



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

Crystal Jacobsen, Coordinator

**NOTICE OF INTENT
TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

The project listed below was reviewed for environmental impact by the Placer County Environmental Review Committee and was determined to have no significant effect upon the environment. A proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project and has been filed with the County Clerk's office.

PROJECT: Gibbs Minor Land Division (PLN 14-00050)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project proposes a Minor Land Division to divide a 9.6-acre parcel into two parcels consisting of 5.0 acres and 4.6 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION: between Newcastle Road and Auburn Folsom Road, approximately 300 feet easterly along the access driveway from Auburn Folsom Road, Placer, County


OWNER: Jarett Gibbs et al, 3610 Cherry Acres Road, Cool, CA 95614

APPLICANT: Nevada City Engineering Inc. 505 Coyote Street, #B, Nevada City, CA 95959

The comment period for this document closes on **February 18, 2015**. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/EnvCoordSvc/NegDec.aspx> Community Development Resource Agency public counter, and at the Penryn Public Library. For Tahoe area projects, please visit our Tahoe Office, 775 North Lake Blvd., in Tahoe City. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Parcel Review Committee. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132, between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm. Comments may be sent to cdraecs@placer.ca.gov or 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603.

Published in Sacramento Bee, Monday, January 19, 2015

APN: 037-053-080
 DOC 2013-0114509
 12/16/2013
GIBBS PROPERTY
 TOTAL AREA 9.64 ACRES



VICINITY MAP
 SCALE: 1" = 2000'

OWNER / APPLICANT:
 ASSESSOR'S PARCEL: 037-053-080
LARRY, JARETT & MELINDA GIBBS
 3610 CHERRY ACRES ROAD
 COOL, CA 95614

- NOTES:**
- PROPERTY PROFILE:
 - A.P.N.: 37-053-80
 - AREA: 9.64 Ac.
 - ZONING: RA-B-X
 - USE: SF RESIDENTIAL
 - COMMUNITY SERVICE INFORMATION:
 - SCHOOL DISTRICTS: AUBURN UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT, PLACER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
 - FIRE PROTECTION: SOUTH PLACER FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
 - TELEPHONE: AT&T
 - POWER: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
 - SEWAGE DISPOSAL: INDIVIDUAL SEPTIC SYSTEMS
 - WATER: PCWA


PREPARED BY:
NEVADA CITY ENGINEERING, INC.
 505 COYOTE STREET, SUITE B * P.O. BOX 1437
 NEVADA CITY, CA 95959
 PH. (530) 265-6911

Andrew R. Cassano 7-15-14
 ANDREW R. CASSANO, L.S. 4370 DATE:
 REGISTRATION EXPIRES: 9-30-15



NOTE:
 THIS IS A TENTATIVE MAP AND DOES NOT REPRESENT A BOUNDARY SURVEY.

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP FOR THE GIBBS
 BEING PARCEL 2 OF 34 PM 68, SITUATE WITHIN THE NW 1/4 OF SECTION 5, T.11 N., R.8 E., M.D.M. IN THE UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY OF PLACER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
 SCALE: 1" = 100' JUNE, 2014
NEVADA CITY ENGINEERING, INC.
 505 COYOTE STREET * P.O. BOX 1437 * NEVADA CITY * CALIFORNIA





COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

Crystal Jacobsen, Coordinator

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

In accordance with Placer County ordinances regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Placer County has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and on the basis of that study hereby finds:

- The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this **Negative Declaration** has been prepared.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has thus been prepared.

The environmental documents, which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached and/or referenced herein and are hereby made a part of this document.

PROJECT INFORMATION

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Title: Gibbs Minor Land Division | Project # PLN 14-00050 |
| Description: The project proposes a Minor Land Division to divide a 9.6-acre parcel into two parcels consisting of 5.0 acres and 4.6 acres. | |
| Location: between Newcastle Road and Auburn Folsom Road, approximately 300 feet easterly along the access driveway from Auburn Folsom Road, Placer County | |
| Project Owner: Jarett Gibbs et al, 3610 Cherry Acres Road, Cool, CA 95614 | |
| Project Applicant: Nevada City Engineering Inc. 505 Coyote Street, #B, Nevada City, CA 95959 | |
| County Contact Person: Melanie Jackson | 530-745-3036 |

PUBLIC NOTICE

The comment period for this document closes on **February 18, 2015**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site (<http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/EnvCoordSvcs/NegDec.aspx>), Community Development Resource Agency public counter, and at the Penryn Public Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Parcel Review Committee. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, please visit our Tahoe Office, 775 North Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96146.

If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references. Refer to Section 18.32 of the Placer County Code for important information regarding the timely filing of appeals.



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

Crystal Jacobsen, Coordinator

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3080 • www.placer.ca.gov

INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project application. The document may rely on previous environmental documents (see Section C) and site-specific studies (see Section I) prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared.

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Project Title: Gibbs Minor Land Division | Project # PLN 14-00050 |
| Entitlement(s): Minor Land Division | |
| Site Area: 9.64 acres / 419,918 square feet | APN: 037-053-080-000 |
| Location: between Newcastle Road and Auburn Folsom Road, approximately 300 feet easterly along the access driveway from Auburn Folsom Road. The Driveway encroachment is on Auburn Folsom Road, approximately 0.25 miles south of the Rock Springs Drive and Auburn Folsom Road intersection, Placer County | |

A. BACKGROUND:

Project Description:

The applicant is requesting approval of a Minor Land Division to divide a 9.6-acre parcel into two parcels consisting of 5.0 acres and 4.6 acres. Each property will have the potential to be developed with single-family residences. The parcel will be served by Placer County Water Agency for domestic water service and each parcel will include a septic system and leach field. Minimal grading and site improvements will be required and will generally include the construction of driveways.

Project Site (Background/Existing Setting):

The subject property is located in a rural residential, single-family area and existing residential development surrounds the subject property. The site is currently undeveloped. The project site is zoned Residential-Agriculture, combining a minimum Building Site designation of 4.6 acres. The project site is within the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan area and is designated Rural Estate, 4.6-20-acre minimum.

Site topography ranges from moderate to steep and approximately half the project site contain oak woodlands. The property also contains shallow, intermittent wetlands. Several unimproved vehicle paths traverse the property.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

| Location | Zoning | Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan Designations | Existing Conditions and Improvements |
|----------|--|--|--|
| Site | RA-B-X 4.6 AC. MIN. (Residential-Agricultural, combining Building Site designation of 4.6 acre minimum parcel size) | Rural Estate 4.6-20 acre minimum | Undeveloped |
| North | Same as project site | Same as project site | Developed with a single-family residence |
| South | Same as project site | Same as project site | Developed with a single-family residence |
| East | Same as project site | Same as project site | Developed with a single-family residence |
| West | Same as project site | Same as project site | Developed with a single-family residence |

C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the County-wide General Plan and Community Plan Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency would use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It will also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

The following documents serve as Program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference will occur:

- ➔ Placer County General Plan EIR
- ➔ Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan EIR

Section 15183 states that “projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site.” Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, and it has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or will be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then additional environmental documentation need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division Office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including “No Impact” answers.

- b) "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
 - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
 - ➔ **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN) | | | X | |
| 4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN) | | | X | |

Discussion- Items I-1,2:

The subject property is not located within a scenic vista or a state scenic highway and as a result, will not have an adverse effect on scenic resources. There are no impacts.

Discussion- Items I-3,4:

The subject property consists of 9.64-acres and is undeveloped. The proposed project would create two buildable residential parcels. Construction of two single-family residences would have the potential to degrade the visual character or quality of the site and create a new source of light or glare. However, the subject property is located in a rural area that consists of parcels ranging in size from approximately three to 19 acres, which are developed with single-family residences. The additional light or glare created by the new residences would be considered negligible. While the construction of a new residence would modify the visual character and quality of each of the proposed parcels, such a change is considered less than significant considering the parcels' location within an existing rural, residential area and because the parcel is zoned for residential development. No mitigation measures are required.

II. AGRICULTURAL & FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, a Williamson Act contract or a Right-to-Farm Policy? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 4. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the loss or conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) or forest land to non- | | | | X |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| agricultural or non-forest use? (PLN) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|

Discussion- All Items:

The subject property is not considered Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance. The subject property is located within a rural residential area, with the majority of the surrounding properties developed with single-family residences. While Residential Agricultural zoning allows for some agricultural uses, there are no agricultural operations located on or immediately adjacent to the subject property that would require a land use buffer. For this reason, the development of two residential parcels on the subject property will have no impact on agricultural uses.

In addition, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or for an agricultural use, and none of the surrounding properties are within a Williamson Act contract. Finally, the proposed project would not result in changes to the existing environment that would result in the loss or conversion of Farm or Forest land. There is no impact.

III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (PLN, Air Quality) | | | X | |
| 2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (PLN, Air Quality) | | X | | |
| 3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (PLN, Air Quality) | | X | | |
| 4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (PLN, Air Quality) | | | X | |
| 5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (PLN, Air Quality) | | | X | |

Discussion- Item III-1:

The project is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) portion of Placer County. The project proposes a minor land division to create one additional parcel consistent with the land use designation. No grading and/or site disturbance is proposed with this Minor Land Division. However, the project will result in two single-family residential parcels that will each eventually be developed with driveways and homes. The increase in density resulting from one additional residentially-zoned parcel would not contribute a significant impact to Region, as the related emissions would be below the significant level. The project will not result in a significant obstruction to the Sacramento Regional Air Quality Plan. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items III-2,3:

The SVAB is designated non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standards (ROG and NO_x), nonattainment for the federal particulate matter standard (PM_{2.5}) and non-attainment for the state particulate matter standard (PM₁₀).

With regards to construction-related air emissions, future grading resulting from the construction of roadway improvements and for residential units will likely occur. Such grading would result in short-term diesel exhaust emissions from on-site heavy-duty equipment and would generate diesel PM emissions from the use of off-road diesel equipment required for site grading. In order to reduce construction related air emissions, associated grading plans shall list the District's Rules and State Regulations. A Dust Control Plan shall be submitted to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District for approval prior to the commencement of earth disturbing activities

demonstrating all proposed measures to reduce air pollutant emissions. With the implementation of the following mitigation measures and notes on the grading improvement plans, construction-related emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any non-attainment criteria.

The operational-related emissions resulting from the additional dwelling unit would be below the significance level and will not violate air quality standards or substantially contribute to existing air quality violations. However, standard mitigation measures have been added to minimize operational emissions.

Mitigation Measures- Items III-2,3:

MM III.1 (Construction)

1. Prior to approval of Grading Plans, on project sites greater than one acre, the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan to the Placer County APCD. If APCD does not respond within twenty (20) days of the plan being accepted as complete, the plan shall be considered approved. The applicant shall provide written evidence, provided by APCD, to the local jurisdiction (city or county) that the plan has been submitted to APCD. It is the responsibility of the applicant to deliver the approved plan to the local jurisdiction. The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving APCD approval, of the Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan, and delivering that approval to the local jurisdiction issuing the permit.

Include the following standard notes on the Grading Plan (#2 - #9):

2. The contractor shall apply water or use other method to control dust impacts offsite. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site.
3. During construction, traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less.
4. The prime contractor shall suspend all grading operations when wind speeds (including instantaneous gusts) are excessive and dust is impacting adjacent properties.
5. In order to minimize wind driven dust during construction, the prime contractor shall apply methods such as surface stabilization, establishment of a vegetative cover, paving, (or use another method to control dust as approved by the individual jurisdiction).
6. The contractor shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust exceeds Placer County APCD Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust) limitations. The prime contractor shall be responsible for having an individual who is CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE). This individual shall evaluate compliance with Rule 228 on a weekly basis. It is to be noted that fugitive dust is not to exceed 40% opacity and not go beyond the property boundary at any time. Lime or other drying agents utilized to dry out wet grading areas shall not exceed Placer County APCD Rule 228 Fugitive Dust limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits will be notified by APCD and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours.
7. During construction the contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (i.e. gasoline, biodiesel, natural gas) generators rather than temporary diesel power generators.
8. During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel powered equipment.
9. During construction, no open burning of removed vegetation shall be allowed unless permitted by the PCAPCD. All removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on site or taken to an appropriate recycling site, or if a site is not available, a licensed disposal site.

MM III.2 (Operation)

Include the following standard notes on all Building Plans approved in association with this project:

1. Prior to building permit approval, in accordance with the Placer County Air Pollution District Rule 225, only U.S. EPA Phase II certified wood burning devices or a U.L. Listed Decorative Gas Appliance shall be allowed in single-family residences. The emission potential from each residence shall not exceed a cumulative total of 7.5 grams per hour for all devices. Masonry fireplaces shall have either an EPA certified Phase II wood burning device or shall be a U.L. Listed Decorative Gas Appliance.
2. Where natural gas is available, the installation of a gas outlet for use with outdoor cooking appliances, such as a gas barbecue or outdoor recreational fire pits shall be shown.

Discussion- Items III-4,5:

The project would result in future minor grading operations that would cause short-term diesel exhaust emissions from on-site heavy-duty equipment and would generate diesel PM emissions and odor from the use of off-road diesel equipment required for site grading. Because of the dispersive properties of diesel PM and the temporary nature of the mobilized equipment use, short-term construction-generated odor and TAC emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and therefore would have a less than significant effect. No mitigation measures are required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries? (PLN) | | X | | |
| 2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN) | | X | | |
| 3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN) | | X | | |
| 4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, including oak woodlands, identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries? (PLN) | | X | | |
| 5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federal or state protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or as defined by state statute, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN) | | X | | |
| 6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nesting or breeding sites? (PLN) | | X | | |
| 7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, including oak woodland resources? (PLN) | | X | | |
| 8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN) | | | | X |

Discussion- Items IV-1,2,6:

The proposed project includes the division of an approximately 9.6-acre parcel into two properties consisting of 5.0 acres and 4.6 acres. The new parcels would be buildable, residential properties that would have the potential to be developed with single-family residences. This development would involve project grading and construction impacts to the site. Because of these impacts, the project has the potential to affect special status wildlife on the property, reduce habitat of special status wildlife and interfere with the movement of any native or migratory fish or wildlife species.

To assess possible biological impacts, a Biological Inventory was prepared for the subject property by Tina Costella of Costella Environmental Consulting on July 15, 2014. A field study of the project site determined that a Valley Elderberry bush occurs onsite. This species of plant is supports the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB), which is a special status, protected animal species. The field study determined that there is a low probability of the VELB occurring onsite, however, the inclusion of a mitigation measure to reduce potential impacts to this species was recommended. The proposed mitigation measure is included below and, with the implementation of this mitigation measure, possible impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures- Items IV-1,2,6:

MM IV.1 Prior to grading on the subject property, the applicant shall contact the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife Service for technical assistance to determine appropriate avoidance measures for the Valley Elderberry shrub that occurs on site.

Discussion- Items IV-3,7:

The Biological Inventory determined that oak woodland habitat, including Interior Live oak, Valley oak and Blue oak, as well as Foothill pine, occurs on site. Ultimate build-out of the proposed project will result in the removal of some of the oak woodland habitat due to grading and improvements for driveways, site access and house pads. However, impacts resulting from oak tree removal will be less than significant with the implementation of the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items IV-3,7:

MM IV.2 Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, trees identified for removal, and/or trees with disturbance to its critical root zone, shall be mitigated through replacement with comparable species on-site, in an area to be reviewed and approved by the Development Review Committee (DRC) or through payment of in-lieu fees, as follows:

- A. For each diameter inch of a tree removed, replacement shall be on an inch-for-inch basis. For example, if 100 diameter inches are proposed to be removed, the replacement trees would equal 100 diameter inches (aggregate). If replacement tree planting is proposed, the tree replacement/mitigation plan must be shown on Improvements Plans and must be installed by the applicant and inspected and approved by the Development Review Committee (DRC). At its discretion, the DRC may establish an alternate deadline for installation of mitigation replacement trees if weather or other circumstances prevent the completion of this requirement.
- B. In lieu of the tree planting mitigation for tree removal listed above, a tree replacement mitigation fee of \$100 per diameter inch at breast height for each tree removed or impacted or the current market value, as established by an Arborist, Forester or Registered Landscape Architect, of the replacement trees, including the cost of installation, shall be paid to the Placer County Tree Preservation Fund.

Discussion- Items IV-4,5:

The Biological Inventory that was prepared for the project site determined that the project site contains several shallow, man-made intermittent wetland features. The inventory further determined that these wetlands are not deep water wetlands or fish-bearing aquatic habitats. The inventory found that the wetlands' original purpose was for irrigation and are now isolated wetlands with no nexus to jurisdictional waters. The proposed project has the potential to impact these wetlands with site construction, including grading and road and driveway improvements. To reduce these impacts to a less than significant level, the following mitigation measures are required:

Mitigation Measures- Items IV-4,5:

MM IV.3 Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall furnish to the Development Review Committee (DRC), evidence that the: California Department of Fish & Game and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (if applicable) have been notified by certified letter regarding the existence of wetlands, streams, and/or vernal pools on the property. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, if permits are required, they shall be obtained and copies submitted to DRC. Any clearing, grading, or excavation work shall not occur until the Improvement Plans have been approved.

Discussion- Item IV-8:

Placer County does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. There is no impact.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN) | | | X | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN) | | | X | |
| 3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN) | | | X | |

Discussion- Items V-1,2 :

An Archaeological Inventory Survey was conducted for the subject property on June 23, 2014 by Sean Michael Jensen of Genesis Society. The survey determined that there is a low sensitivity for historic-period cultural resources and for prehistoric archaeological sites in the project area. No historic period or archeological resources were located on the subject property or within its immediate vicinity. As a result, no mitigation measures are required. However, because of the sensitivity to discovery of these resources on the subject property, the records search includes recommendations for addressing any of these resources that may be discovered during project construction. Therefore, to ensure that impacts to any new discoveries of these resources on the subject property remain less than significant, the following conditions of approval will be included as part of the project permit and will be included on the project improvement or grading plans:

“If cultural resources are encountered during project construction, altering the materials and their context should be avoided until a cultural resource consultant has evaluated the situation. These materials include, but are not limited to, the following:

- *Prehistoric Resources – chert or obsidian flakes, projectile points and other flaked-stone artifacts; mortars, grinding slicks, pestles and other ground stone tools; and, dark friable soil containing shell and bone dietary debris, heat-affected rock, or hum burials.*
- *Historic Resources – stone or adobe foundations or walls; structures and remains with square nails; mine shafts, tailings, or ditches; and, refuse deposits or bottle dumps.*

Identified cultural resources should be recorded on DPR 523 (A-J) historic resource recordation forms, available at www.ohp.parks.ca.gov.”

No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items V-3,4,5:

The Archaeological Inventory Survey that was prepared for this project determined that no known paleontological resources were located on or in the vicinity of the subject property. In addition, no religious or sacred uses exist on the subject property or the properties within its immediate vicinity. As a result, the creation of two additional single-family parcels will not result in significant impacts to any of these resources. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item V-6:

There are no known human remains on the subject property. However, there may be undiscovered resources on the site that could be unearthed during development activities. The following standard condition of approval will be required as part of the project permit and a note added to the Improvement Plans:

“If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and a SOPA-certified (Society of Professional Archaeologists) archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s).

If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect shall be provided on the improvement plans for the project.”

No mitigation measures are required.

VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD) | | | | X |
| 2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD) | | | X | |
| 3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD) | | | | X |
| 4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD) | | | | X |
| 5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD) | | X | | |
| 6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD) | | X | | |
| 7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (PLN, ESD) | | | X | |
| 8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD) | | | X | |
| 9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Chapter 18 of the California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD) | | | X | |

Discussion- Items VI-1,4:

According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Survey of Placer County and the United States Department of Agriculture ~ Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, the proposed project is located on soils classified as Andregg coarse sandy loam with small portions of Andregg-Shenandoah complex and Sierra sandy loam. Permeability is low to moderately rapid. The hazard of erosion is slight to moderate. The Soil Survey does not identify any unique geologic or physical features.. No known unique geologic or physical features exist on the site that will be destroyed or modified. Creation of this Parcel Map and associated improvements will not create any unstable earth conditions or change any geologic substructure. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item VI-2:

In order to construct the residences and associated access, utility, and road improvements, minimal grading is proposed. Site topography is rolling and generally slopes from northeast to southwest at elevations of approximately 760 to 720 feet above sea level (USGS 7.5' Quadrangle Map – Pilot Hill, CA, 2012). The soil unit is Andregg coarse sandy loam with small portions of Andregg-Shenandoah complex and Sierra sandy loam. Soils are mapped as well drained and slightly to moderately erodible.

The earthwork is proposed to be minimal and close to existing grade, as shown on the Proposed Grading Exhibit (dated November 2014). Retaining walls are not proposed. All resulting finished grades are proposed to be no steeper than 2:1. The proposed project's impacts associated with unstable earth conditions, soil disruptions, displacements, compaction of the soil, and overcrowding of the soil are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VI-3:

The two parcel Minor Land Division project is not proposing a substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features. The proposed access is approximately 600 feet long, with minor grading required to construct the access improvements, including widening the existing road and Plate R-17 improvements at Auburn Folsom Road. There is not a substantial change in site topography as a result of this project. There is no impact.

Discussion- Items VI-5,6:

This project proposal would result in limited soil disturbance and grading to construct access improvements and a Plate R-17 roadway connection onto Auburn Folsom Road in order to serve the parcels created on the subject site. The disruption of soils on this previously disturbed property increases the risk of erosion and creates a potential for contamination of stormwater runoff with disturbed soils or other pollutants introduced through typical grading practices. The construction phase will create significant potential for erosion as disturbed soil may come in contact with wind or precipitation that could transport sediment to the air and/or adjacent waterways. Discharge of concentrated runoff in the post-development condition could also contribute to the erosion potential in the long-term; however, due to runoff flows from this project being directed through existing overland flow patterns, downstream water quality impacts are less than significant. Erosion potential and water quality impacts are always present and occur when protective vegetative cover is removed and soils are disturbed. This disruption of soils on the site has the potential to result in significant increases in erosion of soils both on- and off-site. The proposed project's impacts associated with deposition or soil erosion or changes in siltation will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items VI-5,6:

MM VI.1 Submit to the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) for review and approval, Improvement Plans for the required improvements (including the encroachment onto Auburn Folsom Road and onsite parcel map road up to the point of splitting into individual driveways) and pay the appropriate plan check and inspection fees with the 1st submittal. The Environmental Health Division may be required to review and approve the plans for compliance to their regulations if deemed appropriate by the ESD (See Section 16.20.200 c, 3, f).

MM VI.2 The Improvement Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the Development Review Committee (DRC). All cut/fill slopes shall be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal: vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) concurs with said recommendation. Fill slopes shall not exceed 1.5:1 (horizontal: vertical)

The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation, undertaken from April 1 to October 1, shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas, shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD).

MM VI.3 Water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD)).

Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project may include, but are not limited to: Fiber Rolls (SE-5), Hydroseeding (EC-4), revegetation techniques, dust control measures, and limiting the soil disturbance.

Discussion- Items VI-7,8:

The site is located within Seismic Zone 3. Because structures will be constructed according to the current edition of the California Building Code, which contains seismic standards, the likelihood of severe damage due to ground shaking should be minimal. There is no landsliding or slope instability related to the project site. No avalanches, mud slides or other geologic or geomorphological hazards have been observed at or near this project site. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VI-9:

According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Survey of Placer County and the United States Department of Agriculture ~ Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, the proposed project is located on soils classified as Andregg coarse sandy loam with smaller portions of Andregg-Shenandoah complex and Sierra sandy loam. The soil survey did identify shrink-swell potential as a possible limitation with the Andregg-Shenandoah complex and the Sierra sandy loam. Because structures will be constructed according to the current edition of the California Building Code, which contains soils standards, the likelihood of creating substantial risks to life or property due to expansive soils should be minimal. No mitigation measures are required.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant and/or cumulative impact on the environment? (PLN, Air Quality) | | | X | |
| 2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (PLN, Air Quality) | | | X | |

Discussion- All Items:

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of primary concern from land use projects include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). Construction related activities resulting in exhaust emissions may come from fuel combustion for heavy-duty diesel and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, material delivery trucks, and worker commuter trips. Operational GHG emissions would result from motor vehicle trips generated by the additional residents, on-site fuel combustion for space and water heating, landscape maintenance equipment, and fireplaces/stoves; and off site emissions at utility providers associated with the project's electricity and water demands.

The project would result in future site grading and the construction of two dwelling units. The construction and operational related GHG emissions resulting from the project would not substantially hinder the State's ability to attain the goals identified in AB 32 (i.e., reduction of statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020; approximately a 30 percent reduction from projected 2020 emissions). Thus, the construction and operation of the project would not generate substantial greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, which may be considered to have a significant impact on the environment, nor conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases and is therefore considered to have a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials? (EHS) | | | X | |
| 2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS) | | | X | |
| 3. Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (PLN, Air Quality) | | | | X |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| 4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS) | | | X | |
| 5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN) | | | X | |
| 8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS) | | | | X |
| 9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS) | | | X | |

Discussion- Items VIII-1,2:

The use of hazardous substances during normal construction activities is expected to be limited in nature, and will be subject to standard handling and storage requirements. Accordingly, impacts related to the release of hazardous substances are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-3:

There are no known existing or proposed school sites located within a quarter mile of the project location. Further, the project does not propose a use that typically would involve any activities that would emit hazardous substances or waste that would affect a substantial number of people and is therefore considered to have no impact.

Discussion- Items VIII-4,9:

The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. A Phase 2 Soil Sampling Environmental Site Assessment was completed by Aqua Terra Environmental, dated May 15, 2014, in order to evaluate potential contamination related to past land uses as an orchard. Soil sample results are below published screening levels and therefore no additional soil sampling related to past land use is required. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items VIII-5,6:

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport or a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item VIII-7:

The project site is located within an area determined by CalFire to be at moderate risk for wildland fires and is located within a California State Responsibility Area. Standard fire regulations and conditions shall apply to the proposed project, including fire sprinklers in the single-family residences and standard fire safe setbacks. In addition, comments were received from Lawrence Bettencourt, Fire Chief with the South Placer Fire Protection District (the serving fire district for the subject parcel). The comments set forth requirements for the proposed parcel map, which include an increase in the paved driveway to a minimum of 20 feet, installation of a fire hydrant along the proposed driveway and improvement of the existing driveway to current fire district standards. The implementation of these requirements, in conjunction with the application of standard fire safe practices, impacts related to wildland fires are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-8:

The project will result in the creation of two single-family residential parcels and will not create any health hazard or potential health hazard nor will it expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards. There is no impact.

IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Violate any federal, state or county potable water quality standards? (EHS) | | | | X |
| 2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS) | | | | X |
| 3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD) | | | X | |
| 4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (ESD) | | X | | |
| 5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD) | | X | | |
| 6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality?(ESD) | | X | | |
| 7. Otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EHS) | | | X | |
| 8. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD) | | | | X |
| 9. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD) | | | | X |
| 10. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD) | | | | X |
| 11. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS) | | | | X |
| 12. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD) | | | | X |

Discussion- Item IX-1:

This project will not rely on groundwater wells as a potable water source. Potable water for this project will be treated water from Placer County Water Agency. Therefore, the project will not violate water quality standards with respect to potable water. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item IX-2:

This project will not utilize groundwater, and is not located in an area where soils are conducive to groundwater recharge. Therefore, the project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item IX-3:

This residential parcel map project would create two new residential parcels, each approximately 5.00 and 4.64 acres in size, from the 9.64 acre site. To construct the required driveway and access improvements, only minimal site grading is proposed. The residential parcels will not be pad graded as a part of the project. The parcel map

improvements will not cause a significant change to site hydrology. While on site drainage patterns are slightly altered due to the proposed development of this site, the direction of discharge of runoff from the site remains essentially the same as pre-development conditions. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-4:

The new impervious surfaces for the undeveloped parcel will only slightly increase the overall rate and amount of surface runoff from the site. The project proposes to subdivide the 9.64 acre parcel in order to create two new residential single family parcels. The additional impervious areas of the paved private driveway access and future home sites created by the project are small compared to the overall watersheds.

The proposed project's impacts associated with increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Item IX-4:

Refer to text in MM VI.1, MM VI.2, MM VI.3, See Items VI-5, 6 for the text of these mitigation measures as well as the following:

Discussion- Items IX-5,6:

The water quality of all natural waterways is important to maintain for public health and safety and the health of the ecosystem. Potential water quality impacts are present both during project construction and after project development. Construction activities will disturb soils and cause potential introduction of sediment into stormwater during rain events. Through the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for minimizing contact with potential stormwater pollutants at the source and erosion control methods, this potentially significant impact will be reduced to less than significant levels. In the post-development condition, the project could potentially introduce contaminants such as oil and grease, sediment, nutrients, metals, organics, pesticides, and trash from activities such as driveway runoff, outdoor storage, landscape fertilizing and maintenance, and refuse collection. During construction, the driveway improvements will potentially cause erosion, sediment, and water quality impacts to the Auburn Ravine watershed. Erosion potential and water quality impacts are always present and occur when protective vegetative cover is removed and soils are disturbed. This disruption of soils on the site has the potential to result in significant increases in erosion of soils both on- and off-site. The proposed project's impacts associated with soil erosion will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items IX-5, 6:

Refer to text in MM VI.1, MM VI.2, MM VI.3, See Items VI-5, 6 for the text of these mitigation measures as well as the following:

MM IX.1 Water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD)).

Storm drainage from on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD). BMPs shall be designed at a minimum in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. Post-development (permanent) BMPs for the project may include, but are not limited to: revegetation and grassy swales. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

Discussion- Item IX-7:

The project could result in urban stormwater runoff. Standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be used and as such, the potential for this project to violate any water quality standards is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items IX-8,9,10:

The project site is not located within an area shown on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) and there are no proposed building sites within a FEMA-designated Flood Zone or Special Flood Hazard Area. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item IX-11:

The project will not alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater as it does not propose the use of a groundwater source. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item IX-12:

Stormwater runoff from the site eventually flows overland into Miner's Ravine; however the runoff will be treated and infiltrate prior to reaching Auburn Ravine. The improvements proposed do not substantially impact an important surface water resource. There is no impact.

X. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (EHS, ESD, PLN) | | | | X |
| 3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN) | | | | X |

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed project includes the subdivision of a 9.6 acre property into two parcels consisting of 5.0 acres and 4.6 acres. The subject property is located in the Newcastle area and is zoned RA-B-X 4.6 ac. min. (Residential Agriculture, combining minimum Building Site designation of 4.6 acres). The property is within the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan and is designated Rural Estate 4.6-20 acre minimum. The project is consistent with the zoning and community plan designation. The property is bordered on the north, south, east and west sides by rural residential development and the property is consistent with the properties in the immediate vicinity and the surrounding neighborhood. Finally, there are no agricultural operations on the project site or within the vicinity. For these reasons, the project is consistent with its surroundings and the requirements of the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan and the Placer County General Plan. There is no impact.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN) | | | | X |
| 2. The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN) | | | | X |

Discussion- All Items:

The Mineral Land Classification of Placer County (California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology, 1995), was prepared for the purpose of identifying and documenting the various mineral compounds found in the soils of Placer County. The classification is comprised of three primary mineral deposit types: those mineral deposits formed by mechanical concentration (placer gold); those mineral deposits formed by hydrothermal processes (lode gold, silver, copper, zinc and tungsten) and construction aggregate resources, industrial mineral deposits and other deposits formed by magmatic segregation processes (sand, gravel, crushed stone, decomposed granite, clay shale, quartz and chromite).

With respect to those deposits formed by mechanical concentration, the site and immediate vicinity are classified as Mineral Resource Zone MRZ-1, meaning, this is an area where geologic information indicates there is little likelihood for the presence of significant mineral resources. No significant mineral resources have been identified on the property.

With respect to those mineral deposits formed by hydrothermal processes, the site and vicinity have been classified as Mineral Resource Zone MRZ-4. This mineral classification is designated as an area of no known mineral occurrences where geologic information does not rule out either the presence or absence of significant mineral resources.

Because there is no evidence that the site has been mined and because no valuable, locally important mineral resources have been identified on the project site, there are no impacts.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan, Community Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (PLN) | | X | | |
| 2. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN) | | | X | |
| 3. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN) | | X | | |
| 4. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN) | | | | X |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| 5. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN) | | | | X |
|--|--|--|--|----------|

Discussion- Items XII-1,3:

The proposed project will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the Placer County General Plan, Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan, or the Placer County Noise Ordinance. Construction associated with the proposed project will create a temporary increase in ambient noise levels, which could adversely affect adjacent residents. However, with the incorporation of the following mitigation measure, these impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures- Items XII-1,3:

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

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

Discussion- Item XII-2:

The proposed project involves the creation of two undeveloped residential parcels. Vehicle trips generated from the subdivision would be periodic in nature and given the relatively low density of the surrounding area, would not be excessive. The proposed project would not create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XII-4:

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item XII-5:

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip and therefore there is no impact.

XIII. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (PLN) | | | X | |
| 2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN) | | | | X |

Discussion- Item XIII-1:

Because the project includes the development of two single-family residential lots, it will result in a slight increase to population growth. This increase is consistent with what was anticipated for this site in the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan and the Placer County General Plan and has been analyzed as part of these plans. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XIII-2:

The proposed project will not displace existing housing. The project involves the creation of two undeveloped residential parcels and therefore, there is no impact.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Fire protection? (ESD, PLN) | | | | X |
| 2. Sheriff protection? (ESD, PLN) | | | | X |
| 3. Schools? (ESD, PLN) | | | | X |
| 4. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (ESD, PLN) | | | X | |
| 5. Other governmental services? (ESD, PLN) | | | | X |

Discussion- Item XIV-1:

The servicing fire district has reviewed the proposed project. The proposed project does not generate the need for new, significant fire protection facilities as a part of this project. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item XIV-2:

The proposed project would result in the creation of two new residential single-family lots and would increase the number of residents in the project area. However, this increase would not result in an adverse effect to Sheriff Protection facilities because the small increase in the number of residents is considered negligible and is not beyond the number of residents that were analyzed in the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item XIV-3:

The proposed project would result in the creation of two new residential single-family lots and would increase the number of residents in the project area. However, this increase would not result in an adverse effect to schools in the area. This is because the increase in the number of residents is minimal and does not go beyond those numbers analyzed and planned for in the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item XIV-4:

The proposed Parcel Map will access Auburn Folsom Road, a county maintained road. Therefore, the project's impacts to the maintenance of public facilities are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XIV-5:

No other governmental services are proposed as part of this project. There is no impact.

XV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN) | | | X | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN) | | | | X |
|---|--|--|--|---|

Discussion- Item XV-1:

There would be a negligible increase in the use of existing recreational areas in the surrounding area as a result of the Minor Land Division. The increase will not result in a substantial deterioration of facilities as improvements and/or maintenance of these services is offset by the payment of park fees as a part of the conditioning process. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XV-2:

The project does not include recreational facilities nor require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment. There is no impact.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project result in:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD) | | X | | |
| 2. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD) | | | X | |
| 3. Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD) | | X | | |
| 4. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD) | | | | X |
| 5. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN) | | | | X |
| 6. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (ESD) | | | | X |
| 7. Conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (i.e. bus turnouts, bicycle lanes, bicycle racks, public transit, pedestrian facilities, etc.) or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? (ESD) | | | | X |
| 8. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (PLN) | | | | X |

Discussion- Item XVI-1:

This project proposal would result in the creation of a two lot Parcel Map. The creation of one additional residential single family parcel will result in the construction of one additional residence. The proposed project will generate approximately one additional PM peak hour trip. The peak hour trip generation of the proposed project is consistent with the land use zoning for this property.

The proposed project creates site-specific impacts on local transportation systems that are considered less than significant when analyzed against the existing baseline traffic conditions and roadway segment / intersection existing LOS; however, the cumulative effect of an increase in traffic has the potential to create significant impacts to the area’s transportation system. Article 15.28.010 of the Placer County Code establishes a road network Capital

Improvement Program (CIP). This project is subject to this code and, therefore, required to pay traffic impact fees to fund the CIP for area roadway improvements. With the payment of traffic mitigation fees for the ultimate construction of the CIP improvements, the traffic impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures- Item XVI-1:

MM XVI.1 This project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Newcastle/Horseshoe Bar Fee District), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) will be required and shall be paid to Placer County DPW prior to issuance of any Building Permits for the project:

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

The current estimated fee is \$6,162 per single family residence. The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If either the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.

Discussion- Item XVI-2:

This proposed minor land division would ultimately result in the creation of one new residential single family lot. The level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic will not be exceeded. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVI-3:

The project proposes improvements to the existing, substandard encroachment onto Auburn Folsom Road. The design speed of Auburn Folsom Road is 45 miles per hour (mph). These improvements will provide a substantial increase to driver safety by allowing more room for acceleration/deceleration; however with the following mitigation measures impacts are considered less than significant

Mitigation Measures- Item XVI-3:

Refer to text in MM VI.1, MM VI.2, See Items VI-5,6 for the text of these mitigation measures as well as the following:

MM XVI.2 The Improvement Plans shall show the construction of a public road entrance/driveway onto Auburn Folsom Road to a Plate R-17 minor Land Development Manual (LMD) standard. The design speed of Auburn Folsom Road shall be 45 miles per hour (mph). An Encroachment Permit shall be obtained by the applicant or authorized agent from ESD. The Plate R-17 structural section within the main roadway right-of-way shall be designed for a Traffic Index of 8.5, but said section shall not be less than 3 inches Asphalt Concrete (AC) over 8 inches Class 2 Aggregate Base (AB) unless otherwise approved by the ESD.

Discussion- Item XVI-4:

The servicing fire district has reviewed the proposed project and has not identified any impacts to emergency access. The existing road will be widened to the current County Standard Plate R-1 width of 20-feet of pavement and 2-foot shoulders. The turnaround will be improved to meet the current County Standard Plate R-2 as well as the South Placer Fire Department requirements. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-5:

The project does not generate the need for any additional parking spaces and meets the parking standards laid out in section 17.54.060(B)(5)(Parking) of the Placer County Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-6:

The proposed project will not cause hazards or barriers to pedestrians or bicyclists. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-7:

The project will not conflict with any existing, or preclude anticipated future policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item XIV-8:

The project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. Therefore, there is no impact.

XVII. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

| Environmental Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (ESD) | | | | X |
| 2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EHS, ESD) | | | X | |
| 3. Require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage systems? (EHS) | | | X | |
| 4. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (ESD) | | | X | |
| 5. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (EHS) | | | | X |
| 6. Require sewer service that may not be available by the area's waste water treatment provider? (EHS, ESD) | | | | X |
| 7. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs in compliance with all applicable laws? (EHS) | | | | X |

Discussion- Items XVII-1,6:

This project will be served by treated water from Placer County Water Agency and onsite sewage disposal. The project will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVII-2:

The project is located within the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) service area. The current land use consists of one residential single family parcel and the proposed project includes the creation of one additional new residential parcel. To serve the two new parcels, a public water connection will be made to the existing public water line in Auburn Folsom Road in accordance with requirements of PCWA. The installation of a fire hydrant is also required by the South Placer Fire Department. The construction of these water facilities will not cause significant environmental effects and therefore, this is a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-3:

A minimum sewage disposal area (MUSDA) have been defined for Parcel 1 and for Parcel 2. Through the completion of the soils testing the MUSDA's and 100% repair are have been shown to meet the minimum effective soil depth requirements and to meet minimum standards of the Placer County Onsite Sewage Disposal Ordinance and Manual. The onsite sewage disposal systems are required to be installed under permit and inspection with Environmental Health Services and will be required to meet all applicable requirements of the Placer County Onsite Sewage Disposal Ordinance and Manual. Therefore, impacts from new onsite sewage disposal systems are expected to be less than significant. No mitigations measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-4:

The construction for storm water drainage is included in the grading and drainage impacts analysis and will not cause significant environmental effects. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-5:

The proposed project includes the creation of two residential single-family parcels which will be served treated water. Placer County Water Agency indicated their ability to provide water to the project. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVII-6:

The project will be served by onsite sewage disposal systems and there will be no need for public sewer services to the project, therefore there is no impact

Discussion- Item XVII-7:

The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Therefore, there is no impact

E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

| Environmental Issue | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----------|
| 1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially impact biological resources, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | | X |
| 2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) | | X |
| 3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | | X |

F. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES whose approval is required:

| | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Wildlife | <input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry | <input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

G. DETERMINATION – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

Although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

H. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments consulted):

- Planning Services Division, Melanie Jackson, Chairperson
- Planning Services Division, Air Quality, Lisa Carnahan
- Engineering and Surveying Division, Sarah Gillmore
- Environmental Engineering Division, Heather Knutson
- Department of Public Works, Transportation
- Environmental Health Services, Laura Rath
- Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow
- Facility Services, Parks, Andy Fisher

Signature  Date January 14, 2015
 Crystal Jacobsen, Environmental Coordinator

I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES: The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division office, 775 North Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| County Documents | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Pollution Control District Rules & Regulations | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ | |
| Trustee Agency Documents | <input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ | |
| Site-Specific Studies | Planning Services Division | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Study |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Archaeological Inventory Survey |
| | Engineering & Surveying Division, Flood Control District | <input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available) |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tentative Map |
| | Environmental Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |
| | Planning Services Division, Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Emission & Dust Control Plan |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos) |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> CalEEMod Model Output |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |
| | Fire Department | <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic & Circulation Plan |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |