

CHAPTER 2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

The Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan is proposed as a residential community with open-space, recreational, and commercial components in an unincorporated area of southern Placer County, California. The Applicant would construct 597 dwelling units on 142.3 acres of land that it owns or controls. Proposed housing densities would range from low-density agricultural residences (one dwelling unit on 10 acres) to high-density residential units (60 dwelling units on 3.2 acres). Open space, trails, parks, and agricultural uses are proposed on 134.0 acres, which would simultaneously serve as physical buffers between the residences and Dry Creek and its riparian environment. The project would include 123.9 acres reserved for open space, 10.1 acres for parks, and 7.5 acres for commercial uses. Additionally, the ultimate acreage of the existing cemetery under the project would be increased from 1.9 acres to 4.8 acres. Seven parcels, or 203 acres, within the Plan Area are not owned or controlled by the Applicant; development is anticipated on three of these parcels for a total of 210 low-density residential units, 120 medium-density residential units, and approximately 7.5 acres of commercial uses. Two parcels in the floodplain are expected to remain unchanged as they are considered undevelopable.

Residential Land Uses

The proposed project would consist of five types of residential densities.

■ Low-Density Residential:

Project-Level Parcels – 378 low-density residential units would be constructed on lots that are at least 5,500 square feet on 110.4 acres in the southwestern portion of the Plan Area.

Program-Level Parcels – 40 low-density residential units are assumed on APN 023-221-004 (the Lund property) and 170 low-density residential units are assumed on APN 023-221-005 (the Elliott property), both of which are on the eastern side of the Plan Area.

■ Medium-Density Residential:

Project-Level Parcels – 157 medium-density residential units would be constructed on lots ranging from 2,000 square feet to 5,499 square feet on 23.7 acres located west of the Southern Tributary.

Program-Level Parcels – 120 medium-density residential units are assumed on APN 023-200-057 (the Frisvold property) in the southwestern portion of the Plan Area.

■ High-Density Residential:

Project-Level Parcel – 60 high-density residential units would be constructed on 3.2 acres at the southwestern corner of the Plan Area.

■ Rural Residential:

Project-Level Parcels – Two 2-acre minimum rural residential parcels would be designated immediately east of the Southern Tributary in the central portion of the Plan Area. One homestead residence currently exists on one of the parcels. It is anticipated that another residence will be constructed in the future on the other parcel.

■ **Agricultural-10**

Project-Level Parcels – Six 10-acre minimum agricultural/residential parcels would be constructed north of the Plan Area’s primary east-west roadway, located primarily within the 100-year floodplain of Dry Creek. This designation would allow for residential and agricultural uses to co-exist on the same parcel.

Commercial Land Use

A 7.5-acre parcel on the southeastern corner of the Plan Area has been designated for future commercial use. This designation is consistent with the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* land-use designation for this parcel. The Specific Plan provides for a mix of retail uses for this Commercial site to provide services that would support residents of the proposed project as well as neighboring communities. Potential uses include an outdoor gathering area, neighborhood retail shops, restaurants, services, offices, or other business uses to meet the daily needs of nearby residents.

Traffic and Circulation

The Specific Plan would provide for the interior and exterior circulation at the proposed project site. Internally, the circulation system would consist of streets within a hierarchical roadway system to distribute vehicular traffic through the area and to internally connect its streets by crossing the Southern Tributary. Most of the roadways within the Plan Area would be used primarily by residents within the Plan Area, as the roads would not serve areas beyond the proposed project area’s boundaries, except to provide access to parks.

Vehicles would access the proposed project area from PFE Road, Watt Avenue, and Walerga Road. Primary access would be from two entries off the north side of PFE Road. An additional access road on Watt Avenue would serve the western portion of the site, while residential areas to the east would be served by access on Walerga Road. Additional access would be provided to the Commercial site.

Trails System

The Specific Plan includes a hierarchical network of trails for recreational use. These public trails would be designed for pedestrian, hiking, biking, and equestrian use and would also provide users with passage between residential communities, open-space areas, and the regional trail corridor along Dry Creek. The trail along Dry Creek’s riparian corridor within the proposed project area would be about 2.0 miles and reserved for bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian use.

Parks and Recreation

The Specific Plan contains four public parks, which would provide 10.1 acres of active recreational uses within the proposed project site. The parks’ sizes would range from 1.1 acre to 4.4 acres. Their locations would be dispersed throughout the site and would be located primarily near the low-density residential uses.

Public and Quasi-Public Uses

The proposed project would include public and quasi-public uses, consisting of the cemetery, sewer lift station, electrical substation, onsite storage tank for recycled water, and rights-of-way for the roadways.

- The Specific Plan would allocate 4.8 acres of the proposed project site to the Roseville Cemetery, which would add 2.9 acres to the cemetery's existing 1.9 acres. This addition would allow for future expansion of the cemetery.
- A sewer lift station would be located on 1 acre of the western portion of the proposed site, just north of the proposed low-density residences.
- An electrical substation would be located on 0.5 acre in the eastern portion of the site, just north of the designated commercial area.
- Recycled water facilities would include construction of a new pump station and force main that would connect to an existing 24-inch recycled water pipeline. This pipeline would be connected to an onsite storage tank located on a parcel in the northwest portion of the Specific Plan area, adjacent to the Doyle Ranch tree mitigation site.
- About 20.3 acres are reserved for the existing and expanded rights-of-way for roads fronting the Specific Plan area (Watt Avenue, PFE Road, and Walerga Road) and for landscape corridors.

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND PROPOSED AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION

This Draft EIR presents information concerning the environmental setting of the project study area, identifies the project's potential impacts to the environment, and recommends mitigation measures to reduce these impacts. The environmental resources analyzed include land use; population, employment and housing; biology; cultural resources; visual resources; transportation and circulation; air quality; noise; soils, geology and seismicity; hydrology and water quality; public services and utilities; and hazardous materials. The proposed project's consistency with the policies of the *Placer County General Plan* and the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* is analyzed in Appendix D, and potential inconsistencies are summarized in Chapter 4, Land Use.

The location of discussions related to environments in this Draft EIR is identified in Table 2-1 below.

Table 2-2 at the end of this chapter summarizes the potential impacts of the proposed project by environmental resource. Impacts can be construction-related or they can be the short- or long-term result of project operation. The Applicant has worked with the County to anticipate and mitigate potential adverse environmental effects of the proposed project; these are identified in the chapters that discuss each resource area. If an impact is determined to be significant or potentially significant, Applicant-proposed mitigation measures and additional mitigation measures (if applicable) are identified. These mitigation measures are also summarized on Table 2-2. Mitigation measures for project-level parcels would be a part of the Applicant's proposed project and are identified as "proposed" in most instances. The EIR also includes mitigation measures that the County recommends for program-level parcels. The latter are not formally proposed as part of the Applicant's project, are not required by County ordinance, and are identified as "recommended." Residual significance indicates the remaining level of significance after implementation of mitigation measures. An impact that remains significant after mitigation is considered an unavoidable adverse impact of the proposed project.

**Table 2-1
Consideration and Discussion of Environmental Impacts**

Topic	Location of Discussion in this Draft EIR
Significant environmental effects of the proposed project	Summary in Table 2-2 Discussions in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Impacts subsections of Chapters 4 through 15 ■ Cumulative Impacts, Section 16.2 ■ Section 16.4
Significant environmental effects which cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented	Summary in Table 2-2 Section 2.2 above Discussions in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Impact subsections of Chapters 4 through 15 ■ Cumulative Impacts, Section 16.2 ■ Section 16.4
Mitigation measures proposed to minimize the significant effects	Summary in Table 2-2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures subsections of Chapters 4 through 15
Alternatives to the proposed project	Summary in Table 2-3 Section 16.1
Growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project	Section 16.3
Significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved in the proposed project should it be implemented	Section 16.5

The proposed project would result in several impacts that would remain significant or potentially significant after mitigation. These include:

- Permanent loss of farmland
- Williamson Act Contract cancellation
- Inconsistency with plans and policies, if Placer County General Plan and *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* Amendments are not adopted
- Temporary and long-term visual impacts due to construction
- Contribute to traffic volumes on regional roadways and intersections that would exceed their capacity with or without the proposed project
- Additional transit patrons would not be accommodated by existing transit service
- Construction activities would increase short-term criteria air pollutant emissions
- Operational air quality impacts, including significant PM₁₀, ROG, and NO_X emissions in the short-term and significant PM₁₀ and ROG emissions in the long-term
- Inconsistent with the Placer County Air Quality Attainment Plan

- Emissions of greenhouse gases potentially contributing to global warming
- Construction equipment would generate short-term noise level increases at noise-sensitive locations
- Transportation noise sources in excess of an L_{dn} of 60 dBA externally at the property line and in excess of a 45 dBA internally at second floor elevations
- Cumulative impacts:
 - Permanent loss of farmland
 - Loss of vegetation and wildlife habitat
 - Transformation in landscape character from rural to urban
 - Increase in ambient night sky illumination
 - Unacceptable levels of service along some roadway segments and at some intersections within the transportation analysis study area:
 - With PFE Road open, the proposed project would cause PFE Road east of Watt Avenue to operate at LOS E. Walerga Road south of PFE Road and Baseline Road west of Locust Road would have an increased volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at an already substandard LOS;
 - With PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause Watt Avenue south of Baseline Road and PFE Road, east of Watt Avenue, to operate at LOS E. Walerga Road south of PFE Road and Baseline Road from Watt Avenue Walerga Road would have an increased volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS.
 - With PFE Road open or closed, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Watt Avenue at PFE Road to operate at LOS D, and the following intersections to have an increase in the volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS: Watt Avenue at Baseline Road, Fiddymont Road/Walerga Road at Baseline Road, Walerga Road at PFE Road, and Cook-Riolo Road at PFE Road;
 - With PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Galleria Boulevard and Antelope Creek Drive to operate beyond acceptable LOS thresholds;
 - With PFE Road open, the proposed project would contribute traffic to the freeway segment between Riego Road and Elkhorn Boulevard on SR 70/99, and between Watt Avenue and Eureka Road on I-80, which would be operating at LOS F;
 - With PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the freeway segment of SR 70/99 between Riego Road and Elkhorn Boulevard, SR 65 between Blue Oaks Boulevard and I-80, and I-80 between Watt Avenue and Eureka Road to operate beyond acceptable LOS thresholds;
 - Increase in regional criteria pollutant emissions during construction and operation
 - Increase in noise

- Increased risk of flooding due to an increase in surface drainage

A number of alternatives to the proposed project are also addressed in this Draft EIR. These alternatives are described in Section 2.3 below.

2.3 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This Draft EIR evaluates several alternatives to the proposed project that would eliminate or reduce the significant impacts of the proposed project. The alternatives analyzed are described in detail in Chapter 16 and are summarized below.

The **No Project Alternative** is comprised of two subalternatives (Alternatives 1A and 1B).

Alternative 1A: No Development Alternative

Under Alternative 1A, the proposed project would not be developed. The basic landform at the site would remain in its present condition, and a residential community would not be constructed.

Alternative 1B: Community Plan Development Alternative

This alternative assumes that 650 LDR lots could be developed on approximately 230 upland acres within the Plan Area under the existing Community Plan. Analysis for this alternative concluded that it would be environmentally preferred over the proposed project, primarily because of its reduced impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, soils and geology, hydrology, public utilities and services, and hazardous materials.

Alternative 2: Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative

Under Alternative 2, development would not encroach into the 100-year floodplain of Dry Creek. The six Agriculture-10 (Agricultural-Residential) parcels under the proposed project would not be developed, and thus this alternative would not provide for management of this portion of the project site for agricultural use. This alternative would shift the six units from the Agricultural-10 parcels to low-density residential development, resulting in a land plan with a greater density of development on a per-acre basis than under the proposed project. Analysis for this alternative concluded that it would be environmentally preferred over the proposed project, primarily because of its reduced impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, soils and geology, hydrology, and hazardous materials.

Alternative 3: Reduced Density Alternative

Under Alternative 3, residential land uses would be reduced in density as compared to the proposed project, but development would occur within the same footprint as under the proposed project. Residential land uses would be 70 percent of the proposed project within approximately the same footprint. This alternative would not allow the agricultural/residential parcels proposed under the proposed project, which would reduce development within the 100-year floodplain of Dry Creek. Other features of the proposed project would remain under Alternative 3, although the acreage of improved park facilities within the project site would be reduced as a result of the reduction in population under this alternative. Analysis for this alternative concluded that it would be environmentally preferred over the proposed project, primarily because of its reduced impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, noise, soils and geology, hydrology, public services and utilities, and hazardous materials.

Alternative 4: Clustered Development Alternative

Under Alternative 4, the development assumptions would include the same number of residential units as the proposed project in a more clustered arrangement, resulting in higher development densities within a reduced development footprint. This would result in substantially more open space within the Plan Area. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would increase the number of medium- and high-density residential units constructed, while reducing the level of low-density, single-family residences within the project site. The six agricultural/residential parcels proposed under the proposed project would not be allowed, and thus would not be managed for agricultural use. The intent of this alternative is to reduce impacts associated with the conversion of open spaces areas within the project site to urban uses. Analysis for this alternative concluded that it would be environmentally preferred over the proposed project, primarily because of its reduced impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, noise, visual resources, soils and geology, hydrology, public services and utilities, and hazardous materials.

Overall, the No Development Alternative was identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Among the “build” alternatives, Alternative 3, the Reduced Density Alternative, was identified as the environmentally superior “action” alternative. The alternatives and analyses are described in more detail for each environmental resource in Chapter 16 of this Draft EIR.

Table 2-3 compares the proposed project with the alternatives by listing the significant impacts of the proposed project prior to the implementation of any mitigation measures, and then identifying the level of significance for those impacts if the alternatives were built instead (without any mitigation measures). The table also identifies whether the impact of the alternative is greater, less than, or equivalent to the impact of the proposed project.

Please see Table 16-6 in Chapter 16 for a summary of the overall impacts on each environmental resource (e.g., biology, traffic) for the proposed project and alternatives after the implementation of mitigation measures. Table 16-6 also identifies whether the alternative is preferred over the proposed project, or if there is a clear preference between an alternative and the proposed project. More details of the potential impacts of each alternative are presented in Chapter 16.

2.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Aspects of the proposed project that could be of public concern include the following:

- Conversion of existing agricultural and open space to urbanized use;
- Introduction of approximately up to 2,477 new residents into an existing semi-rural area;
- Development within the 100-year floodplain of Dry Creek;
- Traffic congestion;
- Cancellation of the Williamson Act contract on one program-level parcel; and
- Loss or degradation of biological resources, including wetlands and special-status plant habitat.

**Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project**

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
LAND USE				
4-1: Conversion of existing land use designated Open Space to Urban land uses	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
4-2: Compatibility with surrounding land uses	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
4-3: Inconsistency with plans and policies	Potentially Significant	As Specified in Other Chapters ----- Less than Significant with Adoption of Proposed Plan Amendments	None	Less than Significant with Adoption of Proposed Plan Amendments
4-4: Permanent loss of farmland	Significant	None	None	Significant and Unavoidable
4-5: Compatibility with adjacent Agricultural uses on project-level parcels	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 4-5a (Design project elements to buffer the project from adjacent agricultural uses) and 4-5b (Notify residential property owners of County's Right-to-Farm Ordinance) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
4-6: Land use conflicts due to the project's proposed electrical substation	Potentially Significant	None ----- Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 4-6a (Install a community wall along the south and east sides of the lot where the electrical substation would be located) and 4-6b (install a split-face style wall along the north and west sides of the lot where the electrical substation would be located)	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
4-7: Compatibility with adjacent Agricultural uses on program-level parcels	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 4-7a (Implement Mitigation Measure 4-5a: Design project elements to buffer the project from adjacent agricultural uses) and 4-7b (Implement Mitigation Measure 4-5b: Notify residential property owners of County's Right-to-Farm Ordinance) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less Than Significant
4-8: Williamson Act Contract cancellation	Significant	None	None	Significant and Unavoidable
POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING				
5-1: Increase the population of unincorporated Placer County	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
5-2: Exceed regional population projections	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
5-3: Development of project level parcels would increase the demand/need for affordable housing [While CEQA does not require that the induced need for affordable housing be addressed, the County has determined that affordable housing is an important issue that should be identified and analyzed in this environmental document.]	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 5-3a (Comply with Placer County's 10 percent requirement for affordable housing on project-level parcels) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
5-4: Displacement of existing dwelling units on project-level parcels	Significant	Mitigation Measure 5-4a (Contribute a fair share to compensation/relocation assistance associated with Watt Avenue improvements) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
5-5: Development of program-level parcels would increase the demand/need for affordable housing	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 5-5a (Comply with Placer County's 10 percent requirement for affordable housing on program-level parcels) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
5-6: Displacement of existing dwelling units on program-level parcels	Potentially Significant	None ----- Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 5-6a (Contribute a fair share to compensation/relocation assistance on program-level parcels, if required)	Less than Significant
BIOLOGY				
6-1: Loss of jurisdictional and potentially non-jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. on project-level parcels	Significant	Mitigation Measures 6-1a (Compensate for loss of jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional wetlands in accordance with Corps Section 404 Permit and RWQCB requirements), 6-1b (Obtain written Corps approval of offsite wetland delineation, and comply with Section 404 permit requirements prior to offsite construction), 6-1c (Implement Best Management Practices to avoid wetland impacts during construction), and 6-1d (Design final drainage master plan facilities to ensure that drainage features will avoid impacts to wetlands and other jurisdictional waters) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
6-2: Temporary loss of jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S.	Significant	Mitigation Measure 6-2a (Implement Mitigation Measure 6-1c: Implement Best Management Practices to avoid wetland impacts during construction) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
6-3: Potential loss of special-status plant species populations	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 6-3a (Conduct focused surveys for special-status plant species in suitable habitat in portions of the study area that have not been surveyed. If present, comply with USFWS or CDFG mitigation requirements, and prepare a detailed mitigation/conservation plan, as appropriate) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
6-4: Potential loss of habitats used by special-status vernal pool branchiopods	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 6-4a (Avoid and compensate for potential impacts to special-status branchiopods) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
6-5: Potential degradation of aquatic habitats used by special-status fish species	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 6-5a (Provide 100-foot buffer around Dry Creek during construction), 6-5b (Implement Mitigation Measure 14-4a: Design onsite and offsite pipelines to have watertight joints per Placer County Standards), and 6-5c (Implement Mitigation Measure 6-1c: Implement Best	None	Less than Significant

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project**

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
		Management Practices to avoid wetland impacts during construction) ----- Less than Significant		
6-6: Loss and degradation of aquatic habitats potentially used by the western pond turtle	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 6-6a (Avoid potential impacts to western pond turtle) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
6-7: Loss of wetlands and grasslands that may be occupied by the western spadefoot	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 6-7a (Implement Mitigation Measure 6-1a: Compensate for loss of jurisdictional wetland in accordance with Corps Section 404 Permit) and 6-7b (Implement Mitigation Measure 6-1c: Implement Best Management Practices to avoid wetland impacts during construction) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
6-8: Removal of suitable roosting and nesting habitats for special-status bat species	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 6-8a (Avoid potential impacts to special-status bat species) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
6-9: Potential loss of habitats suitable for the American badger	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 6-9a (Avoid potential impacts to the American badger) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
6-10: Potential loss of habitats used by foraging Swainson's hawks	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 6-10a (Compensate for loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
6-11: Potential loss or disturbance of burrows used by nesting burrowing owls	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 6-11a (Avoid potential impacts to breeding burrowing owls) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
6-12: Mortality of nesting bird species that are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or the CDFG Code	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 6-12a (Prevent disturbance of nesting raptors) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
6-13: Loss of native trees that are protected under the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance	Significant	Mitigation Measures 6-13a (Comply with Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance) and 6-13b (Protect existing native trees not proposed for removal) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
6-14: Loss of trees within the Doyle Ranch mitigation site	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 6-14a (Compensation for the removal of trees within the Doyle Ranch mitigation site) and 6-14b (Implement Mitigation Measure 6-1c: Implement Best Management Practices to avoid wetland impacts during construction) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
6-15: Disturbance to wildlife migration corridors during construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 6-15a (Implement Mitigation Measure 6-1c: Implement Best Management Practices to avoid wetland impacts during construction) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
6-16: Degradation of designated Open Space	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 6-16a (Avoid degradation of sensitive aquatic resources due to floodplain excavation) and 6-16b (Implement Mitigation Measure 6-1c: Implement Best Management Practices to avoid wetland impacts during construction) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
6-17: Potential loss or disturbance of elderberry shrubs that may be occupied by the valley elderberry longhorn beetle	Potentially Significant	None ----- Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 6-17a (Protect existing elderberry shrubs) and 6-17b (Compensation for impacts to elderberry shrubs)	Less than Significant
6-18: Potential loss of wetlands on program-level parcels	Potentially Significant	None ----- Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 6-18a (Complete formal wetland delineation, obtain Corps approval, and comply with Section 404 permit requirements prior to development of Plan Area parcels not owned or controlled by the Applicant), 6-18b (Implement Mitigation Measure 6-1a: Compensate for loss of jurisdictional wetland in	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
			accordance with Corps Section 404 permit and RWQCB requirements), and 6-18c (Implement Mitigation Measure 6-1c: Implement Best Management Practices to avoid wetland impacts during construction)	
6-19: Loss of non-jurisdictional seasonal wetland	Less than Significant	None Warranted		Less than Significant
CULTURAL RESOURCES				
7-1: Damage to potentially important known archaeological resources during construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 7-1a (Cap resource area with layer of soil prior to construction); 7-1b (Conduct subsurface testing); and 7-1c (Conduct data recovery excavation) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
7-2: Damage to cultural resources if inadvertently exposed during construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 7-2a (Comply with the recommendations of a qualified professional archaeologist if cultural resources are inadvertently exposed during construction); 7-2b (Implement Mitigation Measure 7-1b: conduct subsurface testing); and 7-2c (Implement Mitigation Measure 7-1c: conduct data recovery excavation) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
7-3: Damage to paleontological resources inadvertently exposed during construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 7-3a (Retain a qualified professional paleontologist to conduct periodic construction monitoring during grading activities and salvage fossils as necessary) and 7-3b (If paleontological resources are identified at a particular site, the project manager shall cease operation until a qualified professional can provide an evaluation) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
VISUAL RESOURCES				
8-1: Temporary and long-term visual impacts due to construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 8-1a (Limit construction activities in the vicinity of the Roseville Cemetery); 8-1b (Replace visual and glare screening of adjacent residences affected by project road-related construction); and 8-1c (Replace/plant native oaks within roadway rights-of-way and at gateway features) ----- Potentially Significant	None	Potentially Significant
8-2: View obstruction and change to landscape character for motorists on adjacent roadways	Significant	Mitigation Measures 8-2a (Implement open space preservation, tree replacement, site landscaping, and project design measures), 8-2b (Implement construction of Dry Creek Trail, other trails, and vineyards), and 8-2c (Implement	None	Short Term: Less than Significant Long Term: Beneficial

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
		Mitigation Measure 8-1c: Replace/plant native oaks within roadway rights-of-way and at gateway features) ----- Short Term: Less than Significant Long Term: Beneficial		
8-3: Visual intrusion and adverse change in visual character due to new residences in views from Roseville Cemetery	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 8-3a (Provide a visual buffer between cemetery and adjacent homes) ----- Short Term: Less than Significant Long Term: Beneficial	None	Short Term: Less than Significant Long Term: Beneficial
8-4: Increase in night light and glare	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 8-4a (Implement proposed light and glare mitigation measures) and 8-4b (Implement light and glare measures to eliminate all direct uplighting and direct offsite light trespass) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
8-5: Visual intrusion due to the project's proposed electrical substation	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 8-5a (Install a community wall along the south and east sides of the lot where the electrical substation would be located), 8-5b (Provide landscaped buffer plantings around substation), and 8-5c (Implement Mitigation Measure 4-6b: Install a split-face style wall along the north and west sides of the lot where the electrical substation would be located) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION				
9-1: Short-term traffic impacts related to construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 9-1a (Prepare and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
9-2: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would cause Walerga Road south of the Dry Creek Bridge to experience a volume to capacity ratio increase at a substandard LOS condition, Walerga Road south of the Dry Creek Bridge to experience a volume to capacity ratio increase at a substandard LOS condition, and Walerga Road south of PFE Road to operate at LOS F conditions	Significant	Mitigation Measures 9-2a (Pay an in lieu fee and construct Walerga Road frontage improvements from the Dry Creek Bridge to the Placer County line) and 9-2b (Contribute a fair share to widen Walerga Road from the Dry Creek Bridge to Baseline Road) ----- Potentially Significant	None	Potentially Significant
9-3: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would cause the following intersections to operate at LOS F: Locust Road at Baseline Road and Watt Avenue at PFE Road, and would cause the volume to capacity ratio to increase at Watt Avenue at Baseline Road, Walerga Road at Baseline Road, and Walerga Road at PFE Road, which already operate at substandard LOS conditions	Significant	Mitigation Measures 9-3a (Contribute a fair share to widen the intersections of Locust Road and Baseline Road, Watt Avenue and Baseline Road, and Walerga Road and Baseline Road) and 9-3b (Contribute a fair share or widen the intersections of Watt Avenue and PFE Road, and Walerga Road and PFE Road) ----- Potentially Significant	None	Potentially Significant
9-4: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on City of Roseville intersections	Less than Significant	None Warranted		

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
9-5: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sacramento County roadway segments	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
9-6: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes at Sacramento County intersections	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
9-7: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sutter County roadway segments	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
9-8: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase volumes on SR 65 south of Blue Oaks Boulevard, and I-80, from Watt Avenue to SR 65, which currently operate at substandard LOS F conditions	Significant	Mitigation Measure 9-8a (Contribute a fair share to widen SR 65 from Blue Oaks Boulevard to SR 65) ----- Significant	None	Significant and Unavoidable
9-9: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase delay at the following state highway intersections that currently operate at a substandard LOS: SR 70/99 at Riego Road, and SR 70/99 at Elverta Road	Significant	Mitigation Measure 9-9a (Contribute a fair share to construct an interchange to replace the SR 70/99 and Riego Road intersection) ----- Significant	None	Significant and Unavoidable
9-10: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause Walerga Road south of Baseline Road, Walerga	Significant	Mitigation Measures 9-10a (Implement Mitigation Measure 9-2a: Pay an in lieu fee and construct Walerga Road frontage	None	Potentially Significant

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project**

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
Road south of the Dry Creek Bridge, and Walerga Road south of PFE Road to operate at LOS E conditions		improvements from the Dry Creek Bridge to the Placer County line) and 9-10b (Implement Mitigation Measure 9-2b: Contribute a fair share to widen Walerga Road from the Dry Creek Bridge to Baseline Road) ----- Potentially Significant		
9-11: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the following intersections to operate at LOS F: Locust Road at Baseline Road and Walerga Road at PFE Road; would cause the following intersections to operate at LOS E: Walerga Road at Baseline Road and Watt Avenue at PFE Road; and would cause the volume to capacity ratio to increase at Watt Avenue at Baseline Road, which already operates at a substandard LOS condition	Significant	Mitigation Measures 9-11a (Contribute a fair share to widen the intersections of Locust Road and Baseline Road, and Walerga Road and Baseline Road) and 9-11b (Contribute a fair share or widen the intersections of Watt Avenue and PFE Road, and Walerga Road and PFE Road) ----- Potentially Significant	None	Potentially Significant
9-12: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on City of Roseville intersections	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
9-13: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sacramento County roadways	Less than Significant	None Warranted		

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
9-14: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes at Sacramento County intersections	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
9-15: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sutter County roadway segments	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
9-16: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase volumes on SR 65, south of Blue Oaks Blvd, and I-80, from Watt Avenue to SR 65, which currently operate at substandard LOS F conditions	Significant	Mitigation Measure 9-16a (Contribute a fair share to widen SR 65 to six lanes from Blue Oaks Boulevard to I-80) ----- Significant	None	Significant and Unavoidable
9-17: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase delay at the following state highway intersections that currently operate at a substandard LOS: SR 70/99 at Riego Road and SR 70/99 at Elverta Road	Significant	Mitigation Measure 9-17a (Contribute a fair share to constructing an interchange at the intersection of SR 70/99 with Riego Road) ----- Significant	None	Significant and Unavoidable
9-18: Additional transit patrons will not be accommodated by existing transit service	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 9-18a (Create a Community Service Area to cover Transit Service) ----- Potentially Significant	None	Potentially Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
9-19: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would cause PFE Road east of Watt Avenue to operate at LOS E. Walerga Road south of PFE Road and Baseline Road west of Locust Road would have an increased volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at an already substandard LOS.	Significant	Mitigation Measure 9-19a (Contribute a fair share to widen PFE Road to four lanes from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road) ----- Potentially Significant	None	Potentially Significant
9-20: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Watt Avenue at PFE Road to operate at LOS D, and the following intersections to have an increase in the volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS: Watt Avenue at Baseline Road, Fiddymont Road/Walerga Road at Baseline Road, Walerga Road at PFE Road, and Cook-Riolo Road at PFE Road	Significant	Mitigation Measure 9-20a (Contribute a fair share to widening the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road, signaling the intersection of Cook-Riolo Road and PFE Road, and signaling the intersection of "East" Road and PFE Road) ----- Significant	None	Significant and Unavoidable
9-21: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes at City of Roseville intersections	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
9-22: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sacramento County roadways	Less than Significant	None Warranted		

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
9-23: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes at Sacramento County intersections	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
9-24: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sutter County roadway segments	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
9-25: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would contribute traffic to the freeway segment between Riego Road and Elkhorn Boulevard on SR 70/99 and between Watt Avenue and Eureka Road on I-80, which would be operating at LOS F under Cumulative No Project conditions	Significant	None ----- Significant	None	Significant and Unavoidable
9-26: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes at state highway intersections	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
9-27: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause Watt Avenue south of Baseline Road and PFE Road east of Watt to operate at LOS E. Walerga Road south of PFE Road and Baseline Road from Watt Avenue Walerga Road would have an increased volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS.	Significant	Mitigation Measure 9-27a (Implement Mitigation Measure 9-19a: Contribute a fair share to widen PFE Road to four lanes from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road) ----- Potentially Significant	None	Potentially Significant

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project**

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
9-28: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Watt Avenue at PFE Road to operate at LOS D, and the following intersections to have an increase in the volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS: Watt Avenue with Baseline Road, Walerga Road with PFE Road, and Cook-Riolo Road with PFE Road	Significant	Mitigation Measure 9-28a (Implement Mitigation Measure 9-20a: Contribute a fair share to widening the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road, signaling the intersection of Cook-Riolo Road and PFE Road, and Signaling the intersection of "East" Road and PFE Road) ----- Significant	None	Significant and Unavoidable
9-29: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Galleria Boulevard and Antelope Creek Drive to operate beyond acceptable LOS thresholds	Significant	None ----- Significant	None	Significant and Unavoidable
9-30: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sacramento County roadways	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
9-31: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sacramento County intersections	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
9-32: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sutter County roadway segments	Less than Significant	None Warranted		

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
9-33: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the freeway segment of SR 70/99 between Riego Road and Elkhorn Boulevard, SR 65 between Blue Oaks Boulevard and I-80, and I-80 between Watt Avenue and Eureka Road to operate beyond acceptable LOS thresholds	Significant	None ----- Significant	None	Significant and Unavoidable
9-34: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would not increase traffic volumes on state highway intersections	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
AIR QUALITY				
10-1: Construction activities would increase short-term criteria air pollutant emissions	Short-term: Significant for NO _x , CO, ROG, and PM ₁₀ Long-term: Less than Significant	Mitigation Measures 10-1a (Prepare and implement emission control/dust control measures); 10-1b (Provide PCAPCD with a list of construction equipment and anticipated construction timeline); 10-1c (Maintain construction equipment and vehicles); 10-1d (Minimize idling time for diesel-powered equipment); and 10-1e (No open burning of removed vegetation) ----- Short-term: Significant for NO _x , CO, and ROG; Less than Significant for PM ₁₀ Long-term: Less than Significant	None	Short-term: Significant for NO _x , CO, and ROG; Less than Significant for PM ₁₀ Long-term: Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
10-2: Increased regional criteria pollutant emissions	Short-term: Significant for PM ₁₀ , ROG, and NO _x Long-term: Significant for PM ₁₀ and ROG	Mitigation Measures 10-2a (Implement measures to reduce energy consumption); 10-2b (Prohibit open burning); 10-2c (Allow only gas-fired fireplace appliances); and 10-2d (Implement offsite mitigation programs or pay an in-lieu amount into the Placer County Air Pollution Control District’s Air Quality Mitigation Program) Short-term: Significant for PM ₁₀ , ROG, and NO _x Long-term: Significant for PM ₁₀ and ROG	None	Short-term: Significant for PM ₁₀ , ROG, and NO _x Long-term: Significant for PM ₁₀ and ROG
10-3: Increase in ambient concentrations of CO at nearby intersections	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
10-4: Exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to odor	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
10-5: Exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
10-6: Inconsistent with the <i>Placer County Air Quality Attainment Plan</i>	Significant	Mitigation Measure 10-6a (Implement the following mitigation measures: Mitigation Measures 10-1a: Prepare and implement Emission Control/Dust Control Measures; 10-1b: Provide PCAPCD with a list of construction equipment and anticipated construction timeline; 10-1c: Do not operate pre-1996 diesel equipment on forecasted Spare The Air Days; 10-1d: Maintain construction equipment and	None	Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
		vehicles; 10-1e: Minimize idling time for diesel-power equipment; 10-1f: Use alternative power source [e.g., power poles] to operate equipment instead of using diesel equipment; 10-1g: No open burning of removed vegetation; 10-2a: Amend the Riolo Vineyards Specific Plan to encourage use of alternative energy; 10-2b: Provide air quality information to homeowners/renters; 10-2c: Prohibit open burning; and 10-2d: Implement offsite mitigation programs or pay an in-lieu amount into the Placer County Air Pollution Control District's Air Quality Mitigation Program)		
		----- Significant		
10-7: Emissions of greenhouse gases potentially contributing to global warming	Significant	Mitigation Measure 10-7a (Implement the following mitigation measures: Mitigation Measure 10-1c: Maintain construction equipment and vehicles; 10-1d: Minimize idling time for diesel-powered equipment; 10-2a: Implement measures to reduce energy consumption; 10-2d: Implement offsite mitigation programs or pay an in-lieu amount into the Placer County Air Pollution Control District's Air Quality Mitigation Program; 9-1a: Prepare and implement a	None	Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
		Construction Traffic Management Plan; 9-2a: Pay an in-lieu fee and construct Walerga Road frontage improvements from Doyle Ranch Road to the Placer County line; 9-2b: Contribute a fair share to widen Walerga Road from the Dry Creek Bridge to Baseline Road; 9-3a: Contribute a fair share to widen the intersections of Locust Road and Baseline Road, and Walerga Road and Baseline Road, 9-8a: Contribute a fair share to widen SR 65 from Blue Oaks Boulevard to SR 65; 9-9a: Contribute a fair share to construct an interchange to replace the SR 70/99 and Riego Road intersection; 9-11a: Contribute a fair share to widen the intersections of Locust Road and Baseline Road, and Walerga Road and Baseline Road; 9-16a: Contribute a fair share to widen SR 65 to six lanes from Blue Oaks Boulevard to I-80; 9-17a: Contribute a fair share to constructing an interchange at the intersection of SR 70/99 with Riego Road; 9-18a: Create a Community Service Area to cover Transit Service; 9-19a: Contribute a fair share to widen PFE Road to four lanes from Watt Avenue to Walerga		

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
		Road; 9-20a: Contribute a fair share to widening the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road, signaling the intersection of Cook-Riolo Road and PFE Road, and signaling the intersection of "East" Road and PFE Road; 9-27a: Implement 9-19a (Contribute a fair share to widen PFE Road to four lanes from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road); 9-28a: Implement 9-20a (Contribute a fair share to widening the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road); Mitigation Measure 9-33a: Implement Mitigation Measure 9-25a (Contribute a fair share to widen SR 70/99 to six lanes from Riego Road to Elverta Blvd, I-80 to fourteen lanes from Watt Avenue to Madison Avenue, I-80 to twelve lanes from Madison Avenue to Riverside Avenue, and I-80 to ten lanes from Riverside Avenue to SR 65) and contribute a fair share to widen SR 65 to six lanes from Blue Oaks Blvd to I-80; and Mitigation Measure 9-25a (Contribute a fair share to widen SR 70/99 to six lanes from Riego Road to Elverta Blvd, I-80 to fourteen lanes from Watt Avenue to Madison Avenue, I-80 to twelve lanes		

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
		from Madison Avenue to Riverside Avenue, and I-80 to ten lanes from Riverside Avenue to SR 65) ----- Significant		
NOISE				
11-1: Construction equipment would generate short-term noise level increases at noise-sensitive locations	Significant (Short Term)	Mitigation Measure 11-1a (Develop and implement a construction noise abatement program) ----- Significant (Short Term)	None	Significant and Unavoidable (Short Term)
11-2: Transportation noise sources in excess of an L_{dn} of 60 dBA externally at the property line and in excess of 45 dBA internally at second floor elevations under existing conditions (2005)	Significant	Mitigation Measures 11-2a (Construct masonry walls of 6 feet elevation above pad) and 11-2b (Conduct noise analyses and measurements according to County standards and requirements) ----- Significant	None	Significant and Unavoidable
11-3: Transportation noise sources in excess of an L_{dn} of 60 dBA externally at the property line and in excess of 45 dBA internally at second floor elevations under future conditions (2025)	Significant	Mitigation Measures 11-3a (Implement Mitigation Measure 11-2a: construct masonry walls of 6 feet elevation above pad)) and 11-3b (Implement Mitigation Measure 11-2b: conduct noise analyses and measurements according to County standards and requirements) ----- Significant	None	Significant and unavoidable

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
11-4: Stationary noise sources within Plan Area could produce excessive noise levels at noise-sensitive locations during project operations	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 11-4a (Design shielding of stationary noise sources to prohibit a day-night noise level L_{dn} above 50 dBA) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
SOILS, GEOLOGY, AND SEISMICITY				
12-1: Topographic alteration resulting from earth grading	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 12-1a (Submit Improvement Plans) and 12-1b (Comply with the County Grading Ordinance) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
12-2: Potential for seismic activity	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
12-3: Potential for increased erosion during and after construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 12-3a (Identify stockpiling and vehicle staging areas on Improvement Plans); 12-3b (Comply with NPDES requirements for construction); 12-3c (Comply with NPDES Phase II requirements); and 12-3d (Prepare and implement stormwater pollution prevention plan for construction) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
12-4: Loss of availability of important mineral resources	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
12-5: Safety risk related to soil stability	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 12-5a (Prepare a geotechnical report for all elements of proposed development) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
13-1: Reduced stormwater quality during construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 13-1a (Implement Mitigation Measure 12-1b: Comply with County Grading Ordinance); 13-1b (Implement Mitigation Measure 12-3b: Comply with NPDES requirements for construction); and 13-1c (Implement Mitigation Measure 12-3d: Prepare and Implement Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for construction) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
13-2: Increase in runoff rate downstream of the site	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 13-2a (Prepare and submit project-specific drainage report); 13-2b (Evaluate downstream offsite drainage facilities); 13-2c (Submit one-time Dry Creek watershed drainage improvement fee); and 13-2d (Submit annual Dry Creek watershed drainage improvement fee) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
13-3: Increase in runoff volume downstream of the site	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 13-3a (Implement Mitigation Measure 13-2a: Prepare and submit project-specific drainage report); 13-3b (Implement Mitigation Measure 13-2c: Submit one-time Dry Creek watershed drainage improvement fee); and 13-3c (Implement Mitigation Measure 13-2d: Submit annual Dry Creek watershed drainage improvement fee) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
13-4: Reduced water quality during operation	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 13-4a (Implement Mitigation Measure 12-3c: Comply with NPDES Phase II requirements); 13-4b (Prepare site-specific BMP plan); 13-4c (Maintain BMPs); 13-4d (Implement Mitigation Measure 14-4a: Design onsite and offsite pipelines to have watertight joints in accordance with Placer County standards; and 13-4e (Design and construct LID measures that comply with performance measures) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
13-5: Placement of fill or structures in 100-year floodplain	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 13-5a (Implement Mitigation Measure 13-2a: Prepare and submit project-specific drainage report); 13-5b (Delineate post-project floodplain boundary); 13-5c (Provide in-kind compensatory storage); 13-5d (Prepare and submit conditional letter of map revision); 13-5e (Submit Letter of Map Revision); and 13-5f (Prohibit grading activities within post-project floodplain) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
13-6: Reduce groundwater recharge	Less than Significant	None Warranted		

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
13-7: Depletion of groundwater supplies	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
13-8: Loss of grassy swales, potentially affecting hydrologic and water quality functions	Significant	Mitigation Measure 13-8a (Implement Mitigation Measures 12-3d: Prepare and implement storm-water pollution prevention plan for construction; 13-4b: Prepare site-specific BMP plan; 13-4c: Maintain BMPs; and 14-4a: Design onsite and offsite pipelines to have watertight joints in accordance with Placer County Standards) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
13-9: Reduced water quality during operation	Potentially Significant	None ----- Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 13-9a (Implement Mitigation Measure 13-4e: Design and construct LID measures that comply with Performance Measures)	Less than Significant
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES				
14-1: Increased demand for treated surface water	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 14-1a (Pay connection fees and construct 16-inch- and 24-inch-diameter transmission line extensions to the Plan Area in accordance with PCWA and Cal-Am standards) and 14-1b (Issue building permits only when sufficient treated water supply exists) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
14-2: The impacts of climate change on water supply could affect future water supply in the Specific Plan Area	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
14-3: Potential impacts to CFD facilities if wastewater facilities are shared with Placer Vineyards wastewater flows	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 14-3a (Upsize existing CFD pump station pumps and ancillary equipment) and 14-3b (Do not allow sewage conveyance connection from Placer Vineyards to common force main) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
14-4: Potential reduction in water quality resulting from accidental discharge of wastewater into Dry Creek drainage	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 14-4a (Design onsite and offsite pipelines to have watertight joints in accordance with Placer County Standards); 14-4b (Locate the pump station system above the 100-year floodplain and use bolt-down covers for sewer manholes which are within the 100-year floodplain); and 14-4c (Install an emergency generator and fuel storage with adequate spill containment for extended operation) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
14-5: Increased demand on wastewater treatment system	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 14-5a (All new development in the Specific Plan area shall comply with General Plan Policy 4.D.2, which requires written certification from the service provider that either	None	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
		existing services are available or needed improvements will be made prior to occupancy to meet wastewater demands of the Specific Plan) ----- Less than Significant		
14-6: Increased demand for recycled water for nonpotable water use	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 14-6a (Implement Mitigation Measure 14-4a:Design onsite and offsite pipelines to have watertight joints in accordance with Placer County standards) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
14-7: Increased demand for electrical supply	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
14-8: Increased demand on the electrical distribution network	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
14-9: Increased demand for natural gas supply	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
14-10: Increased demand on the natural gas distribution network	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
14-11: Increased demand for existing public parks and recreational facilities for new residents in project-level parcels	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
14-12: Increased demand for public schools	Significant	Mitigation Measure 14-12a (Pay statutory school impact fees) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
14-13: Increased demand for fire protection services for project-level parcels	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 14-13a (Fund additional fire protection staff to maintain required staffing ratios) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
14-14: Increased demand for police protection services and law enforcement facilities resulting from increased population, which could cause or contribute to safety issues and crime	Significant	Mitigation Measures 14-14a (Provide funding for additional law enforcement personnel and equipment to serve the Plan Area) and 14-14b (Implement Crime Prevention through Environmental Design in cooperation with Placer County Sheriff's Department) ----- Less than Significant		Less than Significant
14-15: Increased demand for solid waste hauling and disposal	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
14-16: Increased need for additional library services	Less than Significant	None Warranted		
14-17: Increased demand for existing public parks and recreational facilities for new residents in program-level parcels	Potentially Significant	None ----- Less than Significant	Mitigation Measure 14-17a (Dedicate parklands for program-level parcels in accordance with County requirements)	Less than Significant
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
15-1: Accidental releases of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to presence of construction-related hazardous materials	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 15-1a (Comply with Placer County EHS and Fire Department requirements) and 15-1b (Comply with Placer County EHS requirements regarding releases of hazardous materials) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project**

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
15-2: Release of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to existing site conditions on project-related parcels	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 15-2a (Remediate contaminated properties in accordance with applicable regulations), 15-2b (Remove debris and report possible contamination to DTSC), 15-2c (Implement Preliminary Endangerment Assessment in accordance with DTSC protocols), 15-2d (Obtain “No Further Action” letter from DTSC), and 15-2e (Implement Mitigation Measure 15-2a: Remediate contaminated properties in accordance with applicable regulations) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
15-3: Potential hazards associated with unused wells	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 15-3a (Abandon onsite wells in accordance with local and state regulations) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
15-4: Accidental releases of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during project operation	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 15-4a (Comply with requirements for filing of emergency response and hazardous materials storage/containment plans) and 15-4b (Comply with underground storage tank and aboveground storage tank regulations of Placer County EHS and the RWQCB) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant

Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
15-5: Potential health hazard caused by mosquitoes and other vectors	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 15-5a (Avoid occurrence of standing water during construction) and 15-5b (Grant access to Placer Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District for vector control) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
15-6: Potential health and safety hazard caused by abandoned septic systems on project-level parcels	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 15-6a (Destroy existing septic systems in accordance with Placer County EHS criteria) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
15-7: Potential health hazard caused by asbestos in older structures to be demolished	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 15-7a (Evaluate and abate ACMs in accordance with regulations) ----- Less than Significant	None	Less than Significant
15-8: Release of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to existing site conditions on program-level parcels	Potentially Significant	None ----- Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures 15-8a (Conduct Phase I Environmental Site Assessments on program-level parcels proposed for development, and comply with Placer County requirements for remediation), 15-8b (Implement Mitigation Measure 15-2a: Remediate contaminated properties in accordance with applicable regulation), and 15-8c (Implement Mitigation Measure 15-2b: Remove debris and report possible contamination to Placer County EHS)	Less than Significant

**Table 2-2 (Continued)
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project**

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) ----- Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
15-9: Potential health and safety hazard caused by abandoned septic systems on program-level parcels	Potentially Significant	None ----- Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure 15-9a (Destroy existing septic systems in accordance with Placer County EHS criteria on program-level parcels when these lots receive development entitlements)	Less than Significant
SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent loss of farmland • Loss of vegetation and wildlife habitat • Transformation in landscape character from rural to urban • Increase in ambient night sky illumination • Unacceptable levels of service along some roadway segments and at some intersections within the transportation analysis study area, as described in Section 2.2, above. • Increase in regional criteria pollutant emissions during construction and operation • Increase in noise • Increased risk of flooding due to an increase in surface drainage 				

**Table 2-3
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project and Alternatives Before Mitigation**

Impact	Proposed Project	No Development Alternative (Alternative 1A)	Community Plan Development Alternative (Alternative 1B)	Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative (Alternative 2)	Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3)	Clustered Development Alternative (Alternative 4)
Land Use						
4-3: Inconsistency with plans and policies	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant
4-4: Permanent loss of farmland	Significant	No Impact	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
4-5: Compatibility with adjacent Agricultural uses on project-level parcels	Potentially Significant	No Impact	No Impact	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant
4-6: Land use conflicts due to the project's proposed electrical substation	Potentially Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant
4-7: Compatibility with adjacent Agricultural uses on program-level parcels	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant
4-8: Williamson Act Contract Cancellation	Significant	No Impact	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Population, Employment, Housing						
5-3: Development of project level parcels would increase the demand/need for affordable housing	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant
5-4: Displacement of existing dwelling units on project-level parcels	Significant	Less than Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
5-5: Development of program-level parcels would increase the demand/need for affordable housing	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant
5-6: Displacement of existing dwelling units on program-level parcels	Potentially Significant	No Impact	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant
Biology						
6-1: Loss of jurisdictional and potentially non-jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. on project-level parcels	Significant	Less than Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant

Key:

- Proposed Project preferred over the alternative
- Alternative preferred over the Proposed Project
- No clear environmental preference between the alternative and the Proposed Project.

**Table 2-3
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project and Alternatives Before Mitigation**

Impact	Proposed Project	No Development Alternative (Alternative 1A)		Community Plan Development Alternative (Alternative 1B)		Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative (Alternative 2)		Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3)		Clustered Development Alternative (Alternative 4)	
		Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
6-2: Temporary loss of jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S.	Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
6-3: Potential loss of special-status plant species populations	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
6-4: Potential loss of habitats used by special-status vernal pool branchiopods	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
6-5: Potential degradation of aquatic habitats used by special-status fish species	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
6-6: Loss and degradation of aquatic habitats potentially used by the western pond turtle	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
6-7: Loss of wetlands and grasslands that may be occupied by the western spadefoot	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
6-8: Removal of suitable roosting and nesting habitats for special-status bat species	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●
6-9: Potential loss of habitats suitable for the American badger	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
6-10: Potential loss of habitats used by foraging Swainson's hawks	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●
6-11: Potential loss or disturbance of burrows used by nesting burrowing owls	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●
6-12: Mortality of nesting bird species that are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or the CDFG Code	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●
6-13: Loss of native trees that are protected under the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance	Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●
6-14: Loss of trees within the Doyle Ranch mitigation site	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>

Key:

- Proposed Project preferred over the alternative
- Alternative preferred over the Proposed Project
- No clear environmental preference between the alternative and the Proposed Project.

**Table 2-3
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project and Alternatives Before Mitigation**

Impact	Proposed Project	No Development Alternative (Alternative 1A)		Community Plan Development Alternative (Alternative 1B)		Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative (Alternative 2)		Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3)		Clustered Development Alternative (Alternative 4)	
		Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
6-15: Disturbance to wildlife migration corridors during construction	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
6-16: Degradation of designated Open Space	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
6-17: Potential loss or disturbance of elderberry shrubs that may be occupied by the valley elderberry longhorn beetle	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●
6-18: Potential loss of wetlands on program-level parcels	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cultural Resources											
7-1: Damage to potentially important known archaeological resources during construction	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
7-2: Damage to cultural resources if inadvertently exposed during construction	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
7-3: Damage to paleontological resources inadvertently exposed during construction	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visual Resources											
8-1: Temporary and long-term visual impacts due to construction	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●
8-2: View obstruction and change to landscape character for motorists on adjacent roadways	Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Significant	●	Significant	●	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
8-3: Visual intrusion and adverse change in visual character due to new residences in views from Roseville Cemetery	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
8-4: Increase in night light and glare	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●

Key:

- Proposed Project preferred over the alternative
- Alternative preferred over the Proposed Project
- No clear environmental preference between the alternative and the Proposed Project.

**Table 2-3
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project and Alternatives Before Mitigation**

Impact	Proposed Project	No Development Alternative (Alternative 1A)		Community Plan Development Alternative (Alternative 1B)		Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative (Alternative 2)		Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3)		Clustered Development Alternative (Alternative 4)	
		No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
8-5: Visual intrusion due to the project's proposed electrical substation	Potentially Significant	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Transportation and Circulation											
9-1: Short-term traffic impacts related to construction	Potentially Significant	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
9-2: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would cause Walerga Road south of the Dry Creek Bridge to experience a volume to capacity ratio increase at a substandard LOS condition, Walerga Road south of the Dry Creek Bridge to experience volume to capacity ratio increase at a substandard LOS condition, and Walerga Road south of PFE Road to operate at LOS F conditions	Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
9-3: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would cause the following intersections to operate at LOS F: Locust Road at Baseline Road and Watt Avenue at PFE Road, and would cause the volume to capacity ratio to increase at Watt Avenue at Baseline Road, Walerga Road at Baseline Road, and Walerga Road at PFE Road, which already operate at substandard LOS conditions	Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
9-8: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase volumes on SR 65 south of Blue Oaks Boulevard, and I-80, from Watt Avenue to SR 65, which currently operate at substandard LOS F conditions	Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>

Key:

- Proposed Project preferred over the alternative
- Alternative preferred over the Proposed Project
- No clear environmental preference between the alternative and the Proposed Project.

**Table 2-3
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project and Alternatives Before Mitigation**

Impact	Proposed Project	No Development Alternative (Alternative 1A)		Community Plan Development Alternative (Alternative 1B)		Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative (Alternative 2)		Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3)		Clustered Development Alternative (Alternative 4)	
9-9: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase delay at the following state highway intersections that currently operate at a substandard LOS: SR 70/99 at Riego Road, and SR 70/99 at Elverta Road	Significant	Less than Significant	☐	Significant	☐	Significant	●	Significant	☐	Significant	☐
9-10: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause Walerga Road south of Baseline Road, Walerga Road south of the Dry Creek Bridge and Walerga Road south of PFE Road to operate at LOS E conditions	Significant	Less than Significant	☐	Significant	☐	Significant	●	Significant	☐	Significant	☐
9-11: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the following intersections to operate at LOS F: Locust Road at Baseline Road and Walerga Road at PFE Road; would cause the following intersections to operate at LOS E: Walerga Road at Baseline Road and Watt Avenue at PFE Road; and would cause the volume to capacity ratio to increase at Watt Avenue at Baseline Road, which already operates at a substandard LOS condition	Significant	Less than Significant	☐	Significant	☐	Significant	●	Significant	☐	Significant	☐
9-16: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase volumes on SR 65, south of Blue Oaks Blvd, and I-80, from Watt Avenue to SR 65, which currently operate at substandard LOS F conditions	Significant	Less than Significant	☐	Significant	☐	Significant	●	Significant	☐	Significant	☐

Key:

- Proposed Project preferred over the alternative
- ☐ Alternative preferred over the Proposed Project
- No clear environmental preference between the alternative and the Proposed Project.

**Table 2-3
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project and Alternatives Before Mitigation**

Impact	Proposed Project	No Development Alternative (Alternative 1A)		Community Plan Development Alternative (Alternative 1B)		Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative (Alternative 2)		Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3)		Clustered Development Alternative (Alternative 4)	
9-17: Under Existing Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase delay at the following state highway intersections that currently operate at a substandard LOS: SR 70/99 at Riego Road and SR 70/99 at Elverta Road	Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
9-18: Additional transit patrons will not be accommodated by existing transit service	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●
9-19: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would cause PFE Road east of Watt Avenue to operate at LOS E. Walerga Road south of PFE Road and Baseline Road west of Locust Road would have an increased volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at an already substandard LOS	Significant	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
9-20: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Watt Avenue at PFE Road to operate at LOS D, and the following intersections to have an increase in the volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS: Watt Avenue at Baseline Road, Fiddymet Road/Walerga Road at Baseline Road, Walerga Road at PFE Road, and Cook-Riolo Road at PFE Road	Significant	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
9-25: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would contribute traffic to the freeway segment between Riego Road and Elkhorn Boulevard on SR 70/99 and between Watt Avenue and Eureka Road on I-80, which would be operating at LOS F under Cumulative No Project conditions	Significant	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>

Key:

- Proposed Project preferred over the alternative
- Alternative preferred over the Proposed Project
- No clear environmental preference between the alternative and the Proposed Project.

**Table 2-3
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project and Alternatives Before Mitigation**

Impact	Proposed Project	No Development Alternative (Alternative 1A)		Community Plan Development Alternative (Alternative 1B)		Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative (Alternative 2)		Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3)		Clustered Development Alternative (Alternative 4)	
9-27: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause Watt Avenue south of Baseline Road and PFE Road east of Watt to operate at LOS E. Walerga Road south of PFE Road and Baseline Road from Watt Avenue Walerga Road would have an increased volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS	Significant	Significant	☐	Significant	☐	Significant	●	Significant	☐	Significant	☐
9-28: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Watt Avenue at PFE Road to operate at LOS D, and the following intersections to have a increase in the volume to capacity ratio of more then 1 percent at a substandard LOS: Watt Avenue with Baseline Road, Walerga Road with PFE Road, and Cook-Riolo Road with PFE Road.	Significant	Less than Significant for Watt Avenue/PFE Road Significant for Walerga Road/PFE Road	☐	Significant	☐	Significant	●	Significant	☐	Significant	☐
9-29: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Galleria Boulevard and Antelope Creek Drive to operate beyond acceptable LOS thresholds	Significant	Significant	☐	Significant	☐	Significant	●	Significant	☐	Significant	☐
9-33: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the freeway segment of SR 70/99 between Riego Road and Elkhorn Boulevard, SR 65 between Blue Oaks Boulevard and I-80, and I-80 between Watt Avenue and Eureka Road to operate beyond acceptable LOS thresholds	Significant	Significant	☐	Significant	☐	Significant	●	Significant	☐	Significant	☐

Key:

- Proposed Project preferred over the alternative
- ☐ Alternative preferred over the Proposed Project
- No clear environmental preference between the alternative and the Proposed Project.

**Table 2-3
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project and Alternatives Before Mitigation**

Impact	Proposed Project	No Development Alternative (Alternative 1A)	Community Plan Development Alternative (Alternative 1B)	Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative (Alternative 2)	Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3)	Clustered Development Alternative (Alternative 4)					
Air Quality											
10-1: Construction activities would increase short-term criteria air pollutant emissions	Significant	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●
10-2: Increased regional criteria pollutant emissions	Significant	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●
10-6: Inconsistent with the <i>Placer County Air Quality Attainment Plan</i>	Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
10-7: Emissions of greenhouse gases potentially contributing to global warming	Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
Noise											
11-1: Construction equipment would generate short-term noise level increases at noise-sensitive locations	Significant	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
11-2: Transportation noise sources in excess of an L _{dn} of 60 dBA externally at the property line in excess of 45 dBA internally at second floor elevations under existing conditions (2005)	Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
11-3: Transportation noise sources in excess of an L _{dn} of 60 dBA externally at the property line and in excess of 45 dBA internally at second floor elevations under future conditions (2025)	Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
11-4: Stationary noise sources within Plan Area could produce excessive noise levels at noise-sensitive locations during project operations	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●

Key:

- Proposed Project preferred over the alternative
- Alternative preferred over the Proposed Project
- No clear environmental preference between the alternative and the Proposed Project.

**Table 2-3
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project and Alternatives Before Mitigation**

Impact	Proposed Project	No Development Alternative (Alternative 1A)	Community Plan Development Alternative (Alternative 1B)	Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative (Alternative 2)	Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3)	Clustered Development Alternative (Alternative 4)					
Soils, Geology, and Seismicity											
12-1: Topographic alteration resulting from earth grading	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
12-3: Potential for increased erosion during and after construction	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
12-5: Safety risk related to soil stability	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hydrology and Water Quality											
13-1: Reduced stormwater quality during construction	Potentially Significant	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
13-2: Increase in runoff rate downstream of the site	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
13-3: Increase in runoff volume downstream of the site	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
13-4: Reduced water quality during operation	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
13-5: Placement of fill or structures in 100-year floodplain	Potentially Significant	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
13-8: Loss of grassy swales, potentially affecting hydrologic and water quality functions	Significant	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	●	Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
13-9: Reduced water quality during operation	Potentially Significant	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public Services and Utilities											
14-1: Increased demand for treated surface water	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>

Key:

- Proposed Project preferred over the alternative
- Alternative preferred over the Proposed Project
- No clear environmental preference between the alternative and the Proposed Project.

**Table 2-3
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project and Alternatives Before Mitigation**

Impact	Proposed Project	No Development Alternative (Alternative 1A)		Community Plan Development Alternative (Alternative 1B)		Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative (Alternative 2)		Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3)		Clustered Development Alternative (Alternative 4)	
			<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
14-3: Potential impacts to CFD facilities if wastewater facilities are shared with Placer Vineyards wastewater flows	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
14-4: Potential reduction in water quality resulting from accidental discharge of wastewater into Dry Creek drainage	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●
14-5: Increased demand on wastewater treatment system	Potentially Significant	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●
14-6: Increased demand for recycled water for nonpotable water use	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
14-12: Increased demand for public schools	Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	■
14-13: Increased demand for fire protection services for project-level parcels	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
14-14: Increased demand for police protection services and law enforcement facilities resulting from increased population, which could cause or contribute to safety issues and crime	Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
14-17: Increased demand for existing public parks and recreational facilities for new residents in program-level parcels	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hazards and Hazardous Materials											
15-1: Accidental releases of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to presence of construction-related hazardous materials	Potentially Significant	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>

Key:

- Proposed Project preferred over the alternative
- Alternative preferred over the Proposed Project
- No clear environmental preference between the alternative and the Proposed Project.

**Table 2-3
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project and Alternatives Before Mitigation**

Impact	Proposed Project	No Development Alternative (Alternative 1A)		Community Plan Development Alternative (Alternative 1B)		Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative (Alternative 2)		Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3)		Clustered Development Alternative (Alternative 4)	
15-2: Release of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to existing site conditions on project-related parcels	Potentially Significant	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
15-3: Potential hazards associated with unused wells	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>
15-4: Accidental releases of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during project operation	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●
15-5: Potential health hazard caused by mosquitoes and other vectors	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	●
15-6: Potential health and safety hazard caused by abandoned septic systems on project-level parcels	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●
15-7: Potential health hazard caused by asbestos in older structures to be demolished	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●
15-8: Release of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to existing site conditions on program-level parcels	Potentially Significant	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●
15-9: Potential health and safety hazard caused by abandoned septic systems on program-level parcels	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●	Potentially Significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potentially Significant	●

Key:

- Proposed Project preferred over the alternative
- Alternative preferred over the Proposed Project
- No clear environmental preference between the alternative and the Proposed Project.