

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

(DEIR, p. 6.8-35.)

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Significant and unavoidable.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

(DEIR, p. 6.8-36.)

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Significant and unavoidable.

**Impact 6.8-12:**

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

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.8-37.)

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

**Temperature**

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.8-37.)

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

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

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

### **Trace Metals and Organic Pollutants**

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.8-39.)

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

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

### **Aquatic Life Toxicity**

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

### **Mercury**

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

### **pH**

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

### **Biostimulatory Substances (Nutrients)**

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

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

### **Dissolved Oxygen**

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.8-39.)

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

### **Tastes and Odors**

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

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

### **Conclusion**

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

**I. NOISE**

**Standards of Significance:**

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.9-10.)

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

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

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

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

(DEIR, p. 6.9-14.)

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

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

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

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

(DEIR, p. 6.9-19.)

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Significant and unavoidable.

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

**Finding:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

**J. PUBLIC SERVICES**

Law Enforcement

**Standards of Significance:**

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

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

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-4.)

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-5.)

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

- 6.10-2 a) *The project developer(s) shall comply with Placer County Policy 4.H.4, which requires that all future development either fund or develop law enforcement facilities. Compliance with Policy 4.H.4 shall include formation of a County Service Area (CSA) or Community Facilities District (CFD) for the construction or cost of a 2,500-square foot equipped Sheriff's service center prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.*
- b) *The project developer(s) shall enter into a Development Agreement with Placer County prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map for facilities, staffing, and the purchase and scheduled replacement of the number of equipped vehicles needed as determined by the Sheriff in the same frequency and manner currently used by the County in its patrol vehicle replacement program. All patrol vehicles shall include the necessary equipment to accomplish the mission of the Placer County Sheriff's Department or as otherwise required by the Sheriff.*

(DEIR, p. 6.10-6.)

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

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

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

Fire Protection

**Standards of Significance:**

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-11.)

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-12.)

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-13.)

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-14.)

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

Schools

### Standards of Significance:

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

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

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

### **Finding:**

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

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

### **Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

Parks and Recreation

**Standards of Significance**

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-32.)

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-35.)

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-35.)

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

Libraries

**Standards of Significance**

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.10-39.)

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

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

- b) *Completion of one or more branch libraries to provide a minimum of 0.4 square feet per capita and stocking with books and other materials necessary for a functioning library with a minimum of 2.2 volumes per capita and otherwise meeting the standards of the Auburn-Placer County Library Long-Range Plan, including any subsequent amendments, shall occur concurrent with demand.*
- c) *Project developers shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to ensure adequate funding of the Specific Plan's fair share for the ongoing operation and maintenance of library facilities. Such funding mechanism shall be established prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map to ensure that immediate funding for adequate library operations and maintenance is in place.*

(DEIR, p. 6.10-40.)

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

**K. PUBLIC UTILITIES**

Wastewater

Standards of Significance

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

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

(DEIR, p. 6.11-7.)

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

**Finding:**

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

**Explanation:**

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

None required.

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

---

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

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

**Explanation:**

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

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

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

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

**Significance After Mitigation:**

Less than significant.

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

**Finding:**

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