
2. REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

2.0 REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

This chapter presents all of the revisions made to the Draft EIR in response to comments received and minor staff-initiated edits. It should be noted that the following revisions do not change the intent or content of the analysis or effectiveness of mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR.

2.1 DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES

Changes to the Draft EIR are shown in revision marks (underline for new text and ~~strikeout~~ for deleted text).

Chapter 1.0 (Introduction)

On Draft EIR page 1-2, the third bullet is deleted:

Chapter 4.0 (Land Use and Agriculture)

On Draft EIR page 4-21, the following text modifications are made for the analysis of Policy 1.A.5:

The proposed Project does not include the subdivision of any parcels. Furthermore, houses of worship are considered an allowed use within the F-B-X zoning district with approval of a minor use permit ~~the Project site is zoned for urban development.~~

Chapter 6.0 (Biological Resources)

The following text changes are to mitigation measure 6-1a on Draft EIR page 6-31:

Mitigation Measure 6-1a Conduct Special-Status Species Surveys

The applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to perform focused surveys to determine the presence/absence of special-status plant species with potential to occur within and adjacent to (within 25 feet, where appropriate) the proposed impact area, as listed in DEIR **Table 6-3**. These surveys shall be conducted prior to issuance of improvement plans grading permits and in accordance with CDFG-approved guidelines for conducting field surveys. Specifically, the guidelines are outlined in Guidelines for Assessing Effects of Proposed Developments on Rare Plants and Plant Communities (Nelson, 1994). These guidelines require rare plant surveys to be conducted at the proper time of year when rare or endangered species are both “evident” and identifiable. Field surveys shall be scheduled to coincide with known flowering periods and/or during periods of phonological development that are necessary to identify the plant species of concern.

The following additional mitigation is added to mitigation measure 6-4 on Draft EIR page 6-44:

- Potential nesting habitat for black rail occurs in the riparian vegetation associated with the detention pond and drainage on the Project site. If impacts to these areas are unavoidable, then to the extent feasible, all ground disturbance and removal of vegetation to these areas shall be avoided during the bird’s breeding season

(approximately March through May). If construction activities cannot be avoided during the breeding season, a qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct a pre-construction survey to determine presence/absence of active nests. If active nests are found, the applicant shall designate a construction-free buffer zone (typically 250 feet) around the nest.

Chapter 7.0 (Cultural Resources)

Draft EIR page 7-2, the following text change is made under “7.1.1.1 Prehistory”:

Until recently, only a small number of archeological studies had been conducted in the Project vicinity. This is because earlier archaeological excavations had focused either on the large village sites in the San Joaquin Delta region and along the larger waterways in the Central Valley or on the higher elevation areas in proposed reservoir sites, along major waterways in the Sierra Nevada. The property is located between three areas with defined archaeological sequences: the Oroville locality to the north, the Central Sierra area to the east, and the Central Valley/Delta area to the west. These sequences include many similar artifact types and dates for major cultural changes, but there are also significant differences between them. At this time, it has not been defined which of these sequences best reflects the prehistory of the property or whether a separate local sequence is necessary to adequately describe the region. It appears that the prehistoric cultures in the Project vicinity may have been more closely related to the Sierra Nevada native cultures than those of either the Delta or Oroville area (City of Rocklin, 2008; Peak and Associates, 2009). The reader is referred to **Appendix 7.0-1** for greater details on the region’s prehistory provided in the confidential Cultural Resource Assessment cultural resource assessment conducted for the Project by Peak and Associates (Determination of Eligibility and Effect dated December 1, 2009).

Draft EIR page 7-3, the following text change is made to the second paragraph:

The reader is referred to **Appendix 7.0-1** for greater details on the region’s ethnography provided in the confidential Cultural Resource Assessment cultural resource assessment (Determination of Eligibility and Effect dated December 1, 2009) conducted by Peak and Associates, Inc. for the proposed Project by Peak and Associates, Inc., in December 2009.

Draft EIR page 7-3, the following text change is made to the fourth paragraph:

The Mexican Period (ca. 1821–1848) in California is an outgrowth of the Mexican Revolution, and its accompanying social and political views affected the mission system. The Nisenan’s first real contact with the Anglos came with the trappers such as ~~Jed~~Jedediah Smith and the ~~Hudson~~Hudsons Bay Company men after 1828. The trappers established camps in the Nisenan territory and these contacts were peaceful. A devastating epidemic, said to be malaria, spread through the Sacramento Valley in 1833. This epidemic was disastrous to the Valley Nisenan. It is estimated that 75 percent of the native population died in this epidemic. The Mountain Nisenan were not largely affected by the epidemic or early settlers until the discovery of gold and the ensuing Gold Rush. The end of the Mexican-American War and the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 marked the beginning of the American period (ca. 1848–Present) in California history.

Draft EIR page 7-4, the following text change is made:

Please refer to **Appendix 7.0-1** for greater details on the region's history as provided in the ~~confidential Cultural Resource Assessment~~ cultural resource assessment conducted for the Project by Peak and Associates, Inc., ~~in~~ (Determination of Eligibility and Effect dated December 1, 2009).

7.1.1.4 Known Cultural Resources

A review of the files maintained at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System was conducted by center staff on November 3, 2009. According to NCIC files, there was no ~~portion record~~ record of the ~~Project site has been previously inspected~~ previous inspections by archeologists and no prehistoric period or historic period resources have been recorded on the 74-acre Project site. Several other surveys have been conducted in the Project vicinity. There is a recorded historic site within one-quarter mile of the 74-acre Project site.

The 74-acre Project site was completely surveyed in 2003 by Peak & Associates for a previous property owner. The team covered the area in 5- to 10-meter-wide transects, carefully checking for evidence of prehistoric or historic resources. Where necessary, small holes were excavated to allow examination of the sediments. ~~There~~ Within the 17-acre proposed Project development area there was no evidence of prehistoric or historic sites ~~within the Project site. Site 1, .~~ However, a potentially eligible prehistoric period resource recorded in 2003, is located adjacent to the proposed Project, as noted in the confidential cultural resource assessment (Determination of Eligibility and Effect dated December 1, 2009).

Draft EIR page 7-5, the following text change is made above "7.2.2 State":

The Section 106 review process for cultural resources under the NRHP is required for any federal action or permit approval associated with a project. The review process is implemented using a five step procedure:

1. Identification and evaluation of historic properties;
2. Assessment of the effects of the undertaking on properties that are eligible for the National Register;
3. Consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and other agencies for the development of a memorandum of agreement (MOA) that addresses the treatment of historic properties;
4. Receipt of Advisory Council on Historic Preservation comments on the MOA or results of consultation; and,
5. Implementation according to the conditions of the MOA.

Depending on the circumstances, the Section 106 compliance process may not consist of all five steps noted above. For example, if the identification and evaluation process results in a conclusion that the properties are eligible for the National Register then further implementation of the above steps is required.

Amazing Facts Ministry Final EIR

Draft EIR page 7-8, the following text change is made to Table 7-1 for the analysis of Policy 5.D.6:

A ~~Cultural Resource Assessment~~ cultural resource assessment for the proposed Project was performed by Peak & Associates, Inc. in December 2009 and is attached to this document as **Appendix 7.0-1**.

Draft EIR page 7-10, the following text change is made to “7.3.2 Methodology”:

Efforts to identify cultural resources which could be affected by the Project included review of the records search completed by the North Central Information Center, at California State University, Sacramento, and review of the cultural resource assessment report prepared by Peak and Associates (Peak and Associates, 2009). According to the cultural resource assessment, the 74-acre Project area site was completely surveyed on July 11, 2003, for a previous landowner by a team of three qualified archeologists: Ann Peak, Chris Chaloupka, and Sue Merritt. The team covered the area in 5- to 10-meter-wide transects, carefully checking for evidence of prehistoric or historic resources. Where necessary, small holes were excavated to allow examination of the sediments. The study was submitted to Placer County and is part of the confidential record. In addition, a sacred lands file search was completed by NAHC, and Native American representatives were mailed written correspondence by Peak and Associates, requesting information regarding cultural resources on July 18, 2008, and June 29, 2011 (see **Appendices 7.0-2** and **7.0-3**). Furthermore, a search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP) collections database was completed. The potential impacts of the proposed Project on cultural resources were evaluated by considering both construction and operational impacts.

Draft EIR page 7-10, the following text is made to the impact discussion:

IMPACT 7.1: Potential Destruction or Damage to Known ~~and Undiscovered~~ Prehistoric and Historic Resources

The Project site is vacant and undeveloped. In addition, according to the Cultural Resource Assessment conducted for the proposed Project by Peak and Associates, there is no evidence of prehistoric or historic sites or resources within the proposed Project site. ~~However, according to surveys conducted in the vicinity of the Project site, there is one recorded resource site located adjacent to the Project site. This site was found to possess a deposit of intact prehistory that has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history and is therefore a potentially eligible historic resource (Peak and Associates, 2007). The proximity of the Project site to this potentially eligible historic site could result in short term impacts to the recorded resource site during Project construction. Therefore, in order to ensure that no unanticipated disturbance occurs to this resource site during Project construction, protective orange field fencing will be installed around the site perimeter to keep construction debris and construction support vehicles off the site surface.~~ Thus, the proposed Project is not expected to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or affect any historical buildings or sites. This impact is **less than significant** and no further mitigation is required.

IMPACT 7.2: Potential Destruction or Damage to Known Cultural and ~~and Undiscovered Archaeological~~ Undiscovered Cultural, Prehistoric and Historic Resources

The levels of archaeological investigations conducted for the proposed Project are adequate to identify known prehistoric and historic resources in the area. As described previously in this section, the Project area was completely surveyed ~~on July 11, in~~ in 2003, by a team of qualified archeologists who determined that there was no evidence of prehistoric or historic sites or resources within the proposed Project area. However, since there is a possibility of unanticipated and accidental archaeological discoveries (of human remains, bone, or fossils) during ground-disturbing construction-related activities, there is the potential for unanticipated and accidental archaeological discoveries made during Project construction to have a **potentially significant adverse** impact on significant ~~archaeological~~ cultural, prehistoric and historical resources.

According to surveys conducted on the 74-acre Project site, there is one recorded resource site (Site 1) located adjacent to the proposed Project. During Peak's assessment, this site was found to possess an intact cultural deposit that has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history and is therefore a potentially eligible historic resource (Peak and Associates, 2009). The proximity of the proposed Project to this potentially eligible historic site could result in additional but short-term adverse impacts to the recorded resource site during Project construction.

Mitigation Measure 7-2 Mitigate for Known Cultural and Potential Cultural, Prehistoric and Historical Resources

Known Cultural Resources: In order to ensure that no unanticipated disturbance occurs to Site 1 during Project construction, protective orange field fencing will be installed around the Site 1 perimeter and on both sides of the construction area to keep construction debris and construction support vehicles off the Site 1 surface. The placement of orange fencing shall be based upon field staking by Peak & Associates, subject to re-verification of the boundaries of Site 1. Preservation of Site 1 shall be accomplished by restricting construction to the areas for the proposed Project outside the boundary of Site 1. The area east of Site 1 appears to have been impacted during grading work completed in the late 1960's. The work east of Site 1 will generally be located within the area of previous impact, with the spillway lowered and only that grading necessary to maintain adequate slopes, as shown on Figure 3-10b. The United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria and Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians shall be informed in order to provide on-site tribal monitors for construction or disturbance within one hundred fifty (150) feet of this potentially eligible historic resource (Site 1). Subject to confirmation that all applicable federal standards will be met and the property owner and federal agencies agree, all artifacts collected during testing on site and stored with Peak & Associates shall be delivered to UAIC for safekeeping, storage and, if feasible, display at their offices. Additionally, the applicant shall record a permanent conservation or open space easement for Site 1 to permanently protect Site 1. With the implementation of the above mitigation measures, impacts to know cultural resources will be less than significant.

Potential Cultural, Prehistoric and Historical Resources: The final improvement plans approved by the County shall include a note which states, that if during the course of construction cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, exotic rock (non-

native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone, isolated artifacts, or other similar features) are discovered, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency shall be notified, and a professional archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in ~~prehistoric or historical~~ archaeology shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. Determination of impacts, significance, and mitigation shall be made by qualified archaeologist (in consultation with recognized local Native American groups). Mitigation of discovered significant cultural resources shall consist of one or more of the following that will ensure protection of the resource consistent Public Resources Code Section 21083.2:

- Re-design of improvements to avoid the resource.
- Capping or covering the resource in a manner that protects the resource.

The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums shall also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s). Prior to the commencement of Project excavations, all construction personnel shall be informed of the potential to inadvertently uncover cultural resources and human remains and the procedures to follow subsequent to an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources or human remains. In addition, should excavations for site testing or data recovery become necessary, ~~both~~ the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria and Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians shall be informed in order to provide on-site tribal monitors.

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Implementation of mitigation measure **7-2** would reduce this impact to a **less than significant** level.

IMPACT 7.3: Potential Destruction or Damage to a Unique Paleontological Resource or Geological Feature

A search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology paleontological database conducted by PMC did not identify any previously identified paleontological resources on the Project site or in the immediately adjacent area. Previous cultural resource studies have concluded that the rocks which underlie the Project site carry almost no potential to yield significant fossils. As such, the proposed Project is expected to have no known significant impact on paleontological resources. However, development of the Project site during construction, particularly grading and excavation activities, has the potential to adversely impact undiscovered ~~paleontologic~~Paleontological resources on the Project site and on adjoining areas associated with the Project's off-site improvements. This would be considered a **potentially significant** impact.

Chapter 9.0 (Traffic and Circulation)

Draft EIR pages 9-22 and -23, clarifications to the Draft EIR text is noted below:

It should be noted that the proposed resource center building included in Phase I would support the ministry by housing and distributing materials such as CDs, tapes, periodicals, etc., and would not generate any peak hour trips beyond those shown in **Table 9-7** above. Any truck traffic related to the resource center distribution activities would be limited (estimated to be approximately 14 trip-ends per week as described in KD Anderson's May 2011 Traffic Memo (see DEIR Appendix 9.0) and would occur Monday through Thursday only, outside of the peak hours analyzed.

As shown in **Table 9-7**, the initial 1,300 seats proposed for Phase I could generate 780 trips during the Saturday peak hour. Phase I of the Project is only expected to generate 71 trips during the weekday p.m. peak hour. At full occupancy at the end of Phase II, the Project could generate 1,200 Saturday peak hour trips associated with main church services.

Weekday activities at the site will include typical ancillary activities that accompany house of worship operations. At full buildout, up to 80 persons are expected to work at the site as part of the outreach ministries. These persons would typically work on a normal 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. schedule. Additional staff will be involved with operating the facilities (total Project employment is estimated at 97 persons). ~~The current Seventh-Day Adventist (SDA) church in Sacramento also offers regular weekday activities, including prayer meetings and small study groups. These events are typically scheduled refer to the KD Anderson May 2011 Letter in the evenings after the peak commute hour or during midday. Appendix 9.0).~~

As noted, the most appreciable traffic volumes associated with the Project would occur on Saturdays before and after worship services. The amount of weekday Project traffic is very low in comparison to Saturday forecasts. Weekday traffic is low enough to suggest that an additional analysis of weekday conditions would not identify additional increased impacts or require additional mitigation measures. Per the standard Placer County practice for analyzing houses of worship, the impact analysis is limited to peak conditions on the day when services will be held, which in this case is Saturday.

The following correction is made to the Draft EIR on page 9-42:

Background Improvements

Various circulation system improvements may be expected to be completed under the short-term horizon. ~~Recently~~In the near term, Sierra College Boulevard ~~was is to be~~ widened by the City of Rocklin to provide two through lanes in each direction from the El Don Drive intersection north to Interstate 80. This work ~~will create~~ two complete northbound through lanes at the Sierra College Boulevard/El Don Drive intersection. However, at the Rocklin Road/Sierra College Boulevard intersection, no additional turn lanes will be developed as part of this Project. Under the base condition, no improvements have been assumed at the Sierra College Boulevard/Rocklin Road intersection.

The following change is made to Draft EIR mitigation measure 9-2 on page 9-40:

Mitigation Measure 9-2 Sierra College Boulevard/Nightwatch Drive Intersection Mitigation

Prior to the issuance of any building permits for Phase III, construct the following improvements at the intersection at Sierra College Boulevard and Nightwatch Drive.

- Add a second northbound through lane

Chapter 10.0 (Air Quality)

The following change is made to this mitigation measure on Draft EIR page 10-20:

Mitigation Measure 10-1a Mitigate for On-Site Active Dust Control

The proposed Project shall comply with PCAPCD Rule 228, which addresses fugitive dust emissions. Rule 228 provides standards for dust control, as well as recommends mitigation for vehicle track-out. Below are on-site active fugitive dust mitigation measures which are required to ensure that the Project will not violate Rule 228. In addition, mitigation which would lower ROG emissions is provided below.

- Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan to the Placer County APCD. This plan must address the minimum Administrative Requirements found in section 300 and 400 of APCD Rule 228, Fugitive Dust (www.placer.ca.gov/airpollution/airpollut.htm). The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving APCD approval of the Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan.
- The applicant shall submit the following as a standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: During construction, no open burning of removed vegetation shall be allowed. All removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on-site or taken to an appropriate disposal site.
- The applicant shall submit the following as a standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: The contractor shall apply water to control dust, as required by PCAPCD Rule 228, Fugitive Dust, to prevent dust impacts off-site. Operational water truck(s) shall be on-site, at all times, to control fugitive dust. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site. The applicant shall submit the following as a standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: The prime contractor shall suspend all grading operations when wind speeds (including instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour and dust is impacting adjacent properties.
- The applicant shall submit the following as a standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed District Rule 202, Visible Emissions. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits are to be immediately notified to cease operations and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. ~~Additional information regarding Rule 202 can be found at:~~ <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Air/Rules.aspx>.

- The applicant shall submit the following as a standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: The contractor shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust exceeds Placer County APCD Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust) limitations. The prime contractor shall be responsible for having an individual who is ARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE). This individual shall evaluate compliance with Rule 228 on a weekly basis. It is to be noted that fugitive dust is not to exceed 40 percent opacity and not go beyond property boundaries at any time. If lime or other drying agents are utilized to dry out wet grading areas, they shall be controlled so as to not exceed Placer County APCD Rule 228 fugitive dust limitations.
- Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall submit an Enforcement Plan to the Placer County APCD for review. This plan shall evaluate Project-related on- and-off-road heavy-duty vehicle engine emission opacities on a weekly basis. This plan shall use standards as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2180–2194. An Environmental Coordinator, ARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE), shall routinely evaluate Project-related off-road and heavy-duty on-road equipment emissions for compliance with this requirement. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits will be notified and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours.
- The applicant shall submit the following as a standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel-powered equipment. The applicant shall submit the following as a standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: The contractor shall use ARB ultra low diesel fuel for all diesel-powered equipment. In addition, low sulfur fuel shall be utilized for all stationary equipment. The applicant shall submit the following as a standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: The contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary power generators.

The following tables are added to the Draft EIR after Table 10-9 on page 10-24.

TABLE 10-9A
TOTAL LONG-TERM AREA SOURCE UNMITIGATED SUMMER EMISSIONS
(MOBILE SOURCE – SATURDAYS)

Scenario	Daily Emissions (Lbs/Day)				
	ROG	NO_x	CO	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
Project Buildout (Completion of Phase I and Phase II)					
<u>PCAPCD Significance Criteria (lbs/day)</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>550</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Area Sources</u>	<u>1.62</u>	<u>2.05</u>	<u>4.78</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.01</u>
<u>Mobile Sources (Saturday)</u>	<u>21.05</u>	<u>30.30</u>	<u>261.00</u>	<u>47.18</u>	<u>9.12</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>22.67</u>	<u>32.35</u>	<u>265.78</u>	<u>47.19</u>	<u>9.13</u>
<u>Significance Potential?</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>

**TABLE 10-9B
TOTAL LONG-TERM AREA SOURCE UNMITIGATED WINTER EMISSIONS
(MOBILE SOURCE – SATURDAYS)**

<u>Scenario</u>	<u>Daily Emissions (Lbs/Day)</u>				
	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NO_x</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>PM₁₀</u>	<u>PM_{2.5}</u>
Project Buildout (Completion of Phase I and Phase II)					
<u>PCAPCD Significance Criteria (lbs/day)</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>550</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Area Sources</u>	<u>1.37</u>	<u>2.01</u>	<u>1.69</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<u>Mobile Sources (Saturday)</u>	<u>27.14</u>	<u>43.41</u>	<u>298.52</u>	<u>47.18</u>	<u>9.12</u>
Total	<u>28.51</u>	<u>45.42</u>	<u>300.21</u>	<u>47.18</u>	<u>9.12</u>
<u>Significance Potential?</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>

Chapter 13.0 (Hydrology and Water Quality)

The following changes are made to Draft EIR mitigation measure 13-5f on page 13-34:

Mitigation Measure 13-5f Improve or Rebuild Dam to Increase Detention Capacity

The applicant shall retain a qualified engineer to assess the structural integrity of the dam on the Project site based on all applicable state and local standards and will be submitted to the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District for review and approval prior to approval of improvement plans. Based on the results of this assessment, one of the following courses shall be taken:

- 1) If the dam is found to have the required integrity, including a non-seeping core, a new spillway shall be constructed with a lower spill elevation to increase the available detention volume. A lower spill elevation would lower the pond’s normal water surface by 1.8 feet. This could cause a loss of wetland habitat. In order for these improvements to be implemented, the pond would be partially drained and there would be disturbance to the spillway area during construction. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit for the Project (required under mitigation measure **6-6**) shall address this potential loss of wetlands at the spillway and pond perimeter.

- 2) If the dam is found not to have the required integrity, it shall be rebuilt to meet all structural requirements. The new dam shall be constructed at an elevation 1.8 feet higher than the existing dam’s elevation, and the associated spillway shall be constructed at the existing spillway’s elevation. This would result in the pond’s water surface remaining the same but the footprint of the dam would increase, resulting in a loss of wetland habitat at the spillway. In order for these improvements to be implemented, the pond would be completely drained and there would be disturbance to the pond during construction. The dam slope shall be planted with grass of like kind

to the existing site vegetation. Any trees removed shall be replanted with like kind in a compatible location. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit for the Project (required under mitigation measure 6-6) shall address the potential loss of wetland habitat at the spillway.

Chapter 16.0 (Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change)

Draft EIR page 16-16, the following text changes are made:

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Mitigation measure **16-1** and **16-2f** would ~~reduce~~ mitigate the Project’s carbon footprint during construction activities during Phase I. Specifically, mitigation measure 16-2f would require the purchase of carbon credits to offset Project construction and operational GHG emissions. This would not offset GHG emissions from construction. While GHG emissions from construction are a temporary condition, there are no established standards of significance for construction GHG emissions to determine if this impact is mitigated. Thus, this impact would be mitigated to less than significant. ~~is considered significant and unavoidable.~~

Draft EIR Table 16-2 on page 16-17 is amended as follows:

**TABLE 16-2
ESTIMATED PROJECT GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – PROJECT
OPERATION UNDER BAU OPERATIONS (CO₂E METRIC TONS PER YEAR)**

Emission Source		Carbon Dioxide (CO ₂)	Methane (CH ₄)	Nitrous Oxide (N ₂ O)	Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)	Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)	Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF ₆)	CO ₂ e
Mobile Source ¹ (vehicle)		4,838	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4,838
Area Source (on-site heating and cooling equipment, landscaping, consumer products)		400	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	400
Stationary Source	Electricity	556	Negl.	Negl.	Negl.	Negl.	Negl.	556
	Natural Gas	268	Negl.	Negl.	Negl.	Negl.	Negl.	268
Water and Wastewater Conveyance/Treatment		37	Negl.	Negl.	Negl.	Negl.	Negl.	37
Solid Waste		33	Negl.	Negl.	Negl.	Negl.	Negl.	Negl. 33
Total CO₂e Emissions (BAU)		6,132						

The following changes are made to this mitigation measure on page 16-20:

Mitigation Measure 16-2d Energy-Efficient Building Paths

The Project applicant shall include energy-efficient building measures from one of the three paths below (Path 1 or Path 3) to be applied to each of the buildings proposed for the Project ~~as determined feasible~~.

Path 1

- 1) All new fixtures installed within any of the buildings associated with the Project shall meet or exceed the minimum standards as specified below:¹
 - a) Toilets: High Efficiency Toilets (HETs) with flush rate <1.28 gallons per flush (gpf)
 - b) Urinals: waterless or low-flow with flush rate < 0.5 gpf
 - c) Faucets: flow rates < 1.5 gallons per minute (gpm) for all faucets except kitchen sinks
 - d) Pre-rinse Spray Valves: flow rates < 2.0 gpm
- 2) All new HVAC equipment must comply with the Consortium for Energy Efficiency (CEE) Tier 1 commercial HVAC standards.
- 3) High efficiency heating: If new furnaces are specified, they will have a minimum energy efficiency of 92 AFUE.
- 4) Install Energy Star rated office equipment and appliances. For eligible equipment, at least 75 percent of all new office equipment and 90 percent of all new appliances must be Energy Star rated.
- 5) Pre-plumb for solar hot water heater.

Path 3

Exceed California minimum energy efficiency standards (Title 24, Part 6) by 15 percent or more.

All building plans submitted to the Building Division must clearly show the ~~feasible~~ features listed. Substitutions for the energy efficiency methods listed above may be allowed (if equal in points from the PCAPCD Green Points Checklist) but only with approval of the PCAPCD prior to the issuance of a building permit.

The following text changes are made on Draft EIR page 16-22:

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

¹ According to Consumer Reports (2008), low flow faucets reduce water usage by 30 percent over traditional faucets. Furthermore, all restroom urinals will use 0.125 gallons per flush and toilets will use 1.25 gallons per flush.

Reductions achieved through state-led GHG reducing regulations are shown in **Table 16-3**. **Table 16-4** provides estimates of the emissions reductions that will result from implementation of the above proposed Project's GHG-reducing mitigation. When the reductions from **Table 16-3** and **Table 16-4** are totaled (see **Table 16-5**), the amount of GHG reduction is 1,259 metric tons of CO₂e per year. This amount represents a reduction of 20 percent from the BAU figure of 6,132 metric tons of CO₂e per year.

**TABLE 16-5
SUMMARY OF PROJECT GHG REDUCTIONS**

Emissions Reduction Summary	CO₂ Emissions (Metric Tons/Year)
Total Business-as-Usual (BAU) Emissions	6,132
Project-Related CO ₂ e Reduction (mitigation measures 16- a, b, c, and e— 16-2f)	324
Regulatory Reduction	935
Total GHG Emission Reduction	1,259
Remaining Emissions	4,873
Percentage Reduction from Business as Usual	20
District Percentage Reduction Threshold for Less than Significant Determination	29

The GHG emissions from the proposed Project are projected to result in 4,873 metric tons of CO₂e per year (**Tables 16-2** through **16-5**). As the proposed Project would reduce projected BAU emissions by just 20 percent, the Project is not considered consistent with the State of California's ability to meet its AB 32 goals (project compliance with SJVAPCD guidelines equates to compliance with AB 32). Thus, the following GHG emission offset (carbon credits) mitigation is proposed that would either require the purchase of woodland or forest acreage through the Climate Action Reserve (CAR) to sequester measurable and verifiable carbon, and/or ensure that other types of carbon credits are purchased through CAR to offset the remaining percent necessary (currently calculated at approximately 519 metric tons annually) to attain the required 29 percent reduction of the Project's GHG emissions. These GHG emission offset credits would be intended to cover the on-going GHG emissions of Project's operation. ~~the proposed Project's contribution to cumulative GHG emissions is considered cumulatively considerable and a significant and unavoidable impact.~~

Mitigation Measure 16.2f Purchase Carbon Credits

The Project applicant shall purchase carbon offset credits that are 1) from the Climate Action Reserve (CAR) registry or other similar entity as determined acceptable by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD), and 2) quantified through an approved protocol by either the State of California or other similar entity and verified by a qualified verification body (accredited by either the Climate Action Reserve or the State of California, or other similar entity as determined acceptable by the PCAPCD. These carbon credits may include, but shall not be limited to: woodland, including woodlands preserved through mitigation measure 6-9, or forest acreage to attain measurable and verifiable carbon sequestration, and/or purchase of other types of carbon credits through CAR or other similar entities as determined acceptable by the PCAPCD to offset that amount of greenhouse gas emissions necessary to achieve the required 29 percent reduction of the Project's GHG emissions measured against Business As Usual. These carbon

credits would be used to offset both construction and on-going GHG emissions of the Project. Prior to purchase, the applicant shall provide a thorough analysis to the PCAPCD for review and approval. This analysis shall include the Project's estimated emissions, calculation methodology and proposed offset purchase. The applicant shall submit either the purchase certification from CAR registry, or verification certification issued by a qualified verification body for all carbon offset credits purchased, to the Placer County Building Department prior to issuance of building permits.

CAR utilizes a standardized approach for the independent and rigorous verification of GHG emissions reductions reported by project developers into its offset registry. This standardized approach defines a verification process that promotes the relevance, completeness, consistency, accuracy, transparency and conservativeness of emissions reductions data reported in the CAR. Thus, implementation of mitigation measure 16.2f (in combination with mitigation measures 16.2a through e) would reduce the Project GHG emissions 29 percent from BAU, and would reduce this impact to **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Chapter 18.0 (Cumulative, Growth-Inducing, and Irreversible Impacts)

The following change is made to the second bullet on page 18-16:

- Add a third through lane and a separate right turn lane on the southbound Sierra College Boulevard approach for a total of five lanes. ~~The third through lane is included in the SPRTA fee program.~~ The southbound right turn lane is identified as mitigation measure **9-3**.