traffic noise levels. The project would not be a major contributor to future cumulative traffic noise levels. In most cases along Sierra College Boulevard, the project would increase cumulative traffic noise levels to between 0.02 and +0.05 dB. However, the projected noise levels that could occur in the year 2035 would exceed the Placer County's established exterior residential threshold of 60 dBA Ldn, even if the project is not constructed. The closest on-site residential activity areas to Sierra College Boulevard would be exposed to traffic noise levels of approximately 69 dBA Ldn on the first floor and 71 dBA Ldn on the second floor. At this exterior noise level and assuming a 25 dB exterior to interior noise reduction, the interior noise level in the proposed residential homes first and second-stories located adjacent to Sierra College Boulevard would be approximately 44 and 46 dBA Ldn, respectively. Therefore, interior noise levels at the second story of the residential homes facing Sierra College Boulevard would not achieve the 45 dBA Ldn standard. Although the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in traffic noise, it would locate new noise-sensitive residences in a noise environment that exceeds the land use compatibility noise criteria. This impact would be a potentially significant cumulative impact and the project's contribution to the impact would be cumulatively considerable.

#### Mitigation Measures

*3.6-5: Implement Mitigation Measure 3.6-4.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-5 would reduce cumulative noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

Explanation

The development of the project would add traffic volumes to local roadways, particularly along Sierra College Boulevard, which would result in increased traffic noise levels. However, the project would not be a major contributor to future cumulative traffic noise levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-5 would reduce traffic noise levels through the construction of a solid noise barrier, upgrading the north, east, and south-facing second floor windows at the planned noise-sensitive land uses at Lots 1, 2, 55 and 56, located close to Sierra College Boulevard. In addition, all residences will be provided with mechanical ventilation.

## RECREATION

**Initial Study**

- **XV-1: Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.** The project includes a 0.81-acre privately owned and maintained park which would be available for public use during daylight hours. While the project would create an additional demand for park facilities due to the resulting increase in population, Mitigation Measure XV-1 from the IS requires the project applicant to provide onsite active and passive recreational land that meets the requirements set forth in the Placer County General Plan. In the event that onsite provision of sufficient active and passive parkland cannot be provided onsite, the project applicant is required to pay in-lieu fees consistent with the Placer County Park Dedication Fee Program (PDF Program).

Mitigation Measures

***MM XV-1:** The project applicant shall provide onsite active and passive recreational land that meets the requirement set forth in the Placer County General Plan and outlined in the Planned Development requirement. If onsite provision of sufficient active and passive parkland cannot be provided, the project applicant shall pay in-lieu fees consistent with the Placer County Park Dedication Fee Program (PDF Program).*

Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM XV-1 would reduce impacts on existing recreation facilities to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

Explanation

The project would create an additional demand for park facilities due to the resulting increase in population. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM XV-5 would reduce impacts on existing recreation facilities by requiring either the onsite dedication of

parkland that meets the standards set forth in the General Plan and Planned Development standards or the payment of in-lieu fees.

- **XV-2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.** The project includes a 0.81-acre privately owned and maintained park which would be available for public use during daylight hours. While the project would create an additional demand for park facilities due to the resulting increase in population, Mitigation Measure XV-1 from the IS requires the project applicant to provide onsite active and passive recreational land that meets the requirements set forth in the Placer County General Plan. In the event that onsite provision of sufficient active and passive parkland cannot be provided onsite, the project applicant is required to pay in-lieu fees consistent with the Placer County Park Dedication Fee Program (PDF Program).

#### Mitigation Measures

*MM XV-1: The project applicant shall provide onsite active and passive recreational land that meets the requirement set forth in the Placer County General Plan and outlined in the Planned Development requirement. If onsite provision of sufficient active and passive parkland cannot be provided, the project applicant shall pay in-lieu fees consistent with the Placer County Park Dedication Fee Program (PDF Program).*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM XV-1 would reduce impacts related to new recreation facilities to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

The project would create an additional demand for park facilities due to the resulting increase in population. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM XV-5 would reduce impacts related to new recreation facilities by requiring either the onsite dedication of parkland that meets the standards set forth in the General Plan and Planned Development standards or the payment of in-lieu fees.

### TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

#### **Initial Study**

- **XVI-3: Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).** The project would be accessed from one ingress/egress on Sierra College Boulevard. Vehicular movements at Sierra College Boulevard would be limited to right turn ingress, right turn egress, and left turn ingress. Left turns out of the project site onto Sierra College Boulevard would not be permitted, and would be physically prevented by the

center median within Sierra College Boulevard. The right turn ingress and right turn egress areas along Sierra College Boulevard would include areas for deceleration and acceleration to allow vehicles to safely enter and exit the project site. The left turn ingress movement would be from a protected lane that would be constructed within the median of Sierra College Boulevard. The proposed project's impacts associated with vehicle safety would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measures XVI-1, XVI-2, and XVI-3.

### Mitigation Measures

**MM XVI-1:** *The improvement plans shall show the construction of a left-turn ingress-only lane/pocket at the project entrance at Sierra College Boulevard. Traffic striping shall be done by the developer's contractor. The removal of existing striping and other pavement markings shall be completed by the developer's contractor. The design shall conform to criteria specified in the latest version of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual for a design speed of 55 miles per hour (MPH), unless an alternative is approved by Placer County.*

**MM XVI-2:** *The improvement plans shall include a construction signing plan, and a striping and signing plan and shall include all on- and off-site traffic control devices.*

**MM XVI-3:** *Prior to issuance of any Building Permits, the project applicant shall make payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Granite Bay), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) shall be required and shall be paid to Placer County DPW:*

- A) *County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code*
- B) *South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA)*

*The current total combined estimated fee is \$6,776 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.*

### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM XVI-1 through MM XVI-3 would reduce impacts on vehicle safety due to roadway design features or incompatible uses to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

### Explanation

The project would be accessed from one ingress/egress on Sierra College Boulevard. Vehicular movements at Sierra College Boulevard would be limited to right turn ingress, right turn egress, and left turn ingress. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM XVI-

1 through MM XVI-3 would reduce impacts on vehicle safety due to roadway design features or incompatible uses by restricting turning movements from and onto Sierra College Boulevard to reduce risks. A construction signage plan would reduce traffic hazards during construction activities. In addition the project will be required to pay the applicable traffic mitigation fees.

### Draft and Final EIRs

- **Impact 3.3-1: The proposed project could cause an increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections).**
- The project would generate additional trips by residents of the 56 housing units and users of the 0.81-acre park upon completion of construction. The completed project would generate an estimated 618 daily trips. Right-turn-only egress would direct all daily trips originating from within the project site to the Sierra College / Old Auburn Road intersection, which would potentially impact intersection delays and level of service. The City's General Plan LOS policy pertains only to signalized intersections, and the City regularly monitors and reviews data at key unsignalized intersections including the subject intersection to determine if improvements (e.g., signalization, stop signs, turn restrictions) are warranted. The Annabelle Avenue intersection is projected to continue operating at the current LOS ("D/F") during the AM/PM peak hours, under "Existing plus Project" conditions. The project is estimated to increase average intersection delay by less than one (1) second during the AM peak hour and by approximately three (3) seconds during the PM peak hour.
- Based on the City of Roseville design standards, the project driveway would meet the criteria for a right-turn deceleration lane. Therefore, a 220-foot southbound right-turn deceleration lane and a 220-foot southbound right-turn acceleration lane are proposed at the Project Access Driveway (along southbound Sierra College Boulevard) for project opening day conditions. This would alleviate congestion that would form on Sierra College Boulevard due to traffic making a southbound right turn into the project site during the peak hours. The Sierra College Boulevard and Project Access Driveway intersection is projected to operate at LOS "C/C" during the AM and PM peak hours under "Existing plus Project" conditions. AM and PM peak hour delays would be approximately 15.3 seconds and 19.2 seconds respectively.
- The Sierra College Boulevard / Old Auburn Road signalized intersection operates at LOS "C/C" during the AM/PM peak hours under "Existing" conditions. The intersection is projected to continue operating at LOS "C/C" during the AM/PM peak hours under "Existing plus Project" conditions as well. The project is estimated to increase average intersection delay by up to 1.0 seconds during the AM and 0.5 seconds during the PM peak hours. Since this intersection is projected to continue operating at LOS C/C project impacts to this intersection would be less than significant.

- Annabelle Avenue at Sierra College Boulevard generates the same approach vehicles per hour (vph) under “Existing” and “Existing Plus Project” conditions, generating 17 eastbound vph and 13 westbound vph under AM peak hour conditions and 21 eastbound vph and 33 westbound vph under PM peak hour conditions. The highest approach vph (33 westbound vph during PM peak hour) does not exceed the 75 approach vph minimum for satisfaction of the signal warrant, therefore a traffic signal is not warranted and project impacts to this intersection are considered less than significant. The Project Access Driveway at Sierra College Boulevard is projected to generate 37 eastbound vph (exiting the project site) and 12 westbound vph (entering the project site) under AM peak hour conditions and 23 eastbound vph and 39 westbound vph under PM peak hour conditions. The highest approach vph (39 westbound vph during PM peak hour) does not exceed the 75 approach vph minimum for satisfaction of the signal warrant, therefore a traffic signal is not warranted and project impacts to this intersection are considered less than significant.
- Analysis performed for the roadway segment of Sierra College Boulevard between the project Driveway and Old Auburn Road determined that the roadway segment would operate at AM/PM peak hour LOS “B” based on the speed of weaving/merging traffic under “Cumulative Plus Project” (worst case scenario) conditions. Therefore, the distance between the project driveway and Old Auburn Road would be sufficient to allow safe weaving movements. Further, the impact to the segment of Sierra College Boulevard from weaving movement originating from the project site would not alter the existing LOS designation. Therefore, potential impacts to the roadway segment of Sierra College Boulevard to the south of the project site from weaving movement would be considered less than significant.
- Construction access to the site would be provided via Sierra College Boulevard. An onsite construction trailer and parking area would be designated in accordance with County standards. Construction activities would lead to increased trip generation along Sierra College Boulevard in proximity to the project site from construction personnel and equipment. Lane closures and additional trips generated by construction of the project would degrade the existing traffic load and capacity of the roadway system and degrade roadway conditions below acceptable levels, however such impacts would be temporary in nature. These project impacts to roadway users on Sierra College Boulevard and adjacent communities would be potentially significant.

#### Mitigation Measures

**3.3-1(a):** *The project applicant shall prepare and submit a formal traffic control plan (TCP) (including signage) that is consistent with the California Manual of Traffic Control Devices (CMUTCD) to the City of Roseville Public Works Inspector or Engineer for approval, prior to commencement of project roadway lane closures on Sierra College Boulevard. The formal TCP will be prepared and submitted according to Section 12 of the City of Roseville Construction Standards for construction area traffic control devices. The project applicant will maintain a copy of the “accepted” TCP at the project site for the duration of the TCP implementation period.*

*3.3-1(b): During roadway and roadside construction, at least one dedicated lane shall remain open for traffic traveling in both directions on Sierra College Boulevard.*

*3.3-1(c): All construction traffic shall access the project site from Sierra College Boulevard only. Only emergency vehicles may access the project site from Eckerman Road.*

#### Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.3-1(a) and 3.3-1(b) would reduce impacts from roadway construction to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measures be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

#### Explanation

The project would not significantly degrade the level of service at the three intersection on Sierra College Boulevard, nor would the additional trip generation from the project warrant signaling the unsignalized intersections analyzed. In addition, potential weaving movement on Sierra College Boulevard from vehicles exiting the project site is considered less than significant. However, Lane closures and additional trips generated by construction of the project would degrade the existing traffic load and capacity of the roadway system and degrade roadway conditions below acceptable levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.3-1(a) and 3.3-1(b) would reduce impacts related to roadway construction by a requiring a Traffic Control Plan and maintaining open lanes for traffic in each direction during construction activities.

## UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

### Draft and Final EIRs

- **Impact 3.8-8: Implementation of the proposed project could require or result in the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant cumulative environmental effects.** Wastewater from the project would be conveyed east of the project site with a connection in Sierra College Boulevard and ultimately conveyed into the Old Auburn Road Trunk Sewer main. The Systems Evaluation concluded that future buildout within the sewershed served by the Old Auburn Road Trunk Sewer main would result in capacity deficiencies (see Draft EIR, Appendix I), resulting in a significant cumulative impact. The project would contribute a total ADWF sewage flow of 10,640 gpd. The addition of this wastewater flow to the already burdened system would be a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative wastewater flows, and the result would be significant cumulative impact.

#### Mitigation Measures

*3.8-8: Prior to or at the issuance of each building permit, the project shall pay a fair share fee to contribute to the required capacity improvements to the Trunk Sewer main for future buildout.*

Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.8-8 would reduce cumulative impacts related to new or expanded utilities to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors directs that the Mitigation Measure be adopted, and makes the following finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

Explanation

Wastewater generated from the project would ultimately be conveyed into the Old Auburn Trunk Sewer main. The addition of this wastewater flow to the already burdened system would be a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative wastewater flows, and the result would be significant cumulative impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.8-8 would reduce cumulative impacts related to new or expanded utility facilities by increasing wastewater conveyance capacity within the Old Auburn Road Trunk Sewer main and requiring the project applicant to contribute its fair share to increase the sewer main capacity.

**3. FINDINGS FOR SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

None.

**4. FINDINGS ASSOCIATED WITH PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project, or to the location of the Project, which could feasibly obtain the basic objectives of the Project...” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[a]).

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 Cal.3d 553, 566) and that 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). Additionally, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) provides that an EIR need not consider alternatives that are infeasible. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1) provides 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) states that 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.

The following alternatives were analyzed in the Draft EIR to determine whether any of these alternatives could meet the proposed project’s objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening the proposed project’s significant impacts:

- Alternative 1 – No Project/No Build;

- Alternative 2 – Existing Zoning; and
- Alternative 3 – Reduced Density.

These Findings examine the alternatives to the extent they lessen or avoid the proposed project's significant environmental effects. Although as presented here and in the Draft EIR, the project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts, the Draft EIR considered a range of alternatives. Also, the Draft EIR considered alternatives that would have developed the site at a higher density than the proposed project, but rejected these potential alternatives as they would be unlikely to reduce environmental impacts.

In addressing the No Project/No Build Alternative, the County followed the direction of the State CEQA Guidelines which provide that the no project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126[d][4]).

The Board of Supervisors finds that a good faith effort was made to evaluate in the Draft EIR all reasonable alternatives to the project that could feasibly obtain the basic objectives of the proposed project, even when the alternatives might impede the attainment of the applicant's objectives or might be more costly. The Board of Supervisors also finds that all reasonable alternatives were reviewed, analyzed, and discussed in the review process of the Draft EIR and the ultimate decision on the proposed project.

#### PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the project are:

1. Provide the Granite Bay community with a project sized in the 56-unit range, with lot sizes comparable to those in the nearby Annabelle Avenue neighborhood, which will provide new sustainably designed housing opportunities for young and empty nest families alike.
2. Provide considerable opportunity for new students to be generated for local schools with significant declining enrollments, along with significant school mitigation fees for school facilities.
3. Provide a park open to the public that is of a sufficient size to accommodate youth sports practices.
4. Provide sufficient housing opportunities on lots that can accommodate a variety of activities for young families, consistent with the requirements of State Housing law, assisting the County to achieve its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).
5. Provide a project satisfying the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint principles in terms of proximity to a major transportation corridor, with quality design including energy efficiency, and on-site recreational amenities.
6. Create a distinct sense of arrival and attractive gateway to Granite Bay from the Sierra College Boulevard corridor.

7. Replace a long-standing undeveloped property with market ready, economically productive uses that strengthen the tax base.
8. Create a sustainable development that maximizes opportunities for energy efficiency, water conservation, recycling, and use of renewable energy systems.
9. Establish a walkable residential development.
10. Improve an existing, localized flooding problem in the Eckerman Road area with infrastructure improvements/storm drainage improvements.

The project would be a family-oriented community, with a diversity of housing choices and would feature designs and amenities that are consistent with the Granite Bay Community Plan and sustainable design. For example, the Granite Bay Community Plan includes policies to “encourage healthy, sustainable and accessible neighborhoods which accommodate a variety of development, attractive streetscapes, walkable/pedestrian environments, and accessible open space”; “provide a diversity of housing choices that can support a full range of lifestyles in the community”; and “provide sound and adequate housing to meet future needs anticipated in population projections for all economic segments of the community, while ensuring consistency with existing land uses.” The need for more housing attractive to young families is demonstrated by the reduction in student enrollment in the area discussed below.

Similarly, the SACOG Blueprint focuses on increasing density in already-developed areas near transportation corridors. This type of development helps to reduce further suburban sprawl into areas on the periphery of existing development.

The project would be served by the Eureka Union School District (grades K-8) and the Roseville Joint Union High School District (grades 9-12). Declining student enrollment in the Eureka Union School District is a significant problem. Enrollment has rapidly dropped from a peak in 2004 of 4,264 students to only 3,276 students for the 2015-2016 school year. Decreased enrollment results in decreased funding, and the district has been unable to reduce expenses to keep up with the funding cuts resulting from this 23 percent decrease in enrollment. This decrease has previously led to a deficit of several million dollars and closure of the Eureka Elementary School in 2009. Factors that contribute to decreased enrollment include the slow pace of new development in Granite Bay and lack of homes affordable to young families.

Children of families living on the project site could attend Maidu Elementary School (K-3), Excelsior School (4-6), and Olympus Junior High School (7-8) in the Eureka Union School District, and Granite Bay High School in the Roseville Joint Union High School District. Maidu Elementary School experienced a modest increase in student population (24 students) in the two most recent school years. But overall the student population at Maidu Elementary School has declined significantly—by about 20 percent since the 2003-2004 school year. Excelsior Elementary School has faced a decrease of 78 students from 2012 to 2015. Enrollment at Olympus Junior High decreased by 73 students over the past two school years. Since peak enrollment in 2009 Granite Bay High School has experience a steady decline of 134 students over the past six years. Overall, most of the schools that serve the project site are still

experiencing a decline in enrollment that will lead to further losses in funding, and even Maidu Elementary School has not been able to restore its 2003 enrollment levels.

The need for more field space is a growing problem in Granite Bay, which is limiting the ability of the local youth sports leagues to provide participants with a beneficial experience. Granite Bay FC, the local youth soccer league, and Granite Bay Youth Lacrosse, the local youth lacrosse league, both reported the need for more practice fields in the area and have expressed an interest in using the proposed park. There are currently no public parks in the “County Island” portion of Granite Bay. The park proposed as part of the project would be the only park that could accommodate youth sports practices in the approximately four square-mile area south of Hillsborough Park, north of Orangevale Community Park, west of Treelake Park, and east of Crestmont Park.

Currently, the area to the northwest of the project site is subject to flooding during rain events. This is caused, in part, by changes in grading made by local residents and the installation of improvements without adequate engineering and design. The project occupies a significant portion of the drainage shed in the area, and the proposed project would help to improve the flooding condition by reducing the peak flow from the project area. The drainage system for the proposed project is designed so that post-development flows are 10 percent less than pre-development flows. This would be accomplished by several low impact development (LID) features, like the proposed water quality basin, and through an oversized pipe or vault under the project site that would detain storm flows and release them more slowly.

#### ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO PROJECT/NO BUILD

**Description:** Alternative 1 is the No Project alternative as required by CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e). Under the No Project alternative, no building or development would occur on the project site. The site is assumed to remain in its existing condition, including the existing single-family residence and barn.

Impacts of the No Project/No Build Alternative were identified as follows:

As shown in Table 5-1 of the Draft EIR and on pages 5-9 through 5-11 of the Draft EIR, there would be no impact from Alternative 1: No Project/No Build.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), the Board of Supervisors finds that Alternative 1: No Project/No Build is the environmentally superior alternative because it would leave the project site essentially unchanged and would not have the operational effects that would be associated with any of the action alternatives because this alternative has fewer environmental impacts than the project or any of the other alternatives. However, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) states that if the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives; here, that would be Alternative 2: Existing Zoning. Nevertheless, the Board of Supervisors finds that Alternative 1: No Project/No Build is rejected because it does not meet any of the proposed project’s objectives and does not substantially support the objectives.

Alternative 1 would not meet any of the project objectives. For this reason, the Board of Supervisors finds that Alternative 1's desirability is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. Therefore the Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 1: No Project/No Build.

#### ALTERNATIVE 2 –EXISTING ZONING

**Description:** Alternative 2 would develop the project site under the existing zoning for Residential Single Family combining Agriculture minimum building site of 40,000 square feet (RS-AG-B-40). The site would also be developed under the existing land use designation for Rural Low Density Residential (0.9-2.3 dwelling units per acre). Consistent with this land use designation and zoning, this alternative assumes the project site to be developed with approximately 16 dwelling units, each on a lot of approximately 0.9 acres.

Secondary dwelling units (i.e., “granny units”) would also be constructed on each lot, with a maximum size of 640 square feet, as permitted and subject to minimum lot size, maximum floor area, and setback requirements as set forth in section 17.56.200 of the County Code.

Under Alternative 2, 15 of the residential lots would be accessed from the main vehicular access road through a gated entry from Sierra College Boulevard at the eastern edge of the project site. Consistent with the Granite Bay Community Plan, the gate would remain open during daylight hours and would be closed at night, with nighttime access available only for residents and guests. One lot would be accessed from Eckerman Road. Because only one lot would have access to Eckerman Road, and no common areas would be available, there would be no secondary emergency access route for the lots within the main portion of the project site.

Under Alternative 2, five of the lots (Lots 9-13) would likely require individual grinder pumps that would feed into a four-inch sewer force main that would connect to a six-inch sewer line that would serve the remaining lots. The sewer line would connect to existing sewer lines beneath Sierra College Boulevard.

Drainage for the site under Alternative 2 would consist of flows to existing ditches along Eckerman Road to the west of the project site. This alternative would not include any drainage swales or detention basins.

Consistent with the Placer County Design Guidelines Manual, a minimum 15-foot landscaped area would be required along the Sierra College Boulevard frontage. In addition, a soundwall would be necessary along Sierra College Boulevard to shield Lots 1 and 16 from traffic noise generated on Sierra College Boulevard. As part of the landscaped area, climbing vines and landscaping would be required to reduce the visual impact of the structures and the soundwall, consistent with the Granite Bay Community Plan.

Impacts of the Alternative 2: Existing Zoning were identified as follows:

**Land Use and Planning:** Development under Alternative 2 would be consistent with existing zoning, would not require a Variance for single story units, and would result in a lower potential for land use conflicts compared to the proposed project.

**Aesthetics:** Construction of Alternative 2 would have similar impacts on the temporary visual character of the site as compared to the proposed project. At full buildout, Alternative 2 would have 16 single-family homes with 16 secondary dwelling units. Fewer residences would reduce the potential for nighttime light and glare from the project site and would reduce the massing associated with the proposed project. Alternative 2 would not include a 15-foot landscaped buffer easement around the perimeter of the project site, although a minimum 15-foot landscaped area would be provided along Sierra College Boulevard consistent with the Placer County Design Guidelines. Overall, aesthetics impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project, and would be less than significant.

**Transportation Traffic and Circulation:** Construction of Alternative 2 would result in temporary traffic impacts to Sierra College Boulevard during construction of the site-access driveway to Sierra College Boulevard. Alternative 2 would include the left-turn pocket and acceleration and deceleration lanes included in the proposed project, which could lead to temporary lane closures on Sierra College Boulevard. The traffic analysis prepared for the project determined that while the project would add trips to area roadways, it would not result in a decline in the level of service. Increased vehicle trips on Eckerman Road would be expected due to access to the addition of one residence. Overall, Alternative 2 would result in less traffic generation than the proposed project, and would similarly have less-than-significant impacts related to transportation and circulation.

**Air Quality:** Alternative 2 would result in short-term construction emissions and long-term operational emissions from new residences. Because Alternative 2 would construct fewer residential units than the proposed project, it is likely that Alternative 2 would result in a lower quantity of construction emissions. During operation, Alternative 2 would result in fewer vehicle trips, making for lower operational emissions when compared to the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in fewer construction and operational vehicle trips and associated air pollutant emissions than the proposed project, and, like the proposed project, would have less-than-significant air quality impacts.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** Alternative 2 would result in fewer residential units on the project site, which would result in fewer vehicle trips compared to the proposed project. While there would be fewer homes and fewer vehicle trips under Alternative 2, this alternative would not include a park. Thus, residents may need to drive to find recreational facilities, which could increase the number of trips per capita from new residents of the subdivision. However, without a park, there would be no additional vehicle trips attributable to residents outside the subdivision driving to the subdivision to utilize the park. Overall, it is anticipated that greenhouse gas emissions would be less than with the project because there would be fewer units than under the proposed project. The impacts would be less than significant for Alternative 2, similar to the proposed project.

**Noise:** As with the proposed project, construction of Alternative 2 would result in temporary noise impacts from construction equipment. Like the proposed project, Alternative 2 would add sensitive receptors along Sierra College Boulevard, as well as potentially expose new residents to noise from agricultural operations. Because Alternative 2 would not include a park, this alternative would not result in impacts on new residents or existing adjacent neighbors related to noise generated by park users; thus, this impact would be diminished compared to the proposed project, which would also be less than significant. As with the proposed project, a soundwall would be required along Sierra College Boulevard, wrapping around to the northeast and southeast corners of the project site to provide noise attenuation for residents living adjacent to Sierra College Boulevard. Mitigation developed for the project to address impacts of construction noise and noise from Sierra College Boulevard would apply to Alternative 2. Impacts from vibration from heavy equipment operation during construction under Alternative 2 would be very similar to the impacts under the proposed project. In both cases, the impact from vibration would be less than significant.

**Hydrology and Water Quality:** Alternative 2 would be subject to the same storm water quantity and quality requirements (e.g., NPDES/MS4) as the proposed project. Under Alternative 2, the 16 residential units (with a potential for 16 secondary units) would be constructed with parcels of sufficient size to allow design features to address stormwater flows accommodated on each lot-site. This alternative would not include project-wide stormwater drainage facilities. These lot-site facilities could take the form of traditional stormdrains, onsite swales or similar features, or a combination thereof. Like the proposed project, Alternative 2 would add impervious surfaces to the project site, which would inhibit the percolation of stormwater into the ground. Although percolation would be inhibited by new impervious surfaces, this alternative would result in less impervious surface than the proposed project, and would thus have a decreased potential for on- and off-site flooding due to the ability to accommodate localized drainage on the individual parcels. Alternative 2 would have equal or less impacts than the proposed project.

**Utilities and Service Systems:** Alternative 2 would construct 38 fewer units and, correspondingly, would result in fewer new residents than the proposed project. It should be noted that the possible 16 secondary units in Alternative 2 would have the potential to increase demand but these secondary units were not calculated as “units” in the model. Even so, the demand for utilities and service systems would be less than that described for the proposed project. Under Alternative 2, sewer connection to the Eckerman road system would be utilized. This system has been identified by the City of Roseville and Placer County to be at or close to capacity. For water, the increase in units would be more of an impact than the proposed project. For sewer, due to system constraints and infrastructure capacity, similar constraints exist for both the project and Alternative 2. Due to the increased units that would drain to this system under Alternative 2, the total sewer impact to the downstream wastewater treatment facility of the project would be higher under Alternative 2.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), the Board of Supervisors finds that implementing Alternative 2: Existing Zoning, while this is the environmentally superior alternative, could have greater impacts in the area of Utilities and Service Systems, and it would not meet several essential project objectives.

Specifically, the Existing Zoning Alternative would not substantially support the following objectives:

1. Provide the Granite Bay community with a project sized in the 56-unit range, with lot sizes comparable to those in the nearby Annabelle Avenue neighborhood, which will provide new sustainably designed housing opportunities for young and empty nest families alike.
2. Provide considerable opportunity for new students to be generated for local schools with significant declining enrollments, along with significant school mitigation fees for school facilities.
3. Provide a park open to the public that is of a sufficient size to accommodate youth sports practices.
4. Provide sufficient housing opportunities on lots that can accommodate a variety of activities for young families, consistent with the requirements of State Housing law, assisting the County to achieve its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).
5. Provide a project satisfying the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint principles in terms of proximity to a major transportation corridor, with quality design including energy efficiency, and on-site recreational amenities.
8. Create a sustainable development that maximizes opportunities for energy efficiency, water conservation, recycling, and use of renewable energy systems.

The Existing Zoning Alternative would not contribute to the mix of land uses and densities in the community, exemplified by the nearby Annabelle Avenue neighborhood, to the extent the project would. Nor would this alternative help the Granite Bay community provide sound and adequate housing to meet the needs of all segments of the community, to the extent the project would. Additionally, this alternative would not strengthen the tax base as much as the project would. The Existing Zoning Alternative would not provide considerable opportunity for new students to be generated for local schools or significant school mitigation fees for school facilities, to the extent the project would. The Existing Zoning Alternative would not provide a park of sufficient size for youth sports practice.

Because Alternative 2 would not meet these, and other key project objectives, the Board of Supervisors finds that Alternative 2's desirability is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. Therefore the Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 2: Existing Zoning.

### ALTERNATIVE 3 – REDUCED DENSITY

**Description:** Alternative 3 would rezone and develop the project site as Residential Single-Family development, with minimum lot sizes of 11,000 square feet (RS-B-11). This alternative would allow for development of 40 single-family residential units using the standard setbacks for RS-B-11 zoning, and would include an approximately 0.2-acre tot lot/playground park. The average lot size under Alternative 3 would be approximately 13,612 sf. This alternative would develop the site consistent with the low density residential (LDR) land use.

Within the RS-B-11 zoning, minimum setbacks would be as follows: 25 feet from the front property line, 10 feet from the side property lines, and 10 feet (single-story homes) or 20 feet (two-story homes) from the rear property line. Alternative 3 would include a 15-foot landscape buffer easement around the interior perimeter of the project site. This alternative would include two landscape buffer lots to screen the soundwall along Sierra College Boulevard and another landscape lot in the northwest corner of the site near Eckerman Road. The tot lot would be for resident use only, so this alternative would not include a recreational facility that would be open to the public.

The circulation plan for Alternative 3 would be substantially similar to the proposed project. Main vehicular access to the project site would be through a gated entry from Sierra College Boulevard at the eastern edge of the project site. Consistent with the Granite Bay Community Plan, the gate would be open during the day, with access at night available only for residents and guests. Secondary emergency access would be provided from Eckerman Road at the western edge of the project site. This secondary emergency access point would be gated and for the exclusive use of emergency vehicles.

Under Alternative 3, and similar to the proposed project, up to 12 lots (Lots 15-23 and 32-34) would require individual grinder pumps that would feed into a four-inch sewer force main that would connect to a six-inch sewer line that would serve the remaining lots. The sewer line would connect to existing sewer lines beneath Sierra College Boulevard.

Drainage for the site under Alternative 3 would consist of flows to existing ditches along Eckerman Road to the west of the project site. Lot C is identified in Figure 5-2 as a landscape lot in the northwestern corner of the project site rather than a dedicated detention basin as presented under the proposed project. However, this area would have some capacity to detain some amount of stormwater flow before it exits the site to the Eckerman Road ditches.

As shown in Table 5-1 and evaluated on pages 5-14 through 5-18 of the Draft EIR, implementation of Alternative 3 would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts.

Impacts of the Alternative 3: Reduced Density were identified as follows:

**Land Use and Planning:** Alternative 3 would result in the construction of 40 single-family residences on the project site. The land use designation under Alternative 3 would be LDR, as opposed to the MDR designation for the proposed project. Like the proposed project, Alternative 3 would include a 15-foot landscape buffer area between the project site and adjacent properties. Development of Alternative 3 would require a general plan amendment and rezoning to be consistent with the existing land use and zoning for the area. A variance would not be required for this alternative unless the proposed homes exceeded 4,554 square feet, which would not be anticipated. Alternative 3 would be consistent with the goals and policies of the City's General Plan and the Granite Bay Community Plan. Additionally, while Alternative 3 would develop the site at a higher density and intensity than is currently designated, it would be consistent with the overlying themes and each of the policies and goals of the Granite Bay Community Plan. For these reasons, Alternative 3 would have fewer impacts related to land use as compared to the proposed project, and any impacts related to land use would be less than significant.

**Aesthetics:** Alternative 3 would provide a landscaped buffer between the project site and adjacent properties similar to that included in the proposed project. The buffer area would be planted with trees designed to minimize the visibility of homes on the project site from adjacent properties. Reducing the density by increasing minimum lot size would eliminate space for the publicly-accessible park, although a 0.2-acre private tot lot would be included in this alternative. Without the park as the focal point of the main entrance from Sierra College Boulevard, views of the project site from the west would be dominated by residential structures. However, as the number of residences would be fewer than the proposed project, the potential for light and glare impacts would be less because of the decreased number and relative density of residential structures. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less aesthetic impacts than the project and any impacts related to aesthetics would be less than significant.

**Transportation Traffic and Circulation:** Like the proposed project, construction of the site driveway to Sierra College Boulevard in Alternative 3 would result in temporary construction-related traffic impacts to Sierra College Boulevard. Alternative 3 would include the same left-turn pocket and acceleration and deceleration lanes included in the proposed project, which could lead to the same temporary lane closures on Sierra College Boulevard.

The traffic analysis prepared for the project determined that while the project would add trips to area roadways, it would not result in a decline in the level of service. Because Alternative 3 would construct approximately one-quarter fewer units than the proposed project, Alternative 3 would likewise not be expected to cause a decline in level of service. Alternative 3 would not include the on-site publicly-accessible park, but would include a 0.2-acre tot lot, approximately one-quarter of the size of the park included in the proposed project. Overall, Alternative 3 would result in lower overall trip generation than the project and less-than-significant impacts related to transportation and circulation.

**Air Quality:** Like the proposed project, Alternative 3 would result in short-term construction emissions and long-term operational emissions from new residences. Because Alternative 3 would construct approximately 25 percent fewer residential units, Alternative 3 would result in a lower quantity of construction emissions. During operations, Alternative 3 would result in approximately 25 percent fewer vehicle trips because of the reduced number of residences, making for lower operational emissions. Like the proposed project, the emissions from Alternative 3 would not violate air quality standards. Finally, as with the proposed project, residential uses are unlikely to result in substantial odors; thus, Alternative 3 would not have a significant effect related to odors. Overall, Alternative 3 would result in a reduction in air pollutant emissions that would be generally proportionate to the 25 percent reduction in the number of units at the project site. Like the proposed project, these air quality impacts would be less than significant.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** As described above, Alternative 3 would result in the construction and operation of fewer residential units on the project site, resulting in fewer vehicle trips compared to the proposed project. Overall, because of the 25 percent reduction in the number of units constructed and operated, Alternative 3 would result in lower overall levels of GHG emissions compared to the proposed project, and less-than-significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions.

**Noise:** Like the proposed project, construction of Alternative 3 would result in temporary noise impacts from construction equipment, although it is likely that the duration of construction noise would be decreased compared to the project because fewer units would be constructed.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would add sensitive receptors along Sierra College Boulevard, as well as potentially expose new residents to noise from nearby agricultural operations. As with the proposed project, high ambient noise levels would require a soundwall along Sierra College Boulevard, wrapping around to the northeast and southeast corners of the project site to provide noise attenuation for residents living adjacent to Sierra College Boulevard.

Impacts from vibration from heavy equipment operation during construction under Alternative 3 would be very similar to the impacts under the proposed project. In both cases, the impact from vibration would be less than significant.

Mitigation developed for the project to address impacts of construction noise and noise from Sierra College Boulevard would also apply to Alternative 3.

**Hydrology and Water Quality:** Alternative 3 would be subject to the same storm water quantity and quality requirements (e.g., NPDES/MS4) as the proposed project, and the project would be required to mitigate any increase in peak flow discharges from the site. However, the size and configuration of lots in Alternative 3 and the overall reduction in impervious surfaces would mean that this alternative would include a landscape lot that could be used for stormwater detention purposes instead of vegetated swales and a dedicated detention basin like the proposed project. While both the project and Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts, the project would have a beneficial effect with respect to reduction in peak flows and subsequent reductions in localized flooding.

**Utilities and Service Systems:** As described above, Alternative 3 would construct approximately 25 percent fewer units and result in proportionately fewer new residents than the proposed project. As such, the demand for utilities and service systems would be less than that of the proposed project. Water and wastewater conveyance systems would be similar in design and function as described for the proposed project. In particular, the same area of the project site would need to be provided wastewater conveyance through the inclusion of grinder pumps and force mains; for Alternative 3, this would affect 12 units (Lots 15-23 and 32-34). Alternative 3 would result in a 25 percent reduction in water demand and wastewater generation compared to the proposed project, but the systems to serve the project site would be similar to those that would serve the proposed project. Thus, Alternative 3's impacts to utilities and service systems would be similar to, but slightly less than, the proposed project's impacts.

**Finding:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), the Board of Supervisors finds that implementing Alternative 3: Reduced Density would meet some, but not all, of the project objectives, and would not meet them to the same extent as the proposed project. Specifically, the Existing Zoning Alternative would not substantially support the following objectives:

1. Provide the Granite Bay community with a project sized in the 56-unit range, with lot sizes comparable to those in the nearby Annabelle Avenue neighborhood, which will provide new sustainably designed housing opportunities for young and empty nest families alike.
2. Provide considerable opportunity for new students to be generated for local schools with significant declining enrollments, along with significant school mitigation fees for school facilities.
3. Provide a park open to the public that is of a sufficient size to accommodate youth sports practices.
4. Provide sufficient housing opportunities on lots that can accommodate a variety of activities for young families, consistent with the requirements of State Housing law, assisting the County to achieve its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).
5. Provide a project satisfying the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint principles in terms of proximity to a major transportation corridor, with quality design including energy efficiency, and on-site recreational amenities.
8. Improve an existing, localized flooding problem in the Eckerman Road area with infrastructure improvements/storm drainage improvements.

Alternative 3 would not contribute to the mix of land uses and densities in the community, exemplified by the nearby Annabelle Avenue neighborhood, to the extent the project would. Nor would this alternative help the Granite Bay community provide sound and adequate housing to meet the needs of all segments of the community, to the extent the project would. This alternative only provides a tot lot approximately 0.2 acres in size, which is not likely sufficient to accommodate youth sports practices. Therefore the Reduced Density Alternative would not meet this project objective.

This alternative would provide a landscape lot to detain stormwater instead of the dedicated detention lot and other low impact development design features that the project would provide. While the features proposed in the Reduced Density Alternative would be sufficient to mitigate peak flows from the project site, they would not provide the same benefit to the Eckerman Road area with regard to the existing flooding problem. Therefore the Reduced Density Alternative does not meet this project objective.

As discussed under the Existing Zoning Alternative, declining enrollment at local schools is a significant issue. The Reduced Density Alternative would address this issue by generating new students for local schools and providing school mitigation fees for school facilities, though not to the same extent that the project would.

Under Alternative 3, there would be some student generation, but not as much as the proposed project. This alternative would provide a small tot lot, but it would not accommodate youth sports practices. Lastly, this alternative would not provide the same benefit regarding stormwater treatment that the project would. Because Alternative 3 would not meet these key project objectives, the Board of Supervisors finds that Alternative 3's desirability is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social and technological elements. The

project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. Therefore the Board of Supervisors rejects Alternative 3: Reduced Density.

## 5. OTHER IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

### GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires that an environmental impact report (EIR) evaluate the growth-inducing impacts of a proposed action. A growth-inducing impact is defined by the CEQA Guidelines as:

The way in which a project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which could remove obstacles to population growth...It is not assumed that growth in an area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

A project can have direct and/or indirect growth inducement potential. Direct growth inducement could result if a project, for example, involved construction of new housing. A project could have indirect growth inducement potential if it established substantial new permanent employment opportunities (e.g., commercial, industrial, or governmental enterprises) or if it could involve a construction effort with substantial short-term employment opportunities that could indirectly stimulate the need for additional housing and services to support the new employment demand. Similarly, a project could indirectly induce growth if it could remove an obstacle to additional growth and development, such as removing a constraint on a required public service. A project providing an increased water supply in an area where water service historically limited growth could be considered growth-inducing.

The CEQA Guidelines further explain that the environmental effects of induced growth are considered indirect impacts of the proposed action. These indirect impacts or secondary effects of growth may result in significant, adverse environmental impacts. Potential secondary effects of growth include increased demand on other community and public services and infrastructure, increased traffic and noise, and adverse environmental impacts such as degradation of air and water quality, degradation or loss of plant and animal habitat, and conversion of agricultural and open space land to developed uses.

The project would consist of construction of 56 single-family residential units and a 0.81-acre neighborhood park on a 16.3-acre project site. Utilities, including water, sewer, electric, and gas, would be connected to and extended within the project site. Improvements would also be made to the adjacent Sierra College Boulevard to provide access to the site and to accommodate project-generated traffic.

**Finding:** The Park at Granite Bay project would not induce substantial growth in the project area. Land surrounding the project is substantially developed with residential uses. While the project site is zoned Residential-Single-Family within an Agriculture combining district and Building Site combining district, the conversion of site from rural residential uses to low density

residential would not be considered to have reasonably foreseeable indirect effects of converting farmland to non-agricultural uses. While the project would add new residents to this unincorporated area of Placer County, the small number of new homes is very small when compared with the level of development in the project vicinity. Accordingly, the proposed residential use would not generate a significant increase in population or generate a significant increase in employment. Based on the foregoing, the Board of Supervisors finds the project would not be growth-inducing.

#### CUMULATIVE EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a), a “discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great a detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone.” The Draft EIR analyzed the cumulative effects of the project and other alternatives (a) to determine whether the overall long-term impacts of the project combined with all other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would be cumulatively significant, and (b) to ascertain whether the project itself would result in cumulatively considerable impacts. The analysis was conducted in accordance with the list and plan methods in an effort to generate the most reliable future projections possible. While some cumulative impacts were found to be potentially significant, mitigation is available to reduce all cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level.

#### SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES INVOLVED IF THE PROJECT IS IMPLEMENTED

CEQA Guidelines Section 15127 specifically limits the consideration of “Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes Which Would be Caused by the Project Should It be Implemented” to the following activities:

- (a) The adoption, amendment, or enactment of a plan, policy, or ordinance of a public agency;
- (b) The adoption by a Local Agency Formation Commission of a resolution making determinations; or
- (c) A project which will be subject to the requirement for preparing an environmental impact statement pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4321–4347.

The project includes a General Plan Amendment. The following discussion addresses project changes that would be considered irreversible and project commitments/use of resources that would be considered irretrievable.

The construction and implementation of the project would result in irreversible environmental changes to the project site. The cut and fill proposed to create the developed footprint of the project site would result in an irreversible change to the existing topography. The entire 16.3-acre site would be graded and developed, resulting in the permanent removal of on-site habitat as

detailed in the Initial Study. Impacts to all biological resources would be sufficiently mitigated, as discussed in the Initial Study.

Construction of the project would require the commitment of energy, natural resources, and building materials (e.g., wood, concrete). Fuels would be used by equipment during the grading and construction period, by trucks transporting construction materials to the site, and by construction workers during their travel to and from the project site. Energy also would be used in the harvesting, mining, and/or manufacturing materials for structure and roadway construction. This commitment would be commensurate with that of other projects of similar size.

Post-construction operational energy uses of the site would include the use of electricity, natural gas, and water by project residents. This energy use would be a long-term commitment and the use of energy would be irretrievable, although any energy-saving features of the project would reduce this commitment. The project site does not contain any significant mineral, oil, or other energy sources that would be adversely affected by project implementation. No potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the state would occur as a result of the project, as discussed in the Initial Study.

#### GENERAL FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF FACTS SUPPORTING THE FINDINGS

As authorized by the Public Resources Code Sections 21000, et seq. and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091, 15092, and 15093, the Board of Supervisors makes the following findings for which there is substantial evidence in the record:

#### FINDINGS

With regard to the potentially significant adverse impacts, the Board of Supervisors finds that all of the proposed project's impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels with the implementation of mitigation measures. The Board of Supervisors further finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen or avoid these impacts' potentially significant effects on the environment. The Board of Supervisors also finds that the project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts. Finally, the Board of Supervisors finds that the project will meet all of the project objectives.

#### SUPPORTING FACTS

The project will include construction of 56 single-family residential units and a 0.81-acre park in an area characterized by extensive residential development of varying density.

The project will provide a mix of housing to serve a variety of families in the Granite Bay community.

The project will include mitigation measures for all impacts and will reduce all potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Additionally, the Board of Supervisors finds the project will be consistent with both the Placer County General Plan and the Granite Bay Community Plan (see Draft EIR, Section 3.1, Land

Use and Planning). While the project includes a General Plan Amendment, it is nonetheless consistent with these plans because the proposed development intensity provides a transition between larger and smaller parcels, all of which are present in the project vicinity.

## **7. INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE**

The Initial Study, Draft EIR, and Final EIR are hereby incorporated into these Findings in their entirety. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of mitigation measures, the basis for determining the significance of impacts, the comparative analysis of alternatives, and the rationale for approving the proposed project.

## **8. RECIRCULATION NOT REQUIRED**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires a lead agency to recirculate an EIR for further review and comment when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of a Draft EIR, but before certification. Such new information includes: (i) significant changes to the project; (ii) significant changes in the environmental setting; or (iii) significant additional data or other information. Section 15088.5 further provides that “[n]ew information added to an EIR is not ‘significant’ unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement.”

No new or substantial changes to the Draft EIR were proposed as a result of the public comment process. The Final EIR responds to comments and makes only minor technical changes, clarifications or additions to the Draft EIR. The minor changes, clarifications, or additions to the Draft EIR do not identify any new significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of any environmental impacts, and do not include any new mitigation measures that would have a potentially significant impact. Therefore, recirculation of the EIR is not required.

## **9. SUMMARY**

- A. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, the County has made one or more of the following findings with respect to each of the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project:
1. Changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
  2. Such changes or alternatives are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
- B. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, the County has determined that:
1. All of the significant effects on the environment due to the project will be eliminated or substantially lessened.

2. The Alternatives analyzed in the EIR are infeasible.

## 10. APPROVALS

- i. The foregoing statements of procedural history are correct and accurate.
- ii. The Final EIR has been prepared in accordance with all requirements of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance, codified in Chapter 18 of the Placer County Code.
- iii. 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.
- iv. The County finds that the Final 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 EIR is sufficient to carry out the purposes of such analysis under CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.
- v. 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 Park at Granite Bay and makes the following specific findings with respect thereto.
- vi. The Board of Supervisors agrees with the characterization of the 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 Final EIR. This finding does not apply to impacts identified as significant or potentially significant that are reduced to a less than significant by mitigation measures included in the Final EIR. Each of those impacts and the mitigation measures adopted to reduce them are addressed specifically in this document.
- vii. All mitigation measures in the Final EIR are adopted and incorporated into the Park at Granite Bay project.
- viii. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will apply to all mitigation measures adopted with respect to the project and will be implemented.
- ix. The mitigation measures and the MMRP have been incorporated into the Conditions of Approval for the project and have thus become part of and limitations upon the entitlements conferred by the project approvals.
- x. The descriptions of the impacts in these findings are summary statements. Reference should be made to the Final EIR for a more complete description.

- xi. Having independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, certified the Final EIR, and incorporated the mitigation measures into the proposed project, the Board of Supervisors hereby adopts these Findings in their entirety.
- xii. The Planning Division is directed to file a Notice of Determination (NOD) with the County Clerk within five (5) working days of the date of this approval in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21152(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15094. The NOD shall be posted by the County Clerk in the Clerk's Office for no less than 30 full days.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2016

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Robert Weygandt  
Chair of the Board of Supervisors